

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for  
Audit & Review Follow-up Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Early Childhood Education Majors and Minors, 2015-2016**

**Date:** April 14, 2016

**Time:** 11:00am-12:00pm

**Place:** Winther Hall 4013

**Attended:** Provost John Stone; AVC Greg Cook; Associate Dean Robin Fox; Program Coordinator Simone Devore; Department Chair Matt Vick; faculty and staff in the Early Childhood Education program Anne Tillet, Brooke Winchell, Carmen Rivers, Lucy Heimer; Audit & Review Team Chair Xueqing Chen; Audit & Review team members Katy Casey, Joan Cook, Dale Splinter, Linda Yu

1) Call to order

2) Introductions

3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments

The program coordinator and faculty/staff discussed strengths of the program. The Early Childhood Education major is an interdisciplinary undergraduate professional education program, which allows graduates to teach all young children from birth to eight years old. The program noted “We are a team,” there is a very collegial environment, and they meet weekly. They noted that a big strength of the program is its focus on field-based education, and that partnerships with schools are essential for program success. The program noted that they answer to several organizations with different standards and guidelines, which contributes to complexity in creating an assessment plan. Figuring out how to use data they have to impact the program is a challenge. The A&R committee and administrators complimented the faculty/staff for their progress and successful program. It was noted that the program draws students from a wide geographic area, which argues for the strength of the program. Interim Provost Stone noted that this program is “the crown jewel” of interdisciplinary programs on campus.

4) Discussion of Review Team’s evaluation:

a) *Resources. What can the Dean and College do to provide appropriate classroom spaces for 30+ students and resource room for students?*

The program coordinator and faculty/staff stated the need for appropriate classroom space where the majority of the ECE classes can be held and the need for resources to support field-based activities. Associate Dean Robin Fox mentioned that in Fall 2016, the college will have a newly remodeled space for the program in WH2010. Program faculty/staff noted the need for continued support for including field supervision as part of course load. Given the time required to find good placements, there was discussion of whether the Office of Field Experience could take on part of this task.

b) *SLOs. Provide information to connect courses with SLOs.*

There was discussion of how the program separates the professional standards the program adheres to into component skills so each individual program SLO can be assessed. The program has completed this conceptual analysis since the time of the self-study. In the next self-study, the A&R committee wants to see clear evidence for each individual SLO, as well as how each aligns with LEAP ELOs. There was discussion of the challenges involved in aligning program SLOs

with various sets of standards as well as LEAP, and of how EdTPA assessments can be sampled to address program SLOs.

- c) *Further develop and implement assessment processes. Explain how student progress toward learning outcomes is monitored and discussed.*

The program is completing the creation of an assessment plan. The program is recognized as having a good approach to direct assessment (i.e., build on what they are already required to do by EdTPA and for professional standards) but there is not a lot of direct data yet. There was discussion of how to efficiently and effectively gather information on what students do well and what they need help on, including the possibility of requiring an integrative project as a basis for assessing skills. It was noted that, while an integrative project makes sense, it is important to be able to pull data on individual SLOs from the data, as well as information on the integration of skills and knowledge.

- d) *Credits. The average number of credits for graduates is between 161 and 168. Compared with other programs, it is high.*

The program coordinator explained that the program is essentially a dual major. Students get two different licenses and thus more fieldwork is required. Also, some students come from 2-year schools and the credit-to-degree statistic captures a lot of the credits they transfer in. Finally, while the program does not require a minor, many students have a lot of credits towards a minor by the time they declare this major and they choose to go ahead and complete it, which adds additional credits to degree.

- e) *Accreditation. Please clarify the NCATE accreditation and recognition by NAEYC and CEC as a blended program. What does it mean to be recognized as a “blended program,” and what are the advantages of this?*

The college is no longer accredited by NCATE, but this program has received recognition from two organizations as a blended program. *Blended* means that the program includes both regular and special education content and practice. This is the only blended program in Wisconsin, which contributes to a competitive advantage. The dual nature of the program also increases students' marketability.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 2 recommended actions (see page 12, point 4) regarding assessment and resources.

