

*Progress report review is appended to the end of this document.*

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for  
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Individually Designed L&S Majors and Minors, 2015-2016**

**Date:** Tuesday, May 10, 2016

**Time:** 2:30-3:30

**Place:** LT 4012

**Attended:** Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean David Travis; Program Coordinator Liz Hachten; Program faculty and staff Donald Jellerson, Thomas Drucker; Audit & Review Team Chair Rashiqa Kamal; Audit & Review team members Andrea Ednie, Deanna Guthrie, and Joan Cook

- 1) The meeting was called to order at 2:35 PM
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Rashiqa Kamal recognized the strengths of the program and invited program coordinator Liz Hachten to make program-related opening comments.

Liz Hachten stated that this is a unique program that supports excellent students who have needs that don't fit within the molds of existing programs. Some of these students would have transferred if the program were not an option. The program demographic is quite diverse with respect to both ethnicity and age. Faculty are extremely committed.

An important role of the program is to identify areas of interest/need for program development. The program plays a leading role in curriculum change. The coordinator role used to be a faculty chair but now Liz is responsible for the program as it fits well with Liz's curricular responsibilities within the college. Other faculty members mentioned the importance of having someone like Liz as coordinator due to her knowledge of curriculum across the college and her commitment to tailor curriculum to students' needs.

However, the program's unique nature does pose some administrative and assessment challenges.

- 4) Review Team's evaluation on the following issues were discussed:
  - a) Program Structure and Oversight:
    - i) The self-study notes that this program is the responsibility of personnel "for whom the program is a secondary priority at best." This raises questions about consistent and sustainable program oversight. Who has (and going forward, will have) primary responsibility for the program? Based on the structure of the program, there should be an individual who should be responsible for the running of the program.

Liz Hachten mentioned that the current structure includes a faculty committee and coordinator. Advisors are not integrated into the curricular/ organizational structure. As a result, sometimes discipline expertise is not represented in the committee (could improve on this by inviting advisors to meetings). Liz did research looking into the administrative structures at other UW system schools – usually these types of programs are coordinated through the Dean's office, but there is variety in the faculty committee structure. Some are more like thesis committees gathered for each student. This way, advisors would be incorporated more – this would also help with

assessment. There are several committee structure options, and the college should continue to discuss these.

- ii) How often does the IDM committee meet? Are there special and/or separate meetings for considering applications, and discussing assessment data? Why is the turnover high in this committee?

With regards the faculty committee; challenges exist, such as finding times to schedule a meeting of the committee. More continuity in terms of committee involvement would also be beneficial. High faculty turnover in the committee can be attributed to faculty serving on the committee to “try out” things. Maybe having an elected committee can deal with this issue.

- iii) What is the process for admission to the individually designed minor? Is it similar to the major? How does the program coordinator, the IDM committee, and the advising center communicate with students?

Major: committee gets together to approve curriculum.

Minor: Liz approves the curriculum. Minors are even more diverse than the majors.

Liz discussed the need to consider whether proposals for minors should be considered by a committee. The minor is more specialized and works with advisors more closely.

- b) Assessment: What is the program’s plan going forward regarding assessment? Is there a timeframe for assessing/ addressing SLOs that have not yet been assessed, and the implementation of e-portfolios?

It was discussed that assessment is tricky for a program like this – some assessment has led to program changes (like the writing requirement), but otherwise it has been difficult because the students and curriculum are so diverse. There’s also no power to make changes to classes for students in individually-designed majors – because the courses are not developed for their purposes in particular.

Moving toward student e-portfolios will be used as the major assessment measure. The plan is to get the portfolio structure together over summer 2016, then the program will need to tweak applications, etc. They should be able to start with portfolios during fall semester, 2016. The structure of the portfolio will likely be revised over the first few years of implementation. Provost Elrod suggested looking into portfolio management systems that are independent of the online learning platforms like D2L, in order to maintain continuity.

Program learning outcomes were discussed. Given the diversity of the program, using general LEAP-related objectives was discussed as being the most feasible. Students are asked to write a rationale and identify their goals, but they talk more about the ultimate goals and less about learning outcomes. Looking forward, perhaps the advisor could help the student transform their rationale and goals into learning outcomes. These would be used to supplement the LEAP objectives.

