

Progress report reviews are appended to the end of this document.

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Public Policy & Administration Major & Minor, 2012-2013**

Date: Tuesday, April 16, 2013

Time: 8 a.m. – 9 a.m.

Place: Laurentide Room 5025

Attended: Provost Beverly Kopper; Associate Provost Greg Cook; Dean Mary Pinkerton; Program Coordinator Susan Johnson; Program faculty Larry Anderson, Xia Lollar; Audit & Review Chair Joan Cook; Audit & Review team members Angela Harlan, Linda Yu.

- 1) Call to order & introductions.
- 2) Joan Cook summarized numerous strengths of the program, including the interdisciplinary nature of the program, the impressive variety of high impact practices (HIPs) that are integrated into the curriculum, the strong cooperation and coordination among a stable group of instructors (across two colleges), and good efforts to connect with alumni. The program is also strong in its recruitment and retention of minority students. The program is well organized in its overall structure and course plan, offering students a common core of 45 credits along with 7 specialty areas from which to choose. Each specialization has a learning objective specific to that area, and learning objectives are stated for the core as well. Finally, the self-study was well written with a clear organization, which is always appreciated by the review team.
- 3) Program Coordinator Susan Johnson commented on program strengths, including:
 - the HIPs that the program has developed and continues to work hard to maintain and improve, in particular that all students are required to complete an internship; successful efforts to connect with alumni (e.g., through Career Night); the requirement that all students must complete the program's writing intensive capstone course, and that this course also prompts students to think about several different career options; and that all students complete a writing course;
 - the program's successful emphasis on diversity, and the successful coordination with the Minority Business program in COBE;
 - that the program is proud of their "intrusive" advising model which they feel is an effective tool for fostering student success in the program.

Susan noted areas where additional work is needed, including:

- developing a systematic process for measuring demand for and tracking graduates;
- assessment, particularly direct assessment of student learning; and
- the need to be more purposeful in setting program goals and reviewing the curriculum.

Susan also noted that the program is working on revisions to their Senior Exit Survey (adding a case study to allow direct assessment of student learning; planning to move this to an online assessment), and that the program's Advisory Board has been reformatted and met in March 2013.

4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

- a) **Program Vision and Goals:** The program is housed in the Political Science department, and program decisions are made predominantly by that department. There was discussion of ways to bring together and maintain a steering committee that includes faculty from other departments who teach in the program to discuss program vision and set program goals. Susan noted that there was such a committee at one time but time constraints presented challenges and the committee did not continue meeting. The program noted that an additional position in Political Science, with a policy focus, would be a good contribution to the Public Policy program as well as contributing to the recently developed Disabilities Studies Certificate and the Environmental Science program.

Enrollment management was also discussed. Students are coming into the program sooner than in the past, especially from CoBE. Once students enroll, this is a three-semester sequence. The program's strength in minority student enrollment was again noted, and it was suggested that the program gather information on minority graduation rates (e.g., of minority students enrolled, what percentage graduate), and work with the AVC of Multicultural Affairs and Student Success to further enhance this aspect of the program.

- b) **Assessment of Student Learning:** There was discussion of ways to improve the program's assessment of student learning as well as ways to make effective use of the data they do/can gather. The program was advised to work with the Director of Academic Assessment on ways to increase the direct assessment of student learning (perhaps embedding assessment within the program's capstone course), as well as to further develop the program's Alumni Survey and Senior Exit Survey. Susan noted that Advising Surveys show strong student satisfaction with the program's advising. The program was encouraged to share their data with their Advisory Board and to consider how they might make better use of the Board in their program planning and revision.
- c) **Response to recommended actions:** Challenges in responding to the recommended actions of the previous Audit & Review report were discussed. Recommendations regarding assessment were discussed above. One area of difficulty has been tracking of graduates from the program. The program has a Facebook page that they encourage students to connect to, but the most effective strategy has been through the personal relationships the faculty develop with their students. There was discussion of what the campus can do to support the program's efforts.

5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report (below) lists three areas to emphasize in the next full self-study.6) **Recommended Result:** Continue with minor concerns.

- Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
- Submit a progress report that explains progress toward achieving the three areas of recommended actions listed in the summary report below. Due dates are October 1, 2014 to the Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences and the Dean of the College of Business and Economics, and ~~October 15~~ November 1, 2014 to the Chair of the Audit and Review Committee.

- Next full self-study will be due in October, 2017.

7) Adjourn.

