

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Program Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
History & Social Studies Majors and Minors, 2024-2025**

Date: 3/31/2025

In Attendance: Interim Provost Robin Fox; Dean Jason Janke (L&S); Department Chair/ Program Coordinator Kimberly Nath; faculty and staff in the History & Social Studies program Karl Brown, Anthony Gulig, Molly Patterson, Jim Coons, Nengher Vang; Program Review Team Chair Cody Marie Busch; Program Review team members Onochie Fan-Osuala, Louis Fucilla; Assessment Representative Katy Casey

- 1) Introductions
- 2) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments:
 - i) The review team noted a number of accomplishments on this department over the years. Some of what was shared included the commitment to incorporating students in community-based learning opportunities through a commitment to student service, which is well-aligned with university mission/strategic plan. In addition, there is a clear commitment to service by faculty members as noted in their willingness to step into leadership positions (e.g., Kim Nath as Faculty Senate President, Jim Coons as Chair of General Education Review Committee).
- 3) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) The program provided information on student outcomes post-graduation in various places in the report. Can you provide a general overview of whether students are generally successful upon graduation and how you track their outcomes? Clarify your process for using post-graduation data when available.
 - i) The program used Facebook and email to collect information on and track graduates of their program. There is interest among faculty in the program to continue tracking students. The program noted the variety of post-graduation employment settings for History majors. There was discussion over some potential strategies, such as collecting contact information from students in a program-end course before they leave asking how best to reach them to stay in touch.
 - b) How is assessment work managed in the department? Is the current assessment plan sustainable long-term?
 - i) The program is aware of the needs in program level assessment, specifically related to aligning findings with SLOs, analyzing the data and using the findings of that analysis to help inform program-level initiatives. They have a model in place, and are looking at a 6-year structure to assess student learning outcomes. The short-term plan includes establishing a timeline to cyclically measure SLOs, so not focusing on all of them at once. There is also interest in attending the institute, if the date can be past deadlines for AP grading that the program faculty are all heavily engaged in.
- 4) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists three recommended actions (see page 10, point 4) related to assessment, creation of the online degree, and credits to degree.
- 5) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns*
 - Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
 - Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:
 - ☒ Next FULL self-study will be due to the Dean on May 1, 2031 and to the Assessment Office on August 1, 2031.

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

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Review of Program Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2024-2025
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation: 12/5/2024 Short Self Study (SS*)
 Program: History & Social Studies Major ☒ Minor ☒

Evaluations submitted by: Louis Fucilla, Onochie Fan-Osuala, John Ejnik, Katy Casey, and Cody Marie Busch
Review meeting attended by: Louis Fucilla, John Ejnik, Katy Casey, and Cody Marie Busch

I. General Program Information

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

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

2. The program is aware and reflective of changes affecting improvement since the last review.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
First self-study for the program	0

3. Characteristics of the program set it apart from others when compared regionally and nationally. The unique aspects of the program attract students.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	1
First self-study for the program	0

5. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate (only select N/A if there is no accreditation available).

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
N/A	5

General Comments related to Section I:

The program's assessment goals are explained as evaluating SLO's in three courses using students' papers and a rubric to score the papers. A concise description of assessment results and how the results were used in the department would be helpful. The department does an excellent job with professional service to the community. It

would be helpful to know how many history majors are in the program and how the program supports gen ed and other programs.

Department does a good job to discuss the characteristics that make its programs unique and in demonstrating responsiveness to recommended actions from the last A&R report.

I1. The program mission statement does a good job balancing the value of the degree to career outcomes, and the value of the degree to enhancing our essential learning outcomes that can then be generalized to multiple career paths. I3-4. Very thorough and detailed responses to these items. It is clear the program was intentional in addressing feedback from previous reviews.

Good use of charts to buttress some of the evidence. Also, good to see the detailed steps you took to address actions recommended from the last audit and review.

The program outlined changes related to adequate staffing and the significant impact this had on the program overall. Despite staffing challenges, it appears that the History department was able to move forward with several curricular changes. The faculty/staff within the program do a nice job supporting students and integrating unique opportunities into the program. It would be helpful to have a better understanding of how the program compares to programs across the US. I can see the previous A&R report but the actions the program took based on that report are not explained.

II. Alignment within the University

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

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

2. The program supports general education and/or proficiency programs at the University.

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

3. The program is collaborative and supports other academic programs across the College and/or University.

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

General Comments related to Section II:

The history program (curriculum and faculty/staff) contributes to programs across campus. Further, the History department is responsible for the delivery of Core 120. The program should be commended on the many co-curricular opportunities offered and variety of learning experiences for their students.

More than sufficient evidence here that History is aligned with UWW mission and strategic plan, supports general education programs and works collaboratively with other departments in L&S but also across campus.

