

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Special Education Majors and Minors, 2020-2021**

Date: 4/30/2021

Time: 3-4 pm

Place: Webex

- 1) Call to order: Meeting was called to order by Dr. Kumpaty, review team chair, at 3:01 pm; Members in attendance: Interim Provost Greg Cook; Interim AVC Kristin Plessel; Dean Robin Fox (Education & Prof. Studies); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Amy Stevens; Robinson Rowand, faculty, Special Education program; Audit & Review Team Chair Hephzibah Kumpaty; Audit & Review team members, Eric Appleton, Denise Roseland, Assessment Representative Katy Casey.
- 2) Introductions: Dr. Kumpaty asked members in attendance to introduce themselves and their role in the assessment process.
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments: Dr. Kumpaty summarized the program's strengths that were listed by the review team.
 1. This is a dynamic program intent on offering the best that can be envisioned; the program has revised curriculum to prepare special education majors and to meet the standards expected by DPI and professional bodies. The program has comprehensive assessment plan in place.
 2. In particular, the program's commitment to prepare teachers to teach all types, especially, students with **disabilities**.
 3. SPECED4U online undergraduate program to attract non-traditional students, two attractive minors.
 4. The program offers a variety of high impact practices such as **service learning/internships** and a variety of other high-impact practices are integrated to attract diverse group of students.
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation: After the brief opening remarks, Kumpaty invited the department Chair, Amy Stevens, and others on the floor to provide comments and feedback on the following key topics of discussion (a-d) from the evaluation report.
 - a) Tracking program completers. Does the program have a process in place to track graduates? Does the program receive data on number of licenses and students placed in teaching positions?
 1. Program agrees this is an area that is lacking. However, they do know a majority of students are teaching after graduation. In fact, most graduates have a job before graduating. Area schools often call the chair asking to hire graduating seniors. There was good sharing and feedback from Provost Cook and other members. It was mentioned that some of this data was part of the DPI accreditation process as well. The data could be helpful in ensuring the curriculum has been beneficial and students are meeting program goals upon graduation.
 - b) The program has a plan in place to assess student learning. The review team had a concern as to how the program is tracking SLOs, data collection and presenting in a format for curricular review and program management. What plans does the program have to implement and sustain the current plan?
 - i) Described some extenuating circumstances influencing assessment planning in the department. Completed the template to align with new program curriculum. The plan included embedded assessments aligned to SLOs that will be evaluated on a cyclical basis.
 - ii) Provost Cook commented on College responding to ever-changing licensure

standards/expectations. He suggested creating a core set of SLOs for the program that the program can always be evaluating in candidates regardless of changes from outside agencies or new initiatives. Some examples include critical thinking, evidence of student achievement, student learning, writing etc and to prioritize some of these SLOs. Suggested this framework be initiated at the College level.

- c) Work with administration on staffing issues, including filling vacant faculty lines and additional lines to relieve program scheduling needs due to growth.
 - i) Noted concerns about faculty being over-extended and teaching primarily in graduate program, which is hurting undergraduate program because courses end up being at night or online to align with adjunct instructor schedules.
 - ii) Dean noted the large enrollment numbers in graduate programs that was not expected and a plan was not in place.
 - d) Concerns noted from program regrading responsibility to recruit underrepresented students to the program. What resources exist on campus to support programs in this work?
 - i) Program voiced frustration in requesting faculty to recruit new and students of color. Chair Amy mentioned the lack of a robust recruiting program at the university level in attracting students of diversity. Does this work fall to programs? If so, it is not supported with training or resources. Amy commented on how some campuses in the UW system and others have been proactive or staying at the frontline in their URM student recruitment efforts and the need for our campus to improve in these strategies. It was noted that underrepresentation of minority students in education fields remains a national issue; and, the department is exploring possible initiatives to closing the loop and to advance underrepresented student success going forward.
 - ii) Provost Cook spoke about the purpose of the question in the self-study.. He looks at URM between University and the program to get an understanding of whether there is a disparity between the two. If so, it is worth considering aspects of the program that might influence this disparity.
 - iii) There are a number of College and program initiatives in place that might not have been captured in the self-study.
- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists three recommended action (see page 16, point 4) related to assessment, recruitment, and resources.
- 6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns*
- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
Click or tap here to enter text.
 - **Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:**
 - Next FULL self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2025 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2025.
 - Next SHORT self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2024 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2024.
 - A progress report will be due Oct. 15 to Dean, Nov. 1 to Assessment, of 2022.
- 7) Adjourn.