6) **Recommended Result: Continuation without qualification**

- Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
- Because the recommended result of this review is to continue without qualification, the program's next full self-study will be a “short” one focused on the recommended actions from the current report. This short self-study is due October 1, 2020 to the Dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies and November 1, 2020 to the chair of Audit & Review Committee.

- 7) Adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:04PM.

**Submitted by:** Xueqing Chen

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

Date of Evaluation February 4, 2016 Short Self Study (SS\*)           
 Program Early Childhood Education Major X Minor         

**Evaluations submitted by:** Xueqing Chen (chair), Katy Casey, Joan Cook, Dale Splinter, Linda Yu  
**Review meeting attended by:** Xueqing Chen (chair), Katy Casey, Joan Cook, Dale Splinter

**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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	1

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

Introductory comments: The philosophy of the ECE program is clearly reflected in their actions.  
 IA1. Interdisciplinary undergraduate professional education program and 99% of graduates are employed.  
 Evidence of commitment to regional and international engagement. Teacher candidates receive training from an interdisciplinary team. Faculty engage in scholarship to inform their field and mentor undergraduate researchers.

Information on how the program contributes to University core values, Mission, Strategic Plan is a little vague. Can you give a bit more detail here?

IA2. Little information given here, other than students in the program must fulfill university GenEd requirements.

The statement doesn't seem to address the program's contribution towards general education.

IA3. Faculty actively seek and encourage intercultural opportunities for their teacher candidates. A strong international partnership has been established with Ecuador. Further, a program was created to address the needs of non-traditional and transfer students.

The self-study doesn't specifically list the IE goals they address, but they do address at least a couple (Students--recruitment; Students--Intercultural curr/co-curr).

More mention of student recruitment, less on student retention.

IA4. Progress was definitely made, but the recommendations in the last report involved more than what was addressed in the current self-study.

## 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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

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

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

### Comments

IB1. It's beneficial to know when the mission statement was developed and how often this document is revisited.

IB2. The result of goal 3 is a little unclear. For example, one goal was related to a redesign plan to integrate learning and performances in the field as measured by the edTPA. However, there was not a description of how this was done, if it was accomplished, or whether the edTPA reflected these redesign efforts.

It's not clear whether the program sets annual goals.

IB3. The ECE program obviously values input from stakeholders as evidenced by annual Advisory Board meetings.

More detail is needed on the process. What happens after the annual Advisory Board meetings, who is involved in working on the goals, and how is progress evaluated? I believe this is all happening, but it's not described here.

IB5. I do not believe accreditation is an award. Answer better fits with question 6.

What does it mean to be recognized as a "blended program" and what are the advantages of this? Recognized by NAEYC and CEC as a blended program, one of only 7 in the country at that time. Please clarify why the program would like to apply for this again?

The program has been NCATE accredited. Continued to be accredited until 2016. What will happen after 2016?

IB6. The advantages of the "special recognition" the program is investigating was not discussed.

## 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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2

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

**Comments**

- IIA1. Lot of credits required (151 for the 4.5 year dual license), but that's not uncommon in colleges of education.
- IIA2. While some dual-listed courses are offered as part of their program plan, there was not a description of how the courses differ for graduates. The syllabi attachments are helpful, but it would have been nice to read a summary of the distinctions.  
Need to add required work for graduate students for dual list courses
- IIA3. Data from multiple sources were considered before making curricular revisions  
Data are used, but there doesn't seem to be much direct data of student performance considered (is such data available?).
- IIA5. All online courses go through the QM process.

**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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

### Comments

IIB1. It would be nice to see Wisconsin teaching standards mapped to LEAP ELOs.

It was not clear which learning outcomes received specific attention during this review period. Are the WTS the same thing as the program SLOs? It looks like that's how they're being used (which makes sense) and they're mapped to courses, but they aren't really stated as SLOs.