Review Summary Report
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2012-2013
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors

Program Public Policy & Administration Major X Minor X

Evaluations submitted by: Greg Cook, Joan Cook, Angela Harlan, David Nordstrom, Sally Vogl-Bauer, Linda Yu

Review meeting attended by: Greg Cook, Joan Cook, Angela Harlan, David Nordstrom, Sally Vogl-Bauer, Linda Yu

I. Program Purpose & Overview

A. Centrality

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's core values, Mission, and Strategic Plan. | | 1 | 5 |
| 2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W. | NA | | |
| 3. The program has achieved or is appropriately working toward achievement of at least two goals of Inclusive Excellence. | | | 6 |
| 4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Report; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant. | 3 | 3 | |

Comments:

1. Contributes to fulfillment of UWW mission of providing interdisciplinary programs (crosses 11 departments, 2 colleges), programs leading to professional specialization, creating and maintaining positive environment for multicultural students, & providing a regional resource.

1. This interdisciplinary program provides strong liberal arts and pre-professional skills training for students, including a required internship where students practice practical applications and serve the region.

1. In the self-study, it would help to list or mention particular UWW values, mission elements, or strategic plan goals so we can see how this program aligns with those.

2. As an interdisciplinary program, the program doesn't have its own courses to contribute to general education or other programs.
2. Program is not intended to provide support courses to other programs. Instead, it does a good job of utilizing existing courses and 'packaging' them into a successful program.
2. Program is consistent with several LEAP ELOs.
3. Good inclusion of HIPs (3 of them); does a good job of recruiting minority students.
3. Regarding IE, it's impressive that the program requires an internship, a capstone course, and three writing intensive courses—all high-impact educational practices. This shows strong dedication to national best practices for enhancing learning for all students.
3. Regarding IE, the program coordinates with the Minority Business and Teacher Education Program and with advisors in COBE to recruit minority students. The high percentage of minority students in the program (25%) is impressive and very commendable. Inclusive Excellence is a real strength for this program!
3. Impressive progress toward recruit and retain goal: % of minority students in PPA is double % minority students at UWW.
4. In regards to #4, it can be difficult to track the work done by graduates when the overall number of majors is small. It might be helpful to develop some specific strategies (some were listed, but hard to know if these were short-term or more intentional) that will be most effective in light of this challenge.
4. Tracking of demand and of alumni has been a challenge. Program has re-convened their Advisory Board, which should help. What other possible strategies has the program considered/could they try?
4. The program should do more to systematically investigate demand for graduates. Graduates of this program are prepared for a wide variety of career opportunities, so it's difficult to pinpoint potential careers, but it would still help if the program systematically scans the environment to stay more informed about demand and employer needs.
4. It appears that progress wasn't really made on either recommended action from 2007-2008. Please address this.
4. The actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Report may be difficult to measure, but it would be nice to see some evidence of an attempt to make these measurements.
4. The program discusses difficulties with recommended actions. Are those actions still considered valid? Should the program put more effort in these actions?

B. Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. The program's mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program. | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 2. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve or advance the program. | | 1 | 5 |

| | | | |
|---|---|----|---|
| 3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals, and/making decisions about changes to the program goals. | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 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. | | 4 | 1 |
| 5. The program achieved or maintained accreditation (if applicable) and/or earned recognition or awards. | 2 | NA | 1 |
| 6. The program has achieved program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate. | | NA | 1 |

Comments:

1. The only mission mentioned in the program’s mission statement is the provision of the major and minor for students. Should the program consider other purposes and mission such as faculty members contributing to the discipline through scholarly research and/or providing service to the region?
2. The self-study lists a number of improvements and accomplishments achieved during the review period, including modification of the exit survey, improving career information for students, expanding internship opportunities, reviewing the curriculum, and re-establishing the advisory board. The way these are presented in the self-study, however, it’s difficult to tell if these were intentional goals set by the program (and then achieved) or if they are accomplishments that happened more independently of systematic goal setting. These accomplishments are important and valuable either way, but systematic goal setting is also desirable.
2. In what way were the recommended actions from the previous audit & review report considered as goals for this review period?
 2. Appropriate goals were set and addressed.
 2. Great steps have been taken to improve/advance the program.
3. A process for goal setting should be established. It is nice to see that the self-study has already brought this to the program’s attention (pg 5).
3. What differentiates the goal-setting and data review for this program from that of PoliSci?
3. The program should articulate a systematic process for involving stakeholders to set annual or regular goals for program improvement. Is there an annual meeting of program faculty (or a core “steering committee”) to review data and set goals? Consider holding one mtg per year or semester of reps from each dept that contributes teachers and courses to discuss data and adjust goals.
3. What are the outcomes from Advisory Board meetings and how do these outcomes assist program advancement?
4. The self-study lists important goals for improvement during the next review period: working with the advisory board, improving assessment of student learning (especially direct assessment), and continuing to review the curriculum. The self-study, however, does not describe a vision for where the program wants to be in the next 5-10 years—it would help to articulate an aspirational vision to guide shorter-term goal setting.
4. The program has set goals (pg. 6) which are appropriate and reasonable. But I don’t see an explicit discussion of the program’s ‘vision.’ Where would the program like to be in 5 years in terms of enrollment, emphases, etc.? Any thoughts of expanding the program (either in terms of enrollment, areas of placement, level)?