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

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2020-2021
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 2/5/2021 Short Self Study (SS*) _____

Program: Special Education Major Minor

Evaluations submitted by: Katy Casey, Hepsi Kumpaty, Denise Roseland, Sarah Hessenauer, Eric Appleton
Review meeting attended by: Katy Casey, Hepsi Kumpaty, Denise Roseland, Sarah Hessenauer

I. Program Purpose & Overview: A. Centrality

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

1		Sufficient Evidence	5
2		Some/Partial Evidence	0
3		No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.A.1

1. The program has several key strengths to offer; plays a key role in offering attractive curriculum to prepare special education majors to meet state and regional needs. In particular, the program’s commitment to teacher preparation to teach all types and severities of disabilities, SPECED4U online undergraduate program to attract non-traditional students, two attractive minors.
2. New online program. Supportive of students and other programs.

2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W.

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

Comments for I.A.2

1. Every education major takes SPECED courses. Many students in other education programs recognize the value of this department and declare a minor that relies heavily on SPECED coursework.
2. The program supports general education, proficiencies and goals of the university. The department offers one course, SPECED 201, disability and society with GE designation.
3. 2.The primary interconnection appears to be with Education; Phys. Ed Certificate requires Spec Ed. courses. Program features one GenEd course: SPECED 201 (GE).
4. Special Education 201 is a high enrollment course provided by the department.

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

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

Comments for I.A.3

1. SPECED4U has enhanced the diversity of students enrolling in this department's programs. Students in this department's programs are often valuable student workers in a variety of University student services: tutoring, Writing Center, CDS, sign language interpreters, etc.

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

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

Comments for I.A.4

1. The program is trying to address recommendations from 2011 self-study. They didn't have a review in 2015 since the program participated in DQP project. This section should include a summary of that review and recommendations to close the gap. Do you have any specific recommendations from DQP review to address?
2. Implemented new programs, revised curriculum, aligned curriculum with LEAP and high impact goals, and hired new faculty.

General Comments related to Section I.A

1. The program has evolved to address the needs of the field, and changes in student population. I appreciate the innovation and flexibility.

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

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

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

Comments for I.B.1

1. The discussion on “mission” statement sounds somewhat general and lacks focus. Do you have mission statements for the revised special ed program and the minors?

2. 1. The mission statement is structured like a list of imperative SLOs, and less like an aspirational statement of the program's goals. How does a student possess the 'disposition' of a professional organization? How assured can the program be that a graduate will value lifelong learning? I suggest the program review their response regarding unique features and see what aspects can be folded into the mission statement to make this a more dynamic and inspirational statement.

2. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve or advance the program.

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.B.2

1. This department is innovative in it's pursuit of goals: UWW LIFE, SPECED4U, Graduate initial licensure program are all excellent examples of their innovativeness.

2. Impressive set of goals addressed. The goals seem to promote and grow the program, as well address issues related to efficiency and workload.

3. Good discussion here!! Nice work!

4. It looks like that previous A&R report was the catalyst for much self-analysis and structural work that has benefited the program. Goals were identified and met. A substantial list of current goals was offered, with timeline and criteria for completion. Most of the timelines list 2020-22 as expected completion dates; I hope that the program is not trying to attempt too much in too short of time (though it seems that many completion dates are driven by DPI).

5. The program listed six goals since the past audit and review that was met.

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

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

Comments for I.B.3

1. The current goals address a variety of program needs.

2. Good work!

3. The program listed 8 goals, deadlines for meeting, and how they will know when goals are met.

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

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

Comments for I.B.6

1. Consideration of accreditation discussed...how sad that there has been no response from accrediting body.
2. Program level accreditation is not available. The licensure program is approved by DPI.
3. This report is a full self-study for the program and their last self-study was in 2010/2011. The program has had CEC-NCATE accreditation during their previous self-study which was dropped shortly thereafter. The program made efforts to obtain reaccreditation from its accrediting body CAEP. The report mentions that “the accrediting body being unresponsive to UWW’s attempts”. Any particular reason for lack of response? How does the program compare with other similar programs in the UW system and around the nation whose programs are CAEP accredited?
4. Noted that the program is not currently accredited, but it appears that the accrediting bodies have been unresponsive to their queries. The Applied Behavior graduate program is accredited. However, it appears that as long as the program meets DPI standards, lack of accreditation by professional bodies is not detrimental to the status of the program.
5. The program works closely with DPI regulations.