Right now assessment is pretty focused on the program level, since courses can’t be changed within the major (not major-specific courses). Assessment could also focus at the advisory level, where students might need to demonstrate to the advisor how they are achieving key outcomes. We also had an interesting discussion about assessing the roles of minors – whether they are to add breadth to majors, or provide depth/foundation within a particular area.

Compensation Policy: Rashika Kamal inquired about the current compensation policy for the involved faculty. It was stated that it is a work-in-progress. Liz explained her plan to rely on faculty advisors' department policies on how to compensate faculty for supporting the program, perhaps using a system that allocates credits toward course releases.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists two recommended actions (see page 14, point 4) related to program structure and oversight, and program assessment.
- **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns*
  - **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
  - **A progress report describing progress toward recommended actions is due by ~~March 1, 2018~~ September 15, 2017 to the Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences, and by ~~March 16, 2018~~ October 1, 2017 to the Audit & Review Committee. [NOTE CHANGE IN DUE DATES]**
  - **Next full self-study will be due by October 1, 2019.**
- 6) The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM.

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

Date of Evaluation April 8, 2016 Short Self Study (SS\*) \_\_\_\_\_  
Program Individually Designed L&S Major X Minor X

**Evaluations submitted by:** Rashiqa Kamal (chair), S.A. Welch, Deanna Guthrie, Andrea Ednie, Joan Cook

**Review meeting attended by:** Rashiqa Kamal, Deanna Guthrie, Andrea Ednie, and Joan Cook

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

**Comments**

1. This program provides flexibility to address unique needs and interests.
1. It's interesting that the program sees to appeal to URM students. Why do you think this is?
1. The self-study makes the important point that this program cannot be used as "a way to bypass the requirements of existing programs" (pg. 3).
4. Yes, the program addressed the two recommended actions from the previous A&R report, but I saw no evidence that it complied with the request for progress reports. Were any progress reports submitted?
4. Regarding course releases: On first review, the equivalence of advising a single IDM major with a full three-credit course seems like a lot. Is there a good way to estimate how much time (on

- average--I'm sure it varies from student to student) advising an IDM student takes? Do faculty who advise IDM students still keep the same disciplinary advising load, or is this reduced?
4. They have summer and winterim assessment stipends, but what about Fall and Spring?
4. Responses seem to indicate good progress for all recommendations.

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

### **Comments**

2. Maintaining faculty and advisor involvement remains a challenge but the self-study describes efforts and potential strategies to improve on this.
3. If I remember correctly we used to set up an IDM much like Platteville. I'm curious to find out if the

new structure is more effective than previously.

3. Program needs more buy-in from faculty. Need to focus on goal (b) on page 5. Involve faculty in goal-setting process, if possible.

3. More information is needed on the process for setting and monitoring program goals. How often does the committee meet? How do they track progress toward meeting the goals? Does responsibility for working on program goals rest solely with the coordinator or do other committee members take leadership on specific goals?

4. No major revisions being considered right now

5. No program recognitions or awards, but the individual student awards are very impressive.

5. Good that students won such high awards, did the program (and its way of doing things) win any awards?

5. Great student awards!

6. The report states not applicable. I assume this means that no accreditation is available.

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

Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5
--	---

### Comments

1. The program uses a very thoughtful and detailed process for admission to the program.
1. How often are applications denied? Given provisional approval?
2. The report states not applicable.
3. Driven by assessment, writing-intensive requirement was included in the year 2014
4. Who supervises these IDM extracurricular events? The Assistant Dean, or is there a major advisor for each IDM major that oversees these events?
4. Program offers a wide array of integrative learning experiences.
4. This is a difficult question to evaluate for this type of program. The program ITSELF doesn't design and offer opportunities (e.g., student org, a single capstone course, etc.), but I don't think that approach is appropriate for an individually designed program. Instead, the program makes use of opportunities offered in the areas each student is drawing from for their own individual program.
4. Impressive record of study abroad experiences and other integrative learning experiences!
5. Online course evaluation should happen at the department level. I assume that NA for this item means that online courses are not offered by the program itself.

