

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for
Graduate Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Professional Development MSE, 2016-2017**

Date: 04/19/2017
Time: 1:30-2:30
Place: WH 4003

Attended: Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean Seth Meisel; Dean Katy Heyning; Program Coordinator John Zbikowski; Department Chair Matt Vick; faculty and staff in the MSE-Professional Development program Nancy Stevens, Rick Mason, Scott Peters, Liesl Gapinski; Audit & Review Team Chair Joan Cook; Audit & Review team members Jennifer Better-Bubon, Shannon Stuart

1) Call to order at 1:34pm

2) Introductions

3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments

Committee Chair Joan Cook provided an overview of the program's strengths. The program collaborates with area school districts, offers flexibility to students, and continues to meet the changing needs of area educators. It was noted that program is clearly in transition and dealing with changes in educational context and audience. The program's focus on practitioner learning, faculty scholarship and backgrounds, and focus on applied action research are all strengths.

Program coordinator John Zbikowski provided the program's views of its strengths and challenges. He noted that: (a) Overall, enrollment has maintained or expanded, and it has worked to develop more partners in the field as well as a program for non-traditional constituents (the Higher Ed Leadership Program); (b) new curricular options have been developed (e.g., capstone research course, portfolios); (c) the program has addressed diversity goals, with 23% URM students enrolled in the program; and (d) an MSE-PD Council has become more actively involved in guiding the program. Several challenges remain, including adjusting to new circumstances in schools, with fewer practicing teachers enrolled due to changes in licensing rules; tracking students; and staffing for the cohort programs. The program looks forward to developing a more robust assessment system, working to help launch the Higher Education programs into their own major, and further expanding cooperative relationships with schools with more on-site programming.

4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

a) *External Advisory Board.* Please discuss the potential usefulness of and membership on an external Advisory Board for the program, and how a Board might be used effectively to guide and focus the program.

An Advisory Board relevant for the program was associated with Curriculum & Instruction but is no longer in place. The MSE-PD Council, however, has met continuously throughout the program's history. The Council meets once per month and includes representatives from every department involved in the 12 different emphasis areas. The Council has discussed course rotation issues and persistent enrollment problems, as well as providing guidance on where the program fits within the structure of the College of Education & Professional Studies (CoEPS). An external Advisory Board may be helpful in the future, after the Council clarifies a vision for the program's future.

b) *Strategic planning.* Please describe the process the program uses to determine possible directions, that is, its process for strategic program planning. How is information collected that informs this planning process, and what are some possible directions for the program as it moves forward?

- The program said that its strategic planning process is not systematic at this point and that it is not clear whether everyone is 'on board' with a common vision for all emphases.
- AVC Cook noted that having 12 emphases provides good flexibility for students but at the same time may

result in a loss of cohesion, and challenges in program sustainability and assessment.

- If new emphases are to be added, it is important to clarify how they align with the program as it was proposed to UW System. If there has been a significant shift, campus may have an obligation to notify System.
- The program works with regional schools and has offered courses at off-campus locations. The program should be aware that these additional locations may need to be reviewed and approved by the Higher Learning Commission, depending on their structure and how much of the program is offered off-campus.
- Dean Heyning noted that the program may need a “bottom up retooling” since more specialization has been added, and this should be considered during future strategic planning efforts. The CoEPS has a strategic plan, and looking at Masters programs is one of the plan’s key performance indicators.
- There was discussion of whether all the existing emphases are still needed, especially given lower enrollments in some. The program has serves an incubation function for developing programs, which can then be spun off into independent programs if they are successful. This role should be considered as the program moves forward with strategic planning of emphases.
- The Provost commended the program for adapting to changing circumstances and moving to other locations, expanding the university’s footprint and reaching into the community.

- c) *Assessment. Overall, assessment of learning outcomes and linking changes in the program to assessment data is a relative weakness. Please explain your assessment plan in more detail, as well as how data are used to make decisions about the program.*

Program assessment presents challenges since each emphasis area has its own processes. The program has been working on a more consistent approach and rubric that can be used across emphases, centered on the three main areas of research, practice, and voice. The Council is also re-evaluating the MSE-PD course matrix and the overall assessment plan. The program wants to balance a consistent approach with the ability to be flexible in programming and to stay nimble in light of changes in the Department of Public Instruction.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 3 recommended actions (see page 13, point 3) related to program oversight and guidance, strategic planning, and assessment.