4. To address goal C (Continue to review curriculum...), the program will need to get information on employment trends and demands. How will/might they find this info? (This was one of the last A&R's recommendations too.)

6. Accreditation is not available for this program.

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

A. Curriculum

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable). | | 1 | 5 |
| 2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students; otherwise NA. | NA/No evidence | | |
| 3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions. | 2 | 3 | |
| 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. | | 2 | 4 |
| 5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable). | 3 | 1 | |

Comments:

1. This program may be trying to do too much. There are so many different options to select, that it may make it difficult (or at bare minimum, very time-consuming) to assess student learning systematically. It might make more sense to have this many options if there were large numbers of students enrolled in this program. But at the present time, the program looks closer to being an individualized major in public policy.
1. Does the program coordinator provide feedback to these courses (with regards to content as well as assessment) offered by the 11 departments that will impact the major?
 1. PPA offers students choice of 7 concentrations.
 1. (pg 6) I'm curious—why is a 2.25 overall gpa required but a 2.0 in the major?
 1. The curriculum is well-structured, provides students with the prereqs for higher level courses required, provides opportunity to coordinate/include courses from other majors/minors (e.g., Environmental Science; Health Promotion minor)
 1. (pg. 7) What are the differences between the Human Resources minor and the Personnel emphasis of the current major? Do they draw from the same/a similar student pool?

1. This is a 60-unit major that does not require students to have a minor. Seven areas of specialization are available within the major, and an individualized specialization is also available. All specializations include a common core of 45 units. This is an impressive structure that provides a common set of basic information and skills yet allows students to choose among a structured set of specializations tailored to individual career goals.
1. Many of the courses in the core area of the major are the same courses required for business degrees. This provides efficient transfer of credits if/when students switch their major to business. Nice feature!
2. (pg 11) Are any of the courses included in the curriculum dual-listed (even if they are housed in other departments)?
3. (pg 11) Are all curricular changes the responsibility of just the department chair? How do others in the program share the administrative work (e.g., goal-setting, curricular changes, administration of the program) and participate in decision-making? Are other departments' personnel (e.g., chairs, faculty who teach the courses) involved in discussions about the program from time to time (e.g., annually)?
3. Although the program uses courses from other departments (and doesn't own its own courses), assessment data should still be used when making decisions about revisions in the major and minor. The program should develop a method for involving assessment data in decision-making.
3. Were the courses added to the General Management and Legal Affairs concentrations new course offerings, or were they existing courses? If they were existing courses, what was the reason rationale for adding them?
4. Internships are required for all majors, and this experience provides an important and impressive opportunity for both application of skills in a real-world setting and provision of service to the region. This is very commendable. In the self-study, it would help to provide a list of internship sites or types (at least the most frequent ones) along with the numbers of students who served in each during the review period.
4. Internships and student organizations are mentioned in the self-study. Are there other ways that students learn outside the classroom (e.g., undergraduate research)?
4. (pg 11-13) Excellent opportunities are provided for student learning beyond the classroom (required internship, required capstone course, multiple other opps available). Based on the description (pg. 13), the capstone course seems to do an excellent job of bridging to "authentic," real-world tasks. Are any data available to assess students' performance on these tasks (e.g., rubric-based scores on case analysis and/or presentation)? Impressive that students are required to do a lot of writing, of different types.
4. (pg 12) The internship program is impressive. How are the internships managed and supervised? This seems like a *lot* of work—is there a course release or compensation strategy for this? Is this an opportunity for faculty administrative development?
4. To its credit PPA requires every student to complete an internship. Suggest adding minimum duration and credits.
4. (pg 11-12) How many students (approximately) have worked on projects for the Center for PolSci and Public Policy Research?
5. (pg 13) Please provide some information about online courses, at least which courses are available/regularly taught online. I realize that the program does not have control over the courses taught, but maybe the program should be discussing the evaluation methods for online courses with the departments that teach the courses to ensure that they meet the program's expectations.

5. While it's true that evaluation of courses and instruction (online and otherwise) is the responsibility of departments rather than programs such as Public Policy & Administration, would the program want to use the evaluations as a way to monitor quality of instruction in the program?