Good evidence of strong alignment within the university

III. Program Goals & Accomplishments

1. Program goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve/advance the program.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. Goals currently in place will contribute to the program's advancement. Criteria for determining success were measurable and attainable.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section III:

What are the criteria for determining if actions taken on these goals (III.2) are successful? Actions look appropriate but try to quantify. By next A&R report, all faculty will use Navigate for advising for first short-term goal as an example.

The short- and long-term program goals have identified a clear path forward for the program. The process the program uses to set, and evaluate progress towards goals occurs regularly and in a variety to activities (e.g., in program meetings, assessment meetings in and outside the department, etc.). However, the criteria could have been specified more clearly- what is the long-term and/or intended outcomes of these goals (e.g., 100% faculty use of Navigate to quickly address student needs, barriers, progression through program, etc.).

The History program has outlined some great goals. It would be helpful to have additional information on how the program will determine success with these goals. I am also curious about how the senior portfolios are being used to make decisions about the program.

I would have liked to see more goals besides hiring and creating new courses. Were there any goals for increasing enrollment? What are the success criteria for some of the classes that were created? Are students enrolling in the new classes in good numbers?

IV. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum.

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

2. The program prepares students in majors, minors, and related emphases tracks in post-graduation and other applicable experiences.

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

3. Changes to the program's curriculum were summarized and considered student needs/interests and/or internal and external stakeholders.

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

4. Students participate in high impact practices.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section IV:

Program does a good job to documenting evidence with respect to curriculum in this section of the report.

I would have liked to see participation numbers for some of the HIPs that are encouraged or available but not required

We know that students learn from and enjoy HIPs. I wonder if there is a way to integrate more HIP offerings (UGR is noted "as needed basis" and CBL is available, but not required) or if students have expressed more interest in these kinds of opportunities. HIPs prepare students for post-grad real world work... What do potential employers look for with History grads?

V. Assessment of Student Learning**1. The program uploaded an assessment plan that includes student learning outcomes.**

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

2. Student learning outcomes are "mapped" to the curriculum.

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

3. The program provided a timeline indicating when faculty and staff assess SLOs. The timeline is manageable and sustainable.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

4. The program described the measures/processes they use to assess SLOs, and the criterion for performance.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

5. The program described the results of the assessment data collected.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	1

6. Student learning outcomes are aligned with UWW's Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.

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

7. The program described specific actions individuals in the program took, or will take, to make changes to the program based on assessment results.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	1

General Comments related to Section V:

Difficult to determine a timeline when the SLOs will be assessed (each semester, year, etc.). Not clear how assessment data/results will change program. Right now, it seems the program is making changes to complete assessment.

It looks like there is an assessment plan but not actual assessment conducted here (V.5 & V.6)?

1. Overall, it was very difficult to interpret the assessment plan. I did see SLOs and mapping, but it was confusing as to which SLOs were actually being assessed by the program, and how. Further, there were SLOs noted for public health that were not evaluated in the plan. 3. The timeline indicated a subset of the SLOs were assessed every time 455/465 was taught. How frequently the data is then reviewed by the program was not clear. 4. The program included a rubric that seems to be used on papers in 3 core history courses. There was also a table where the same SLOs that seem to be measured by the rubric are also assessed using certain assignments from courses. 5. The assessment plan did not include this information. The results of using the rubric on 10 papers was shared when reporting out updates from the last program review. However, there was not any student learning data shared in the assessment section directly tied to the SLOs. It was also unclear which SLOs the program was reflecting on because the summary of the results of the 10-paper analysis, just indicated students were "generally successful in meeting our SLOs". There are up to 12 SLOs, but some were noted just for public health. 6. There were points in the report that indicated an awareness of student performance on SLOs, primarily in the report reflecting on actions since the last review. However, this discussion of assessment data was not aligned to specific SLOs. In addition, the "findings" section of the assessment plan, listed the assignment being used to assess (which did not include the rubric) and the criterion for performance. What was missing was how the students actually performed, which is what is being asked in the findings section. The actions in the action plan did not clearly align to data from the SLOs.

I would have liked to see the numbers of how students are meeting the SLO expectations

The program is clearly intentional with the curricular design. I saw alumni surveys listed as a way to measure ELOs and SLOs (among other things). Have you found success with this? I wonder if there are more effective/efficient ways of gathering data as opposed to relying on alumni?

VI. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: Trend Data

1. Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. The program described the College and/or University recruitment activities the program engages in to help maintain enrollment.

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

3. Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years, or reasonably efficiently.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	4

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

5. The program described retention issues, if any, impacting enrollment.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

6. 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

General Comments related to Section VI.A:

The statement is made that faculty are "overworked", justified by high SCH/FTE. It would be very helpful to support this statement with actual SCH/FTE numbers.