IIB3. The assessments seem to blend several learning outcomes into the same assignments. This is fine, but I'm not clear on where the program gets information on each individual SLO. That is, how do they know how students are doing on *each individual SLO*?

IIB3 & 4. The program has an appropriate assessment plan. A collection and analysis of cooperating teacher data was provided. It would have been helpful to see results, or at least a student sample, of the data collected on the student portfolios. How meaningful is the data collected from the artifact rubrics?

Can't tell for sure but it seems that most of the 'direct' assessments are student reflections, narratives, etc. Are there direct assessments of student knowledge and skills that aren't based on student reflections?

Can the program pull data from the feedback they're providing to students? It sounds like they would like to be able to say more about how students improve over time.

It seems that a lot of what the program is looking at are attitudes, self-confidence, empathy, etc. I'm a little unclear as to how they assess students' levels of these qualities. What knowledge base, specific teaching strategies and skills, etc. do students need to be successful in this

profession? Are these built into the assessment program, and where/how?

IIB5. Data from exit surveys was analyzed. The methods the faculty use when evaluating assessment data from portfolios were unclear. I am not sure what is meant by "critical analysis through cooperative inquiry."

IIB6. The program has a plan to share assessment data with internal and external constituencies.

### 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	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

#### Comments

IIIA3. While the credit to degree is a bit high, the program is aware of the need to reduce the credits and have taken steps to do so.

III.A. 4-5. I have concern over the time to degree. Credit totals much higher than the majority of majors on campus, however, placement rate is much higher in ECE than many other majors on campus. Tradeoff?



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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

IIIB1: Have graduates working in all of the paths.  
 IIIB3. The COEPS started distributing an alumni survey in Fall 2015. This should help the ECE program track their graduates. They were able to survey 100 graduates out of 162, 62% response rate is good.

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

**Comments**

Are there any competing programs?  
 Do other program also offer dual majors, cohorts, etc.?

**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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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**

IV A1. Missed information about faculty expertise
---

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

**1. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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**

**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**

Impressive amount of external funding rewarded.

**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
<b>Comments</b>	

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

##### Comments

#### 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

IVG1. Classroom spaces that are appropriate for the ECE program model are needed

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

##### 1. Program strengths are discussed.

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

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

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

##### 3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

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

Yes	3
No	0

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

- Clear mission statement and philosophy that is reflected in the program's actions.
- Program was created based on consumer demand, e.g., ECE4U.
- In addition, the program model (e.g., use of cohorts, adopting reflective practices, and infusing social justice) has been researched and clearly reflects best practice in the field.
- The program adopts an Interdisciplinary approach to training teachers.
- The faculty and staff are responsive to student needs; program does a good job of responding to the needs of non-traditional students.
- Faculty seek feedback from stakeholders regularly through advisory board meetings.
- Student data on SLOs are collected.
- Dedicated faculty.

**2. Areas for Work or Improvement**

- Adequacy of facilities
- There needs to be a clearer description of how portfolio data are used to inform curricular revisions and assess student progress toward SLOs.
- Assessment: SLOs clarified (how to assess them unambiguously?); how are portfolio data used to inform decisions?

**3. Other comments/questions**

Well written report.

**4. Recommended Actions**

1. Further develop and implement the program's assessment plan:
  - a. Clarify how the DPI Teaching Standards are translated into assessable SLOs.
  - b. Explain how each *individual* SLO is assessed (i.e., how does the program evaluate students' learning on each individual SLO, not SLOs in combination with one another).
  - c. Provide clear information on how students' progress toward each individual learning outcome is monitored and discussed, including examples of rubrics used and student work samples.
2. Resources:
  - a. Work with the dean and college to gain resources to maintain growth.

**5. Recommended Result\***

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	
Continuation without qualification	X*
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	
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.	

**\*Because the recommended result of this review is to continue without qualification, the program's next full self-study will be a "short" one focused on the recommended actions from the current report. This short self-study is due October 1, 2020 to the Dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies and November 1, 2020 to the chair of Audit & Review Committee.**