B. Assessment of Student Learning

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. The program has clearly articulated learning outcomes for students, courses are “mapped” to these learning outcomes, and some outcomes received specific attention during the review period. | | 3 | 3 |
| 2. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful. | | | 6 |
| 3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes. | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| 4. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgments about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes. | | 5 | 1 |
| 5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program. | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 6. Results of assessment efforts have been shared with appropriate internal and external constituencies. | | 3 | 2 |

Comments:

1. Consider rephrasing the learning objectives to include Bloom's taxonomy action verbs.
1. The core learning outcomes are adequate. However, the learning objectives for the different concentration areas need greater development. There is only one additional learning outcome per concentration, and there does not appear to be a great level of application. The outcomes focus on understanding only.
 1. (pg 49) Specify what “will acquire” means—demonstrate? Be able to use to solve a problem in the discipline?
 1. (pg 49) Similar question for “will gain experience”—can this be stated in more measurable terms?
 1. (pg 49-50) For the concentrations, does “will understand” imply being able to apply, demonstrate the use of, in some way?
- 1,2. Work toward developing assessment methods for each of the LO. Where possible, include both direct and indirect methods (include embedded assessments from within courses as appropriate).
2. The map by learning outcome and courses is somewhat difficult to read and process. Any way to reorganize this to make it more useful to those working with this – perhaps switch what is on the X and Y axis – and use some abbreviations?

2. There are three courses that are listed as “significant emphasis” for written communication, but no course satisfies this outcome. What does “significant emphasis” (and “X”) mean in the matrix?
2. Only 2 of the 8 courses in the Planning and Budget Concentration are linked to a learning outcome. None of the sociology courses in the Police and Criminal Justice Administration Concentration are linked to a learning outcome. Only 1 of the 6 courses in the Urban Affairs Concentration is linked to a learning outcome.
3. The assessment plan is underdeveloped.
- 3,4. (pg 16-17) The program does a good job of gathering and summarizing survey data from graduating seniors, and it surveyed alumni. However, all the data are opinion-based perception/self-evaluation of skills. This is very important information to have, but are there also any measures of actual performance, skill demonstration, or are any such direct assessments planned? The change to the exit survey is interesting and gives students a specific context to think about as they self-evaluate (pgl. 16), but it’s still a self-evaluation.
3. The program uses indirect assessment methods via a survey of graduating seniors, survey of alumni, and the campus Senior Outcomes Assessment Survey. I agree with the self-study that it’s interesting and heartening that the alumni rated their satisfaction with learning even higher than did the graduating seniors. I would be cautious about a selection factor operating here, however, especially given the lower response rate for alumni.
- 3/4. It’s not clear how items in the surveys (even the revised exit survey) are aligned with the stated learning objectives. This alignment should be tightened so the data speak to attainment of the stated learning objectives (more directly).
4. (pg 15-16; 72-) What’s the response *rate* on the exit surveys (both UWW and the Program’s)? N was 46 to 48 but out of how many graduating? For example, the Alumni Survey has a 50% response rate (pg. 103) but I’m assuming this is 50% of the 17 whose contact info could be found, not 50% of those who graduated during the 2007-2011 period.
4. (pg 14; 105-110). How many internship supervisors provide evaluations? Has the program done any analysis of these evals (even a simple categorization of “good, okay, not okay”)? Consider using a more structured rating scale for supervisors to use for each of the three areas. This may be faster for the supervisors and would provide data that is easy to summarize.
5. (pg 17) What are some examples of changes made to the program that were based (partly or mostly) on assessment data? The self-study mentioned advising as an example—is this an area where changes were made?
5. The self-study does not describe the process that the faculty, staff, and other stakeholders use to consider assessment data. Is there an ongoing and systematic process for considering data and making decisions to improve the program? How are the data related to student achievement of the learning outcomes involved in this?
5. I was still unclear about how assessment data was used when making decisions
5. It will be beneficial to see curriculum improvement (content, teaching pedagogy, etc.) as a result of these assessment data.
- 5, 6. (pg 17) Please describe the “regular program review” process. Who participates, how often is it done, how are the data included in the process?

6. (pg 17) Program plans to share data with Advisory Board. Are there any more specific plans for sharing the data with students? Are there any relevant student orgs where it could be shared, a program webpage?
6. What is the plan to have students and faculty involved in the assessment process?

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation

A. Trend Data

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1-2. Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability. | | | 6 |
| 3. [Majors Only] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years, or reasonably efficiently. | 1 | | 5 |
| 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. | 1 | | 5 |
| 6. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation. | | 1 | 5 |
| 7. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level is justified or supported by examples or data. | | | 5 |

Comments:

1. (pg 17) Enrollment is healthy. Any thoughts about why there was the big jump in majors from 2010 to 2011 (43 to 54)?
 1. (pg 17-18) How many students are enrolled in/graduate from each concentration? Have these enrollment patterns changed over the review period?
- 1-2 (pg 17-18). Percent of majors who graduated over the review period seems low: $67/211=32\%$. What's the UWW comparison rate? Am I calculating/thinking about this correctly?
3. Can the program increase its awareness among student to reduce number of credits to degree?
 3. The average credits to degree in this program ranged from 129 to 135 during the review period, and these are lower than the overall campus average of 136. Good work! The self-study provides a good explanation for reasons why the average is above 120. The program should continue to work toward lower credits to degree, where possible.
 4. Program should be commended for its systematic efforts to connect with the Minority Business and Teacher Education Program and COBE to recruit minority students and for the strong system of advising (all students meet every semester with the program coordinator).