General Comments related to Section I.B

II. Assessment : A. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable).

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.A.1

1. Clear and purposeful curriculum. It is a good idea to sequence courses and provide students with a roadmap through the program. This likely makes the course of study easy for students to navigate, and knowledge and skills can build throughout the major.
2. I particularly appreciated the clear description of the scope and sequence for the majors and minor; not just a list of courses, but discussions of content, course linkage, and content rationale. Comments regarding changes for efficiency are supported and appear reasonable.
3. The program has made significant changes based on university goals, feedback from advisory board members, and department goals.

2. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.

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

Comments for II.A.3

1. The program worked with advisory groups, as well as the DPI to make curricular changes that maintained program quality more efficiently. In addition, to program began to offer an online program of study to meet student interest and demand.
2. The program’s implementation of assessment plan tracking student learning outcomes began in 2019-2020. Their plan is to review a subset of outcomes in the subsequent years. The WTS Excel sheet reports in the attachments provides some data.
3. The discussion of curricular revisions is well-supported and well explained. It appears that revisions were embarked upon after analysis of assessment data and other criteria such as DPI mandates.

3. 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.

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.A.4

1. Service learning/internships and a variety of other high-impact practices are integrated into this department's programs.
2. Good description of the revised Special Ed curriculum with cap on 120 credits. The curriculum is efficient and purposeful and offers innovative tracks to prepare special education teachers. The department offers a variety of high impact practices that provide the foundation as life-long learners.
3. The program described high impact practices the student are involved with.

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.

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.B.1

1. All SLOs were reviewed during this period.

2. Curricular mapping is provided in the document, "assessment plan template".

3. Program submitted an assessment plan with outcomes.

2. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.B.2

1. Many LEAP aligned and HIP outcomes and practices at play in this department's programs.

3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.

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

Comments for II.B.3

1. The assessment data to date is pulled exclusively from the Clinical Evaluation, and not the artifacts/assignments described. Have rubrics been created to evaluate these embedded assessments?

2. The self-study reports limited data on assessment work. Given that this self-study is presented after a 10-year period, progress on assessment is of concern. The assessment plan template mentions assessment tools to be utilized in measuring SLOs but lack of documentation in the uploads section. The program needs to develop assessment tools and begin collecting data.

3. Example signature assessments identified include: A1) Artifact in portfolio A3) Internship supervisor's student evaluation A7) Applied Course Project

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

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

Comments for II.B.4

1. Data were collected, but not all was discussed. For example, data on student performance was collected on assessments that have been discontinued, but would have provided evidence of student learning for the time period under review.

5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.

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

Comments for II.B.5

1. The High School paraprofessional program with Milton High school...so awesome at meeting a local/regional need...so important to introducing high school students to a career pathway in the field.

2. Limited data is available from the self-study.

3. Program reports they meet to discuss program changes.

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

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

Comments for II.B.6

1. The program reports having two stakeholder meetings in the past 10 years. They should have a meeting once each year to receive the necessary input from the stakeholders.
2. Program reports they do have an advisory board. Program shares at faculty meetings. They do form a subcommittee if there is an issue.

General Comments related to Section II.B

1. The program is in the process of revising the assessment plan. When making revisions, consider aligning this program's assessment plan to that being required by DPI- it might help streamline reporting processes. There was data collected that could have been reviewed for this report.

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

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

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

Comments for III.A.1-2

1. The program implemented a number of effective strategies to address enrollment. Numbers are strong and growing.
2. The Special Ed enrollments have slightly declined but the program’s online version and the adaptive minor enrollments are on the rise. The program faculty and Chair are doing everything they can to support the vitality of the program.
3. 2015-2019 declines were discussed; events. actions of 2019 and 2020 appear to be helping numbers increase. "While it seems prudent to limit enrollment to match faculty resources, there is pressure from the university to attract and retain students, and there is a professional need in the field. . . the three of these issues makes for a difficult predicament."
4. Bachelor numbers have decreased slightly. Adaptive License Minor has increased. Graduate numbers have increased.