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

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

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

**Comments**

- (pg 12: "...starting point for students and advisors as they define and refine the more specific performance student objectives...") Please explain this process more fully. Do students articulate (in writing) additional SLOs that they address in their individual programs (pg. 12)? Or do they specify how their specific program 'interprets' the broader program SLOs? Are they asked to demonstrate their proficiency on each, or discuss how they've met them in a narrative of some sort?
- Appendix D mentions that they plan to use critical thinking and research matters rubrics in the capstone project/ paper. These will be assessed by the committee like the writing-intensive requirement in the past.
- Can program include specific questions in the senior exit survey?
- What's the plan for assessing all the other SLOs? This will take some thought from the committee, since collecting data is likely to be distributed across several years (to gather a reasonable sample). Would it be useful to include a case-based analysis approach, in combination with a grouped analysis?
- What was the interrater reliability?
- The analysis of writing is well done. It combines quantitative ratings using a calibrated rubric with a more qualitative description of aspects of individual cases. The recommendations based on the data (pg. 15) are good ones. I especially encourage the program to consider rec #3 (have students write a reflective essay to be included in their portfolio).
- The exit interviews address students' perceptions of their integrative learning. Is there a way for the program to gather some sort of direct data on this SLO? E.g., supervisor ratings on the integrative experiences?
- Commendable job of assessing writing requirement!
- e-portfolios is a good idea as it can explain things like variations in writing scores.
- Good discussion of changes in the writing requirement. Also, the exit interviews seem to be effective at providing the coordinator and faculty members context for the student experiences and benefits associated with the program.
- Need to communicate/ share results with advisors
- Saw that they shared assessment data with internal constituencies but was unclear if there are any external ones they report to.
- Also consider ways to share assessment results, conclusions, and actions taken with students in the program.

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

**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**

1. It almost seems as though they are being eliminated given all of the new majors/minors developed at UW-W
1. The program seems to be filling a need, especially where most students are referred by their advisors.
- 1-2. Declining numbers - not concerning, given the structure of the major, however, need to reflect on reasons. Try to make it more visible.
3. Credits needed are on higher end but are as expected given the nature of the major and transfer students.
3. While they present evidence, the number of credits to complete the degree is quite high! Did the students first attempt an established major before signing up for a IDM?
3. The credits to degree look very high but I agree that it's difficult to draw conclusions regarding this given the small number of students and the wide variety of student backgrounds and goals.
4. It's probably not appropriate to actively recruit students to this major. If their needs and interests can be met with existing programs, that's where they should enroll.
4. The program is not recruiting students, exactly.
6. It can be difficult for students from other colleges to get information/ advising that they need, especially minors. What is the process for admission in the minor?

7. Report suggests that it is at optimum level. Demand and resources dictate that it should stay smaller.

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

#### Comments

1. Impressive level of acceptance into graduate programs.
2. Difficult to address this given the individualized nature of the program.
3. They seem to do a good job tracking graduates, informally. Could develop a more systematic formal tracking process.
3. Individual tracking of graduates provides evidence that the program is preparing students for their next steps.

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

#### Comments

1. As they report, UW-W's program doesn't seem to have a competitive edge over other comprehensive schools. What draws IDM students to a comprehensive in the first place?
1. The program does not have a comparative advantage over other campuses

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

#### Comments

1. This information did not address all that was requested (gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc....)
1. This may not be available as the make-up of the faculty would depend on the direction chosen by the ID student.
- 2-3. Draws from faculty/ courses across different disciplines
- 2-3. There are not faculty assigned to this program.
- 2-3. Is there any way to get greater stability for membership on the committee, such as adding 'standing, ex-officio members' or increasing the term length? Why is there high turnover in the IDM committee?
- 2-3. Although the program does require commitment from the Assistant Dean and other faculty members, it appears they are committed to a structure they feel is manageable and that does not require excessive resources.

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

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

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

#### Comments

1. They do not seem to have tracked the activities of their faculty. I know this group changes per the needs of the students, but they could present information on those who have participated in teaching ID majors.
1. There are not faculty assigned to this program, not sure whether this should be No/Limited or NA
1. Missed this part if it was included, but I'm not sure if it's relevant?

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

#### Comments

1. There are not faculty assigned to this program, not sure whether this should be No/Limited or NA

1. Missed this part if included, but may not be relevant?

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

##### 1. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.

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

#### Comments

1. There are not faculty assigned to this program, not sure whether this should be No/Limited or NA

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

#### Comments

1. There are not faculty assigned to this program, not sure whether this should be No/Limited or NA

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

#### Comments

1. While this was not addressed, I presume it is not necessary as the services and supplies get absorbed by the individual departments that have the IDM faculty participating in an IDM program.
1. No discussion of resources
1. Does the program need any (additional) resources?
1. Students appear to be well-supported and to have good relationships with faculty mentors.