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

- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
- **Next full self-study will be due to the dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies by October 1, 2018, and to the Graduate Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2018.**

- 7) Adjourned at 2:35pm

Submitted by Joan Littlefield Cook

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Graduate Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Professional Development M.S.E, 2016-2017
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors

Date of Evaluation 03/02/17 Short Self Study (SS*)

Program Professional Development M.S.E Major X Minor

Evaluations submitted by: Jennifer Betters-Bubon, Pavan Rao Chennamaneni, Joan Littlefield Cook (chair),
Christine Neddenriep, Shannon Stuart, S.A. Welch, Andy Yu

Review meeting attended by: Pavan Rao Chennamaneni, Joan Littlefield Cook, Ed Frederick, Christine Neddenriep,
Shannon Stuart, S.A. Welch

I. Program Purpose & Overview: Centrality

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	6
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 included (if relevant).

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	7

Comments

General: How are standards from DPI, APA, NASPA integrated and/or measured within the work and field experiences?

1. It would be helpful to point out specifically and explicitly the link between the core missions/values/strategic plan and the program design
1. Great information. Could use a table to elaborate why so.
1. the program seems to have a strong collection of courses that support UW-W's mission
3. While there are emphases that are designed to meet the intercultural curriculum goal, how is the program overall meeting this goal? What if students choose a different emphasis (e.g., reading) or different elective courses?
4. This is a new program as of 2008, and therefore this is the first Audit and Review, so #4 is not applicable. The MSE-PD replaces two previous programs, the M.S.-Curriculum and Instruction and the M.S.E.-Reading.
4. Were there A&R recommendations of the previous 2 programs that are relevant for the newly organized MSE-PD?

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	7
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
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 evaluating progress on achieving program-level goals, and making decisions about program changes based on assessment data.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	6

Comments

1. I am a little confused. The mission is said to be 'practitioner-oriented' and yet, in the introduction, program participation has shifted to include fewer public school practitioners and more university level staff. I think this should be made clearer in this section.
2. Who are the constituents who took the survey? Response rate? It almost seems as though there is less cohesion given the number of new courses/emphases/certificate programs developed. Do you have a copy of the advising survey and responses?
2. The program definitely seems to have done much to recruit students into the cohort programs. The certificates seem like a good approach
2. The program is clearly in transition with respect to audience and programs. What is the 'vision' for future direction of the program—same/similar focus or transitioning to something different?
3. The council page has not been updated. Is this still meeting?
3. The program will benefit from constituting an advisory board of members from the industry/alumni. I have some concerns about the proposed spinoff for the two higher ed emphases. They constitute about a third of the program strength and if they are separated, will this program be sustainable?
3. How often does the Council meet?
3. What role does the Council play in making 'bigger' decisions about the program as a whole, and about the individual programs within it? I'm trying to understand who has responsibility for shaping the future direction of the program. This seems very important right now, as enrollment patterns have shifted and the higher enrollment programs are spinning off.
4. Several goals are listed but most are somewhat vague. I'm still not getting a sense of the overall vision of the program, particularly in light of the transitions it has (and probably will in the future) experience. I don't get a sense of a well-defined strategic plan for the program.
5. The program has not received special recognition or awards.
5. this is N/A because no awards were earned during this review period
6. The college decided not to renew national accreditation for this program, but several emphases continue to be licensed by DPI. Is additional *specialized* accreditation (i.e., by disciplinary agencies other than DPI) available? Most reviewers assumed it is not, and so rated this item as NA.

II. Assessment: Curriculum & the Assessment of Students' Learning**1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, complete with a capstone experience.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	2

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. How is the practicum experience or portfolio experience evaluated? It seems more difficult to assess than the capstone project. This appears to be an important question given the number of students who choose these options over the capstone.
1. Could you say more on why "The Capstone Project option was removed from the Health, Physical Education and Recreation and Coaching emphasis as of 2015"?
2. A sample syllabus would be helpful evidence for this question.
2. There seem to be a number of emphases in which a large portion of coursework comes from dual-listed courses. I know that HLC encouraged us to reduce the number of dual-listed (i.e., UG/G) courses not too long ago. What percentage of credits earned in graduate-only courses? Have the number of these courses been reduced, or are there plans to do so?
3. Mostly anecdotal data--what types of assessment data were used?
3. Great job talking about why changes happened in #4, 6, 7, and 10. Others need more solid evidence and rationale behind the change.
5. Quality matters certification for online courses will help ensure quality
5. Include more evidence on end-of-semester course evaluations for online courses, such as #2 Graduate Outcomes and Satisfaction Survey which you mentioned here.
5. Please say more on why "Online courses for the most part are not assessed differently from other courses in the program."