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for III.A.3

1. The recent efforts to revise the undergraduate program to be 120 credits is to be commended and was not likely easy to accomplish.
2. The process of reducing credits was no doubt difficult and time-intensive. I commend the program for rising to the challenge while maintaining high-quality and rigor.
3. Good description of the revised Special Ed curriculum with cap on 120 credits. The curriculum is efficient and purposeful and offers innovative tracks to prepare special education teachers.
4. Major work has been done in the past few years to bring credit hours required down to 120, with the plan going into effect in Spring 2021.
5. Program reports students can graduate in 120 credits.

4. Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students.

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

Comments for III.A.4

1. The education field in general lacks diversity. Any specific recruitment strategies that might attract students to this major? Is there work at the College level to address this?
2. A number of initiatives are listed (though none speaks specifically to diversity). The program is seeing more "non-traditional" students enrolled in online courses (SPECED4U). UWW Life began enrollment of young adults with intellectual disabilities. The objective of the COEPS Future Teacher Program "is designed for students from diverse backgrounds to have a support structure as they enter into university."
3. Was unable to find.

Comments for III.A.5

1. "Moving to a closer approximation of diversity representation on campus."

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

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

Comments for III.A.6

1. Good advising practices and program planning make students path through this major efficient and manageable.
2. Program reports that students are able to graduate in 4 years.

7. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level is justified or supported by examples or data.

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

Comments for III.A.7

1. It appears this program is growing and may need additional resources for staffing.

2. There has been a faculty turnover and the program lost three tenured faculty to UW-W Special Education BSE. Bulk of the undergraduate course work is currently taught by adjunct faculty.

3. "Given the current number of student numbers and assuming support for the programs remain the same, we have too many students to sustain." The argument is supported by enrollment and faculty numbers.

4. The program has high numbers of advisees.

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.

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

Comments for III.B.1

1. Impressive employment rate.

2. Due to the shortage of teachers, especially in special education, this program addresses a critical need.

3. The information provided in the "Special Education BSE Grad Outcomes (Dec.2014 - Aug.2019) lacks specific student detail regarding career placement. While tracking graduates is difficult, the program should gather some data on where students are employed.

4. Career and Leadership data and Emergency license information is provided.

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

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

Comments for III.B.2

1. Above 95% placement!

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program

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

Comments for III.B.3

1. We all struggle with this but your efforts are noted.
2. See comments above, on B1
3. Tracking appears to be done largely through the Career and Leadership office; other information is anecdotal, reported by graduates themselves.
4. Tracked by career and leadership and emergency license information.

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

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

Comments for III.C.1

1. Good description of the revised Special Ed curriculum with cap on 120 credits. The curriculum is efficient and purposeful and offers innovative tracks to prepare special education teachers.
2. The program appears highly aware of what it offers and why, though it would have been good to hear what the program offers that other regional competitors don't -- assuming competing programs also aim for high-quality and innovative teaching,
3. The program did submit a document stating how they are competitive.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty Characteristics

1-2. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.)

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

3-4. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments:

1. There has been a faculty turnover and the program lost three tenured faculty to UW-W Special Education BSE. It is a concern that a lot of the courses are taught by adjunct faculty.
2. "The shortage results in a specific need for instructors in the areas of reading interventions, co-teaching and collaboration, severe/profound disabilities, educational assessment and UDL, and directed teaching supervision." "in 2010. . . being understaffed was noted with a request to work with administration to resolve this issue. A decade later, the problem is even greater."

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

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

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

Comments:

1. The program has been innovative and responsive to meet student interests and needs, which has resulted in a number of programs that need to be adequately staffed. This may be an ongoing issue for this program. Have there been conversations about how to manage the staffing challenges?
2. Staffing shortages are noted throughout the report, and the program is wary of the over-reliance upon part-time and adjunct faculty. It appears that current levels can be maintained, but there continue to be sacrifices what can be offered to students. expected growth will increase stresses upon the program. Adequate administration support is noted, but the program has lost the majority of its student workers. Supply costs have been reduced to a "tight but survivable" level. The most urgent physical need is procuring/maintaining an adequate number of standardized testing kits for SPECED 462.
3. There are high student numbers to faculty.