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

**Comments**

1. No discussion of resources

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
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	2
No	3

**Comments**

- The portfolio plan seems like it would be a good addition!

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

- Thoroughness of the report
- Informal efforts to track graduates have been good.
- Graduates seem to be successful in getting jobs and being admitted to graduate programs.
- Offering alternatives to a small/diverse group of students whose needs are not met by the traditional majors/minors.
- Good progress on the assessment plan.
- The program has the flexibility to allow students to pursue an academic program specific to their career goals and future academic interests and has the ability to retain students who might otherwise leave.
- The program appears to be successful in meeting the needs of students who are otherwise not served by the college.

**2. Areas for Work or Improvement**

- Reporting more specific information on the faculty who participate in the program.
- They need to determine a strong unique competitive edge.
- More needs to be done to come up with and implement an assessment plan for the minor.

- Assessment has been improved since the last report but a more thorough assessment of student outcomes and achievement of learning goals is needed.
- Additionally, compensation and recognition of faculty should be further explored and specific policies outlined.

### 3. Other comments/questions

- Is the plan to "bank" faculty advisor's time as credit towards a course release supported by the college and other departments?
- Does campus need to have Individually Designed majors and minors in two separate colleges (L&S and in A&C)? Would there be an advantage to combining these?
- I am concerned that the self-study was late (due Fall 2014, submitted March 2016) and none of the progress reports required in the previous A&R were submitted. This supports the self-study statement that the program oversight is the responsibility of personnel "for whom the program is a secondary priority at best." This issue was raised in the last A&R. What can be done about this?
- Involve faculty/advisors in the goal-setting process, implementing the assessment plan, and sharing the results of the plan.

### 4. Recommended Actions

1. Program structure, oversight, and compensation:
  - a) It is clear that the program offers a valuable service to a group of students on campus thus, it is important to identify who is responsible for the oversight of the program. Develop strategies to increase the sustainability and stability of program oversight.
  - b) The compensation policy needs to be clarified. How does course release work and how did the program come up with the equivalence of course release? Are departments and colleges on board with these policies? How rigorous is an advisor's involvement in the student's plan of study? These policies should be formalized and reported.
2. Assessment:
  - a) Develop a full assessment plan that addresses all SLOs.
  - b) Continue to revise and implement the assessment methods and tools (e.g., the e-portfolio).

### 5. Recommended Result\*

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

\* A progress report describing progress toward recommended actions is due by ~~March 1, 2018~~ **September 15, 2017** to the Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences, and by ~~March 16, 2018~~ **October 1, 2017** to the Audit & Review Committee. [NOTE CHANGE IN DUE DATES]

**The program's next full self-study is due October 1, 2019.**

---

Progress report was submitted 1/10/2018 and is stored on the shared T drive, 2017-2018 folder, Progress Reports subfolder.

---

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater**  
**Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Progress Report**  
**Undergraduate Programs, 2017-2018**  
**Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Program Name: Individually Designed L&S Majors and Minors

Date of Progress Report: March 19, 2018

**Evaluations submitted by:** James Collins (review team chair), Andrea Ednie, Corey Davis, Pilar Melero, Joan Littlefield Cook

**Review meeting attended by:** James Collins, Andrea Ednie, Corey Davis, Joan Littlefield Cook

**Recommendation #1**

Program structure, oversight, and compensation:

- a) It is clear that the program offers a valuable service to a group of students on campus thus, it is important to identify who is responsible for the oversight of the program. Develop strategies to increase the sustainability and stability of program oversight.
- b) The compensation policy needs to be clarified. How does course release work and how did the program come up with the equivalence of course release? Are departments and colleges on board with these policies? How rigorous is an advisor's involvement in the student's plan of study? These policies should be formalized and reported.