- 4-5. (pg 19) Intrusive advising seems like a good idea. Any data on student perceptions of this (e.g., do they feel it builds a better relationship w/faculty), or other measures? Is there any way to compare this type of advising with “typical” advising on some specific measure?
5. (pg 19-20) Program diversity is very good, good strategies for recruiting students
5. The percentage of minority students in the program is at least double the percentage in the overall campus population. It would be interesting to look at graduation rates for the different racial and ethnic groups.
7. What will the program do if enrollments increase beyond the current level of 54? The self-study states that enrollments beyond 50 will be difficult to accommodate. Have any discussions or strategies emerged here yet?

B. Demand for Graduates

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. [Majors Only] Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education. | | 5 | 1 |
| 2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong. | | 3 | 2 |
| 3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program. | 1 | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

1. Percent in table seems wrong. Total of 63.9% should be 53% (16/30).
1. Can the program modify curriculum to emphasize skills related to health care and social service program management (these are the two areas show employment potential)?
 - 1,2. Job outlook isn't wonderful, but that's not the program's fault.
3. (pg 23) The program tries to track their grads—any way to improve this? This seems like a problem for many departments.
3. The exit survey seems to be the primary (only?) method that the program employs for tracking graduates. They also use the data supplied by Career Services, but response rates are typically low in those surveys. What other strategies might be useful?
3. What % exit surveys have students' personal email address? Also, explain difference between 31 students in table vs 68 students in table item #1.

1-3. This is tough data to get overall.

C. Comparative Advantage(s)

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|-----------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| | | | |

| | d Evidence | al Evidence | Evidence |
|--|------------|-------------|----------|
| 1. The program has unique features that distinguish it from competing programs—giving it a competitive edge. | | | 6 |

Comments:

1. UW-W has the only such major in southern Wisconsin (does this include private schools also?). Distinguishing features include the degree of interdisciplinarity, specific specializations, and the required internship for all students.

IV. Resource Availability & Development

A. Faculty Characteristics

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.). | | | 6 |
| 2. Context is clear for understanding the expectations regarding faculty and staff support of the program. | | 1 | 4 |
| 3-4. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need. | NA | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

1. It's extremely challenging to coordinate a program where 11 departments contribute to its curriculum.
- 3-4. (pg 26) What would the program *like* to do with respect to staffing? This is related to the statement of program 'vision' above.
- 3-4: I just want to be sure I am concluding that this program is not seeking any additional resources or staffing needs for the future.

B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising. | | | 5 |
| 2. The context is clear for understanding expectations for faculty & instructional academic staff to enhance their teaching and advising. | NA | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

1. The Digital Measures process in COBE isn't capturing teaching enhancement activities for their faculty. Faculty and staff members should therefore report this information directly, for inclusion in the self-study.
2. (pg 28) Does the program have expectations about quality of the instruction in the courses that contribute to their program? How does it verify that the courses that are listed in the matrix of LOs and courses (in Appendix D) do address the listed LOs?
2. You don't have to delegate all oversight to the departments. The program could include/exclude courses (even instructors?) based on engagement in teaching enhancement activities and other performance measures.

C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly or creative activities. | | | 5 |
| 2. The context is clear for understanding faculty engagement in scholarly/creative activity. | NA | 1 | 3 |

Comments:

1. The Digital Measures process in COBE isn't capturing teaching enhancement activities for their faculty. Faculty and staff members should therefore report this information directly, for inclusion in the self-study.
1. PPA faculty scholarly work is impressive.

D. External Funding

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts. | | | 5 |
| 2. The context is clear for understanding faculty expectations for attracting grants, contracts, and/or gifts. | NA | 1 | 3 |

Comments:

1. Very impressive engagement in grant-writing!

E. Professional & Public Service

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department. | | | 5 |
| 2. The context is clear for understanding faculty engagement in professional and public service in ways that benefit internal and external constituencies. | | 1 | 3 |

Comments:

1. Impressive engagement in service activities.
1. Service activities that seem to have special potential for PPA student learning and interning include these: Muskego zoning board, Ozaukee County Board, Port Wash police & fire commission.

F. Resources for Students in the Program

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students. | | 3 | 3 |

Comments:

1. (pg 40). Are the current resources adequate? Are there any scholarships or other sources of support targeted for just this major?
1. Problems or deficiencies are not noted in the self-study.
1. I'm not sure that ¼ release is enough time to administer this program, especially if that includes meeting with its 40 – 50 majors each semester for advising.