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

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

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

Comments for IV.G.1

1. Budget cuts has made securing funds for some program initiatives (assessment materials) difficult.
2. As UWW Life grows, more classroom space will be required.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Program strengths are discussed.

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for V.1

1. The innovation. The clarity of the programs offered. The impeccable ways they meet the regions demands in the field are notable about this department.
2. It seems the program has strong and collaborative faculty, willing to do what it takes for the benefit of students. There are challenging times ahead and the cohesiveness of this group will be important for moving the program forward. Reducing the program to 120 credits is commendable. Congrats on the variety of new programming.
3. It appears that this is a dynamic program intent on offering the best that can be offered, and ensuring that its graduates meet the standards expected by DPI and professional bodies. It has a robust assessment program that is a major factor in guiding curriculum revision. The current teacher shortages nationally and state-wide point toward growth in graduate employment (though not the conditions in which the graduate will work).

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for V.2

1. Action items are well-thought out.

2. Resources and staffing will be an issue moving forward. In the event there will not be funding for additional lines, the program will need to find creative solutions to address faculty workload (e.g., coordinator stipends, program caps, major only sections).

3. 1) Solution to faculty/staff shortage 2) Advising loads 3)Funding for assessment kits 4) requesting university level assistance in recruitment and advertisement 5)working to implement a sustainable program evaluation (assessment) process

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for V.3

1. Seven specific action items for the near future are noted

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

1. The program has several key strengths to offer; plays a key role in offering attractive curriculum to prepare special education majors to meet state and regional needs. In particular, the program’s commitment to teacher preparation to teach all types and severities of disabilities, SPECED4U online undergraduate program to attract non-traditional students, two attractive minors. The program offers a variety of high impact practices that provide the foundation as life-long learners. The program mentions both short-term and long-term goals and criteria, timelines for measuring milestones. The program has special mission to serve students with disabilities.

2. It appears that this is a dynamic program intent on offering the best that can be offered, and ensuring that its graduates meet the standards expected by DPI and professional bodies. It has a robust assessment program that is a major factor in guiding curriculum revision. The current teacher shortages nationally and state-wide point toward growth in graduate employment (though not the conditions in which the graduate will work).

3. 1. Strong curriculum with significant changes since last audit and review. 2. Development of comprehensive assessment plan.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

1. The self-study reports limited data on assessment work. Given that this self-study is presented after a 10-year period, progress on assessment is of concern. The assessment plan template mentions assessment tools to be utilized in measuring SLOs but lack of documentation in the uploads section. The program needs to develop assessment tools and begin collecting data.
2. The program provides its own list of action items; these seem well-considered and actionable. My only suggestion is to add "Implement a program evaluation process that is sustained across time and will benefit program revision and development." (this statement makes it seem that the program feels it lacks an assessment plan, but I found plenty of evidence that a plan seems to be in place -- if so, what does the program believe a program evaluation process is?)
3. Address faculty: student ratio which can be addressed through hiring a new faculty member. 2. Address recruitment, especially related to minority groups 3. Develop ongoing regular meetings to address assessment/goals.
Resources. Work with the program to find creative solutions to resource issues, in the event additional funds are not available.

3. Other comments/questions

1. A solid, reflective, informative report. Thank you for your work.

4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

1. Assessment planning. The next self-study should include a plan with updated SLOs, tools to assess, and summaries of findings. Articulate how the program is systematically monitoring and compiling the data. Provide documentation of assessment tools (ex: rubrics, surveys, course specific assessments etc.), data gathering, and use of data in decision making for program improvement. Progress report and next self-study should include full implementation of the assessment plan and tracking subset of SLOs on a regular cycle.
2. Recruitment of diverse students to the program. The program should work with the College to identify strategies targeted at recruitment of ethnically and racially diverse teacher candidates.
3. Work with administration on staffing issues, including filling vacant faculty lines and additional lines to relieve program scheduling needs due to growth.

5. Recommended Result

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	1
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	4

Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns	0
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	0
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.	0
Non-continuation of the program.	0
Report not submitted; refer to Provost for action.	0