II. Assessment: Assessment of Student Learning

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

1. How do the programs' SLOs map to the Graduate School MELOs?

1-2. The emphasis areas seem to function as basically independent programs. If this is true, then each area should articulate its own SLOs (aligned with the overall program SLOs AND with the Grad School

MELOs), and its own assessment plan. Some information is provided on emphasis-specific assessment plans (pg. 17), but it would be useful to see the full plans.

2. Does the praxis measure student learning in the program? How do you assess if students choose not to do a capstone project (it seemed as though it was optional given previous information?). Again, I go back to the question of how you are assessing student learning through the practicum/portfolio option and whether the same areas are assessed.
2. Curious on why Art Education does not have emphasis assessment plan. Please say more.
4. Do you examine rubric data from the capstone project?
4. Direct student performance data are reported for state assessments, but how many students took these?
Other than this, there's no direct assessment data provided.
4. On the Grad survey: 145 responses = 80% response rate. Is this over all the years since the program's beginning in 2006? This seems like a very small enrollment.
4. There was some variety of evidence collected but I saw little evidence that the data allowed judgments about SLO performance, or that it was used to make judgments.
5. I am glad to read that the council will be determining more comprehensive examination of student growth data.

Assessment of learning outcomes and linking assessment data to changes made in the program is a relative weaknesses and should be a stronger focus going forward.

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

1-2. Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1-2. The proposed spin-off of the higher ed emphasis will significantly reduce enrollments in the current program. Are there plans to/for how to increase numbers of graduate students outside of the ed leadership and athletic program? Do you see a need for the continuation of the MSE-PD program without these two programs?

1-2. Enrollment & degrees granted in some of the emphases are very low. This has to raise the question as to whether they are all still needed. This again points to a need for strategic planning—where does the program want to invest its energy and resources?

3. For the recruiting strategies which should be linked to promote diversity, the program mentioned it pretty well on #1 Project SWEETT..., which drew Spanish speakers. Please say more on how other channels provide the way to promote diversity.

4. Since this program consists of several sub-areas, you may want to design a table for each and provide more specific information for further evaluation.

5. Please say more on how the only student in Art Education emphasis could take classes to graduate (on time).

5. The program seems to be all over the board in terms of over versus undersubscribed. With the variety of courses offered, this seems like it would be a difficult problem to work with in upcoming years.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	7
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	6
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. Program is cognizant of differences in student populations (e.g., full-time/part-time students, working adults, recent undergraduate degree recipients, etc.).

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

4. The program effectively tracks graduates of the program.

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

Comments

3. What about students in the ed leadership/athletic leadership program?
3. The question asked here is inconsistent with the report (differentiation in data showing graduates seeking full-time employment and those graduate who are already employed). Thus, cannot evaluate.
4. The questions here asked both recruitment and tracking of graduates of the program. The answer here only addressed recruitment. Need to say more on "tracking" methods.
4. Nor did I seem much discussion on how they track their graduates. I did see the chart indicating how many responded but was unclear as to how they track their graduates
4. No evidence that speaks to the tracking of graduates although a clear recruitment plan is outlined.

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

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. More applicable for the programs listed. There may not be distinguishing features for all emphases/specialties offered.
1. It would be great to design a table to show which schools this program is compared to. "Other institutions in the region" is too vague. Also, you may mentioned the advantage that is in the top of the nation since the online program students could be from anywhere and your job placement/market may be nation-wide. Should define the boundary better to avoid self-constraints or inconsistency.
1. The program does have some advantages over other programs
1. Strong evidence of competitive advantage.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: Graduate Faculty Characteristics**1. Characteristics of the faculty (e.g., gender, ethnicity, rank, percentage of time devoted to the program and course responsibilities) are clearly indicated.**

Sufficient Evidence	7
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

- I may have very limited knowledge about the scheduling/course arrangement. Why are all the faculty less than 50% in program?
3. While they did address changes in the faculty, there was not much discussion on how this affected the program.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: Teaching & Learning Enhancement**1-2. Graduate faculty engage in activities to enhance teaching, advising, involvement in course or curricular revision, new course development, etc.**

Sufficient Evidence	7
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

- 1-2. Great! But the latest evidence was 2013. Please update.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities**1-2. Graduate faculty engage in scholarly/creative activity in ways that support or advance the graduate program.**

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

- 1-2. Great achievements! The latest publication/creative activities was in 2014 (3 counts) and one in 1998. Please update the list too.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: External Funding

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

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1-2 very nice

IV. Resource Availability & Development: Professional & Public Service

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

Sufficient Evidence	7
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

IV. Resource Availability & Development: Resources for Students in the Program

1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its graduate student population.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Any grant money or scholarship to support students?