G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, and technological resources to effectively serve its students. | NA | 2 | 2 |

Comments:

1. The self-study does not identify any problems or deficiencies in this area.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

| Criterion | Patterns of Evidence | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | No/Limited Evidence | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. Program strengths are discussed. | | | 6 |
| 2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed. | | 3 | 3 |
| 3. Recommendations and resources are discussed. | | 2 | 4 |
| 4. Other comments by program (not rated) | ---- | ---- | ---- |

Comments:

1. Excellent response but “HIP” and “intrusive advising” are undefined terms.
1. Several strengths are noted:
 - participation in HIPS including internships, a capstone course, and writing intensive courses;
 - a strong program in recruiting minority students, and a high percentage of students in the program are minorities;
 - strong cooperation and coordination among a stable cadre of instructors and with departments in two colleges.
2. It would help to have more discussion of how the program will address the areas of improvement indicated in this section.
2. An exit survey does not constitute direct assessment.

Strengths of the Program:

1. Interesting interdisciplinary program.
2. The program reflects on its strengths and areas for improvements.
3. Nice variety of high impact practices integrated into the curriculum (internships, a capstone course, and writing intensive courses);
4. There is a strong program for recruiting minority students, and a high percentage of students in the program are minorities.
5. There is strong cooperation and coordination among a stable cadre of instructors and with departments in two colleges.
6. A well-structured major with 45 units of common core course and seven specialty areas (15 units each) available for students.
7. Each area of specialization in the major has a learning objective specific to that area, and learning objectives are listed for the common core in the major.

8. Well-organized course plan
9. Good effort to make connections with alumni (surveys, guest speakers, Career Days)

Areas for work or improvement:

1. The learning objectives should be revised to be stated in terms of student learning outcomes.
2. Continue to review the learning outcomes that differentiate the specialization areas—are you satisfied that one outcome per area properly captures what you expect students to know and be able to do in each area?
3. The program needs to include direct assessment of student learning, related to the learning outcomes.
4. The program needs a stronger, systematic assessment plan. There is an over-reliance on exit surveys as primary data for examining student learning.
5. A system for regular meetings needs to be articulated for setting goals to improve the program—including a variety of stakeholders (students, alumni, advisory board, employers, etc.).
6. The program should consider plans for handling further increases in student enrollment—you are currently at full capacity, according to the self-study.
7. Concerns about too many different concentrations, especially in light of demands this will place on creating unique aspects for the program’s assessment plan.

Other comments/questions:

- As campus develops more interdisciplinary programs, it seems that a mechanism is needed to allow evaluation of areas such as faculty characteristics (particularly related to teaching quality and development), resources, facilities, etc. and to allow clear communication regarding course scheduling needs.
- Would like to see enrollment in all specializations.
- Curriculum matrix w/scores is difficult to read since it occupies so many pages. Hard to detect patterns across the program. We recommend considering a table for this information.
- This self-study is very well written, clear, and organized. Responses are concise and informative. Thank you!
- My overall impression is that this is a very well-organized program that provides great service to students and to the region. It’s impressive that all of this can be accomplished without the structure of being an actual academic department—you are doing this as a collection of courses and people across many departments. Well done!
- Your work to recruit and enroll minority students is very impressive.
- Student learning outcomes seem focused on lower level comprehension (in Bloom’s Taxonomy). Please consider opportunities for deeper/higher levels of learning.

Recommended Actions:

1. Work with campus offices (e.g., Career and Leadership Development, Institutional Research, Registrar’s Office, Alumni Office) to:
 - a. develop better methods for tracking graduates and to collect, analyze, and use information from graduates; and
 - b. find ways to measure demand for graduates.

2. Further develop the program's vision and program goals:
 - a. develop a vision for where you want this program to be in 5 to 10 years. Use this vision to guide shorter-term goal setting for improvement of the program (see #2.b. below). Enrollment management should be part of this vision, i.e., how can you accommodate further growth in enrollment or limit growth?
 - b. articulate a systematic and sustainable process for setting, monitoring, and revising program goals to improve the program. Include a variety of stakeholders in the process. Define goals in ways that are measurable so you can get better feedback about the degree to which you've achieved the goals. Check and reflect on the goals more systematically throughout the year and the review period. Focus on data-based decision making.
 - c. consider developing an Executive/Steering Committee to oversee the curricular review process, participate in program goal-setting, etc.

3. Develop and improve the assessment plan for the major and all areas of specialization to include:
 - a. revision of the current learning objectives to be stated as student learning outcomes;
 - b. systematic methods to collect both direct and indirect assessment data connected in a clear way to the listed student learning outcomes. In particular, emphasize the development of direct assessment;
 - c. a plan to focus on assessing a few outcomes at a time, but all outcomes over time;
 - d. a systematic process for reviewing, discussing, and using assessment data in meaningful ways to inform program improvements, teaching improvements, and improvements in the assessment system (i.e., "close the loop");
 - e. systematic means for sharing assessment data appropriately with stakeholders.