**Recommendation #1 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).**

Good Progress	3
Making Progress	2
Little/No Progress	0

**Comments related to recommendation #1**

1. The change to the structure of the faculty steering committee seems like a good one (appointed for 2-year terms; advisors invited to be part of relevant meetings). How is this working so far?
1. Clarification of advisor compensation and responsibilities is going along well. I especially like that advisors are getting "credit" for their work (in advising load and in eventual course releases).
1. Very good idea to develop the document laying out info for faculty advisors. This might be a useful model for other programs on campus with less clear expectations and responsibilities to a program (e.g., for interdisciplinary programs).
1. Is Liz Hachten's role as program coordinator specified anywhere, included in her position description? How is she compensated for her work?
1. Oversight and compensation seem clear; I am not sure the issue of program structure was addressed fully, but, I cannot say that it was not addressed because, while program structure is mentioned in the recommendation as an area to be addressed, it is not part of points a) and b) (oversight and compensation, respectively.) If possible, please specify criteria used to appoint members to

the faculty steering committee for the major. That would provide transparency and perhaps a better match between appointed faculty expertise and student interests, one of the problems the IDM faced before.

1a. Steering committee and ex officio members should help to ensure some stability and some institutional memory.

1a. Faculty appointments to the steering committee seems like a good idea.

1a. The department now requires that members of the Faculty Steering Committee, which plays a key role in program oversight, to be appointed by the Dean to two-year terms, rather than being chosen through a self-nomination and election process. The intended outcome is for this to facilitate involvement of faculty who have specific expertise within the major that will be assessed, rather than misalignment resulting from the self-nomination process. This change was approved by the Dean and implemented in the fall of 2017. Is there any indication whether or not this process is an improvement and working as intended? The strategy sounds reasonable, but its value will ultimately be measured by how well that it works. Additionally, (a) faculty advisors have been incorporated as ex officio members of the Faculty Steering Committee and are invited to meetings in which their advisee's proposal is being considered for approval, (b) current and past advisors have been added to annual assessment meetings, and (c) advisors will participate in the scoring of their student's ePortfolios. These changes seem logical and would promote oversight and active involvement by those who are directly working with students.

1b. This seems fair. Who will keep track of the "banking" of the 498 credits? Will the College track this, or does the faculty member have to keep track of this themselves?

1b. Efforts seem to be in place to increase the involvement of advisors, and to compensate advisors. Plan is to circulate the document before the end of this academic year.

1b. Question #1 The program now counts IDM advisees as part of a faculty member's formal advising load. Additionally, advisees enroll in a one credit hour independent study designed to support them with ePortfolio development; the faculty advisor is the instructor of record for this class and credits apply to buyouts. Stipends are now being provided to faculty for assisting with grading ePortfolios as well. These are great ideas. Is one IDM advisee equal to one traditional advisee? More details here would be useful because it seems possible that an IDM advisor would require much more time-per-student than traditional advising responsibilities; although, this would possibly be mitigated by buyouts earned during the independent study.

1b. Question #2 Unknown. The above policies were in the process of being circulated to department chairs and faculty for feedback when the progress report was submitted.

1b. Question #3 The policies are in the process of being formalized. As described, I think that the involvement of advisors is reasonable and meaningful.

## Recommendation #2

Assessment:

- a) Develop a full assessment plan that addresses all SLOs.
- b) Continue to revise and implement the assessment methods and tools (e.g., the e-portfolio).

## Recommendation #2 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

Good Progress	2
Making Progress	3
Little/No Progress	0

## Comments related to recommendation #2



- 2. The assessment plan is good.
  - 2. Makes sense to use an ePortfolio structure for this type of major. I encourage the program to talk with other programs using ePs (as they are doing with Liberal Studies). Might also see if Women's & Gender Studies program and the Diversity Leadership Certificate has ideas that might be useful.
  - 2. The eP process is still in development, given where students are in the program (i.e., no new students in 2016-17).
  - 2. I encourage the program to share the eP template with the eP campus project leaders (Kelly Delaney-Klinger; Nicole Weber) if they haven't already, to see what is being planned at the campus level.
  - 2. Good that the eP and exit survey requirements are now included in the program's catalog description.
- 
- 2. Program plans to use ePortfolio to assess all seven of the common SLOs. Program has developed an ePortfolio template and has revised application materials and catalogue descriptions for the IDM major.
  - 2a. Seems like a good idea to use the existing campus rubrics where applicable, but this plan still seems to need some clearer definition.
  - 2a. Collecting assignments via ePortfolios, but yet to develop rubrics or actually assess the assignments.
  - 2a. The program is approximately one year from assessing the first ePortfolios, which will be used to evaluate the seven SLOs that are common to all IDM programs. Other SLOs may be measured as well due to the unique nature of each student's plan of study. The program indicates that students will submit artifacts and reflections to demonstrate mastery of SLOs, which will be scored by faculty evaluators using campus and VALUE rubrics. More details here are needed that specify exactly which class, activity, and/or assignment aligns with a specific SLO. Development of a table that maps these out would be helpful.
  - 2b. It will be interesting to see how this works out, once the first students go through using the portfolio template.
  - 2b. Progress has been delayed this year because no new students were approved for the major last year.
  - 2b. The program has developed an ePortfolio template modeled after the one being used by the Liberal Studies program; progress has been made in areas related to assessment, but more details are needed for the Committee to have a thorough understanding of how the pieces fit together.