IV. Resource Availability & Development: Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings

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

Sufficient Evidence	7
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Any insufficiency?

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Program strengths are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	7
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	6
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

Comments

Thank you for the comprehensive report!

1. May say more on placement rate and why so here since I do see that is a very attractive feature too.
3. Good job talking about the possible direction and constraints. Resources the program needs to overcome the hurdles and achieve the program goals should be discussed as well. How may the university invest and help?
3. It was unclear what resources were being addressed in the recommendation section of the report.

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

- Focus on practitioner learning
- Attempt to meet changing needs of educators hoping to engage in professional development
- Faculty with wide range of scholarship and backgrounds.
- The program is well positioned (DPI approved, multiple emphases) within the state and offers flexibility to students.
- I agree the self-study's conclusion on diversity, practitioners' inquires in research, and personnel.
- The program makes an effort to collaborate directly with area school districts. The focus on applied action research is important to educator scholars in this program.

- The program makes use of the assessment data collected thus far.
-
- The program is very adaptive and thorough in how it is approaching changing demands.
 - The report was well thought-out.
-
- Student enrollment data and diversity of student body relative to the larger population are a strength.
 - The program's ability to offer cohort models in school districts and in creative ways to accommodate teachers.
 - The strong enrollment of the higher education emphases.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- Assessment plan is weak and there is little knowledge of growth of student knowledge, attitude, and skills upon completion of the program. There seems to be a need to determine focus on capstone versus practicum/portfolio across programs and to determine best ways to assess these culminating experiences.
 - With the loss of the Higher Education Leadership and Athletic Administration, it will be critical for the program to clearly define purpose and outcomes.
 - In addition the program will need to engage in recruitment efforts to sustain program.
-
- Enrollment in non-higher ed emphases is a concern and the program acknowledges this and seems to have a plan of action.
-
- The report mentioned marketing, partnership, undersubscribed programs (Art Education, Reading, etc.), individualized Curriculum & Instruction, simplifying capstone projects are all critical.
 - The program may need to talk about the specific hurdles and possible solutions, especially about how the university may provide resources to help overcome the hurdles.
-
- Program assessment may require more technical support than the program currently uses.
 - The program would benefit from stronger marketing.
 - Students have difficulty completing the program in a specific timeline because a master schedule is not in place. Courses do not always fill and get dropped. Perhaps revamping course offerings or allowing students a choice of a substitute class when a class is dropped due to low enrollment would be an option.
-
- A more consistent way of assessing student outcomes would be beneficial.
 - Tracking graduates.
-
- Under-enrollment in specific emphases.
 - Lack of a comprehensive assessment plan to reflect meaningful student outcomes.
 - There is a clear need for strategic planning for the program as a whole. The program's recommendations (pg. 44) indicate that they (the Council?) is looking at options for program changes (e.g., suspending enrollment in some emphases pending decisions), but there is a need for some sort of "summit-type" review. Perhaps the feedback from this A&R will help stimulate this type of longer-range planning.

3. Recommended Actions

1. To help guide the program, formalize the external Advisory Board and establish a regular meeting schedule.
2. In collaboration with an Advisory Board, develop a longer-term strategic plan for the program. The plan should include:
 - a. Identification of emphases to continue/grow/discontinue
 - b. A process for regular program review by the program emphasis areas (i.e., a regular internal review process), and
 - c. Given low enrollment in a number of specialty areas, identification of recruitment strategies.
3. Create a comprehensive assessment plan, to include sharing of assessment data and review of next steps

4. Other Questions

- Will the program be sustainable once higher ed is spun off?
- Is there an external advisory board? Does it meet regularly?

5. Other Comments

- I do think this program is great. Perhaps, need to be modified a bit in a creative way to enhance the enrollment # of students in those undersubscribed emphasis.
- Seems that there have been, and likely will continue to be, a lot of changes in these programs.

6. 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 reports to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress in addressing the major concerns	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion.	
Non-continuation of the program	

***Next full self-study is due to the dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies by October 1, 2018, and to the Graduate Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2018.**