Recommended Result:

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

*Submit a progress report that explains progress toward achieving the three areas of recommended actions listed above. Due dates are October 1, 2014 to the Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences and the Dean of the College of Business and Economics, and ~~October 15~~ November 1, 2014 to the Chair of the Audit and Review Committee.

Progress report was submitted October 28, 2014 and is stored on the shared T drive (A&R, 2014-2015, Progress Reports, Reports Submitted).

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Progress Report
Undergraduate Programs, 2013-2014
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors

Program Name: _____ Public Policy and Administration _____

Date of Progress Report: _____ October 28, 2014 _____

Progress Report was due to A&R Committee November 1, 2014. It was submitted October 28, 2014 and is stored on the T drive (A&R, 2014-2015 folder). Next full self-study is due October 1, 2017.

Evaluations submitted by: Paul Ambrose, Rashiq Kamal, Jim Kates, Linda Yu, Joan Cook

Review meeting attended by: Paul Ambrose, Linda Yu, Joan Cook

Recommendations listed below are from the program's most recent A&R final report (2012-2013).

Recommendation #1.

Work with campus offices (e.g., Career and Leadership Development, Institutional Research, Registrar's Office, Alumni Office) to:

- a. develop better methods for tracking graduates and to collect, analyze, and use information from graduates; and
- b. find ways to measure demand for graduates.

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Good Progress | 0 |
| Making Progress | 2 |
| Little/No Progress | 3 |

Reviewer Comments related to recommendation #1

1. Closer ties to advisory board should help improve this measurement.
1. The report mentions that they were asked to focus more on other recommendations, so there is little progress on this recommendation. Formalization of the alumni network could be a useful resource but more information about how the program decided to do this would have been helpful.
 - 1.a. This is a campus-wide challenge for many programs. How can central campus offices help?
 - 1.b. Is demand for grads a topic on the Alumni Survey? Or at the Advisory Board meetings? Are/could the Bureau of Labor Statistics stats be helpful in measuring demand? It seems that this is a different point than tracking of graduates, and one that the program might be able to do more on.
 - 1.b. The response to Rec #2 below mentions aligning the program with "current growth areas." How are these areas identified, and how might this source/info be useful to measure demand for grads?

Recommendation #2.

Further develop the program's vision and program goals:

- a. develop a vision for where you want this program to be in 5 to 10 years. Use this vision to guide

shorter-term goal setting for improvement of the program (see #2.b. below). Enrollment management should be part of this vision, i.e., how can you accommodate further growth in enrollment or limit growth?

- b. articulate a systematic and sustainable process for setting, monitoring, and revising program goals to improve the program. Include a variety of stakeholders in the process. Define goals in ways that are measurable so you can get better feedback about the degree to which you've achieved the goals. Check and reflect on the goals more systematically throughout the year and the review period. Focus on data-based decision making.
- c. consider developing an Executive/Steering Committee to oversee the curricular review process, participate in program goal-setting, etc.

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Good Progress | 1 |
| Making Progress | 4 |
| Little/No Progress | 0 |

Reviewer Comments related to recommendation #2

- 2. The program still does not have a vision, but they have started thinking about it. Although the program is doing good work in trying to focus on career-oriented concentrations and initiatives, the report does not address any progress made with regards to recommended action.
- 2. Progress made by establishing a program committee. The program is looking to introduce 2 new concentrations. What were the key inputs to expand the offerings? The document later states this plan was shared with the advisory board, but what was the impetus to develop the concentrations?
- 2.a. I'm a little unclear on your stance re: enrollment management. You've got a new faculty member (who, unfortunately, may be your last for a while, given budget constraints), but how do your plans for the future align with either demand for the major (from students) or demand for graduates (from employers)?
- 2.a. The "vision" is there, but could be articulated more clearly, e.g., over the next five years, the program would like to identify and implement new programming/concentrations in specific growth areas, increase students' exposure to possible careers, etc.
- 2.b. This recommendation was not really addressed. What are the specific program goals, how are they developed and monitored?
- 2.c. The Program Committee was re-established. The report says this committee "is contributing to" progress on the recommended actions, but it would be useful to have more information on the committee and its processes. Who serves on the Program Committee? What departments are represented? Are they all faculty, or are alumni or employers also included? How often do they meet? From the response to Rec#3, it's clear that this committee has been active in revising the curriculum and program assessment.

Recommendation #3.

- 3. Develop and improve the assessment plan for the major and all areas of specialization to include:
 - a. revision of the current learning objectives to be stated as student learning outcomes;
 - b. systematic methods to collect both direct and indirect assessment data connected in a clear way to

the listed student learning outcomes. In particular, emphasize the development of direct assessment;

- c. a plan to focus on assessing a few outcomes at a time, but all outcomes over time;
- d. a systematic process for reviewing, discussing, and using assessment data in meaningful ways to inform program improvements, teaching improvements, and improvements in the assessment system (i.e., “close the loop”);
- e. systematic means for sharing assessment data appropriately with stakeholders.