**Recommendations for next review. Additional progress reports required?**

Yes, Please List Due Dates (e.g. in 1 year, 2 years)?	0
No	5

**Next self-study should specifically address the following:**

Faculty advisor responsibilities, timeline, and compensation document.

Results of ePortfolio assessments and discussion over how this will be used to inform the program.

Generally speaking, more details related to each Recommended Action should be provided so that the Committee can fully understand the extent and impact of changes.

**Additional comments:**

Making good progress overall. It will be interesting to see how the system modifications and assessment plan work out. Hopefully, there will be some data to look at by the time the next regular self-study is due.

The program has been responsive to the Recommended Actions from the previous report. They have addressed the clarification of the faculty steering committee and faculty advisor roles, responsibilities, and compensation. They are in the process of addressing the assessment recommendations.

The previous self-study was due October 1, 2014 and was submitted March 31, 2016. The current progress report was due October 1, 2017 and was submitted January 10, 2018.

**The next full self-study is due to the college dean on October 1, 2019 and to the Audit & Review Committee on November 1, 2019.**

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Progress Report  
Individually Designed L&S Major, 2017-2018**

**4/25/2018  
9:30am – 10:30am  
Laurentide Hall 4012**

**Attendance:** Liz Hachten (Program Coordinator), James Collins (Review Team Chair), Joan Cook

We discussed the review team's comments related to the progress report submitted on January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018 by the Individually Designed L&S program and a summary of the meeting is provided below.

We began the meeting with introductions and a discussion of the unique configuration of this particular program. Due to the highly individualized nature of courses of study that students within this program complete, coupled with the limited number of students who enroll in this program, the review team inquired about the possibility of combining future reviews with Liberal Studies, but Liz presented concerns about how this could feasibly be accomplished. Specifically, she indicated that Liberal studies has a very structured curriculum, in contrast to Individually Designed L&S, and student profiles are quite different between these programs. Following this, the team discussed reviewer comments and began reviewing recommended actions. Due to low student enrollment (only four new students entered the program since the previous review), it has been a challenge to determine the effectiveness of implemented changes resulting from the previous audit and review process. For example, faculty oversight of the program has improved, but the lack of students moving through the process has presented limited opportunities to evaluate the efficacy of such changes. Faculty compensation procedures for student advisors were also discussed and Liz commented that the audit and review process has helped the program clarify how to make faculty efforts more visible and how to help recognize their hard work. However, the effects of recent changes to faculty compensation (e.g., stipends for grading ePortfolios, course buyouts for advisors who support students in an advisory role) are also not fully known due to limited opportunities for evaluation.

Regarding assessment, the team discussed the importance of identifying a matrix of student assignments, and the corresponding artifacts, embedded within anchor courses that could depict alignment with essential learning outcomes that are common to all IDM programs. This will be a challenge due to the

individualization of each student's plan, but doing so will help provide evidence of student growth and will continue formalizing the framework and processes followed by the program. Moreover, we discussed the importance of eventually using a common campus ePortfolio system, which will be important to this program as they continue moving forward.

**\*Tentatively, the next full self-study is due to the college dean on October 1, 2019 and to the Audit & Review Committee on November 1, 2019.** This report should contain:

- More details related to the faculty compensation plan so that the process can be better formalized and conceptualized by the review committee
- Specific details related to curricular alignment with ELOs that are common across students in the program

*\*As part of the discussion and after considering the unique characteristics of this program, the review team would like to discuss the possibility of adjusting the review schedule that the program follows. The A&R committee will meet in the fall of 2018 to discuss this issue; an addendum will be added to this summary document at a later date that will include a final decision and deadline for the next self-study.*