Program provides sufficient evidence with respect to enrollment, recruitment and retention.

1. The program provided context for enrollment. However, there has been a downward trend but with some evidence of steadying. 3. On average, the BSE has 146 average credits to degree, the BS has 137, and the BA has 128. There was not any information provided for this response. 4. I put some because while the response indicates there are not any issues in students completing courses, without delaying graduation, this was not directly addressed, and is also unclear due to no response for item 3.

The trend suggests a need to work on enrollment since there's been a decline. There was not enough information on the program retention issues (e.g., analysis of DFW grades), particularly the concrete numbers

It is great that the dept worked so closely with COEPS to ensure that history and education courses were not offered at conflicting times.

VI. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: Demand for Graduates**1. Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.**

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments for VI.B:

No data is given from resources that project job growth in fields. Could use O'Net for example as data on employment trends.

Evidence is sufficient for these components.

1-2. I did not see information directly related to employment outcomes in this response. However, they have a method in place to collect this information. They could have reported on the information provided by career services. Similarly, they reference available sources to use to determine employment projections.

The program should make efforts to collect data on graduate placements (employment or continuing education) and to provide the numbers. There were no numbers provided although I see that the program highlighted their challenges with collecting these data. There was not enough information provided on whether employment opportunities for graduate will continue to remain strong. This is something that the program should look into providing subsequently

Yes, alumni surveys are difficult. Have you considered implementing a survey about where your students are going and they complete during one of the senior courses? It might be easier to catch them/gather the data before they actually leave UWW.

VII. Resource Availability & Development: Faculty and Staff Resources

1. Information on the numbers of full and part-time faculty and staff is provided.

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

2. The program has identified staffing changes since the last review.

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

3. Expertise of teaching staff are aligned with the needs and future vision for the program.

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

4. The program has identified anticipated staffing changes or areas of need, and how these may impact the program.

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

5. The program described factors that may be impacting their ability to recruit faculty and staff.

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

General Comments related to section VII.A:

It's nice to see salary data.

Program appears to have a good handle on staffing.

I commend the faculty in the department keeping on despite evidence of them being on below national mean and median wages

VII. Resource Availability & Development: B. Student Resources**1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.**

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

2. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, technological, and library resources to effectively serve its students.

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

General Comments for VII.B:

The data shows that the instructors are overworked with large capacity classes that can be a challenge. The data shows that the program needs facilities and technology to support delivering on the programs promises

VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program**1. Areas of strength are discussed.**

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

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

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

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

General Comments for VIII:

The SCH/FTE is reported in this section. Supports claims made earlier in report.

Commendable efforts by everyone in the program despite noted challenges.

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

The program supports the Gen Ed program significantly. The program also has a strong profession service component in the community.

1) Program contributes to the university's mission and supports the general education program. 2) The program has a developed curriculum and shows that it is thoughtful about developing and implementing curricular changes.

The program makes significant contributions to the university and professional community.

Strong alignment with the university's goals. The program has good goals and service to general education. The faculty's commitment to growing the program despite the below national mean/median salaries, large class sizes, and need for facilities.

1. Faculty/staff dedication for delivering a high-quality program 2. Responsiveness to students (increased desire for online programming).

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

The assessment plan needs to include a better timeline on when SLOs will be assessed and how the data/results will be used.

Implement assessment plan to collect data.

The program should continue to work on growth, particularly in recruiting more students given the noticeable decline in enrollment. Make efforts to provide more concrete numbers on some of the issues highlighted like how students are meeting SLO expectations, student placements after graduation, etc.

It would be helpful to identify processes that would benefit from greater efficiency (perhaps advising?). For example, have you all considered a group advising model vs. individual meetings? Continued development of the portfolio process and assessment of the portfolio.

3. Other comments/questions

Overall, the self-study was consistent and well done.

If the department is unable to gain any additional staffing (the instructional staff position), does the department foresee any problems in being able to offer needed courses in a timely manner?

Are the current resources available to the department sufficient to support a fully online history program?

Continue with efforts to see how you can get more faculty to help with class sizes and workload.

4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

1. Revise the assessment plan to clearly indicate the SLOs being assessed, in which years SLOs are reviewed and discussed by the program, student learning data collected that directly aligns to those SLOs, and how the program discusses that data and uses it for program improvement.

2. Describe the progress toward creating the online degree.

3. The credits to degree are consistently above 128 for some emphases. Do students encounter any challenges to completing their program in a manageable time frame?

5. Recommended Result

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	1
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	4
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	0
Refer to Provost for action. This option is selected if the report is not completed by the date due.	0