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Good Progress | 4 |
| Making Progress | 1 |
| Little/No Progress | 0 |

Reviewer Comments related to recommendation #3

- 3. The program appears receptive to the recommendation of improving assessment and has made considerable progress on this. Their discussion of the "next steps" shows that they are well-aware of what needs to be done to further address the issue of assessment.
- 3.a. Good work on revising SLOs. Good inclusion of higher level LOs.
- 3.a. Some of the revised SLOs are likely to be difficult to assess "cleanly", i.e., somewhat difficult to gather data that tells you if/to what degree a specific SLO has been achieved. This can be addressed by thinking about how the SLOs are worded, and then perhaps breaking the overall SLO into a few more specific performance indicators.
- 3.b,c. The plan to focus on writing, to embed direct assessment within the capstone, and (especially) to use the student papers to assess more than one SLO is very reasonable and practical.
- 3.b,c. The program committee is clearly thinking about ways to do meaningful assessment, e.g., find a way to get samples of student writing earlier and later in the program. Might want to consider using a design that would allow you to get both cross-sectional data (papers from the 200 level course, if it's implemented, and papers from the capstone) AND longitudinal data (papers from the same students in the 200 level course and then again when they get to the capstone).
- 3.b,c. The assessment plan is well-conceived, but no data are available yet. I look forward to seeing what you find.
- 3.b,c. The exit survey was suspended after discussion and pre-testing, which is fine. Will questions on the revised Senior Outcomes Assessment Survey cover some of the things you wanted to get from your exit survey? You might be able to add program questions to the SOAS instead of doing a separate program survey.
- 3.e. Good use of the Advisory Board for feedback on A&R recommendations and curricular changes.

Additional comments:

It appears the program has positively reviewed the recommendations from the Spring 2013 report, and is taking action to address the minor concerns. It is moving in the right direction.
The program has clearly thought about what is still needed.

Overall, the program is working to address the Recommended Actions and is making progress. In

the next full self-study, please make sure to address progress on all three recommended actions, with specific attention to:

- Any progress on measuring demand for graduates.
- Your plan for establishing a program vision, and for establishing and revising program goals.
- A clear statement of program goals.
- An update on the outcomes of the assessment of SLO #1 (Writing) in Spring 2015, even if it is considered pilot data. Please include a more concrete discussion of progress in the assessment plan, including if/how assessment data are being used to guide curricular changes.
- Progress on the Exit Survey, including if/how it aligns with the university's SOAS.

No additional progress report is required. The program's next full self-study is due October 1, 2017.

**Audit and Review
Discussion of the Progress Report Submitted April 20, 2015 by
PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION**

**September 30, 2015
2:00-2:45pm
Laurentide Hall 4016**

Attendance: Susan Johnson (Program Coordinator), Jolly Emrey (Department Chair), Jonah Ralston (incoming Program Coordinator), Joan Cook (Review Team Chair)

We discussed the review team's comments related to the progress report submitted October 28, 2014 by the Public Policy & Administration (PPAD) program. The program is continuing to make progress, particularly in their assessment of student learning.

We discussed some of the staffing issues the program has dealt with recently (e.g., retirement, coordinator moving to college administrative position) which have impacted the program's progress in discussing and developing program vision and direction. Jonah will serve as the program coordinator going forward. The program has begun work on defining its vision and longer-term goals and will continue to work on this. The Program Committee has been re-established. In the next self-study, the review team would like an update on this area, including the process for establishing and monitoring program goals and more detail on the role the Program Committee plays in program planning and oversight.

Program enrollment trends have been stable. Susan discussed the program's ongoing collaboration with the College of Business & Economics, especially in health fields, and the positive impact this has on enrollment.

The review team appreciates the program's positive attitude and responsiveness toward the recommendations in the area of assessment. The program has made good progress in developing a thoughtful and meaningful assessment plan. For the next self-study, the review team expects to see data, even if it is initial pilot data, on some of the student learning outcomes (e.g, writing, which the program plans to embed within the capstone). We talked about progress in tracking graduates. The program has not focused a great deal on this yet (consistent with Joan's advice following a previous progress report), but

they have reviewed the program's exit survey in light of the newly revised campus Senior Outcomes Assessment Survey. Susan noted that the program conducts a 5-year alumni survey. Joan encouraged the program to contact campus offices (Alumni, Career & Leadership Development) to see if they can help in tracking and contacting alumni.

Finally, we discussed items the review team would like the program to specifically address in their next self-study when they discuss their response to Recommended Actions (listed above, on page 21).

No further progress reports are required. The program's next full self-study is due October 1, 2017.