

Minutes and Review Team Summary Report
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
Special Education, Undergraduate Majors & Minors

Monday, April 4, 2011

12:30 – 1:30 PM

Winther Hall 1013

Attending: Associate Dean Ellie Dickmann; Department Chair Diana Rogers-Adkinson; Audit & Review Chair Greg Cook; Audit & Review team member Leda Nath; department members Shannon Stewart, Katy Casey, Jessica Hagaman, Brooke Winchell, Rowand Robinson, Sharon Kolb, Amy Stevens Griffith, David Gordon, Nomsa Gwalla-Ogisi, Lana Collet-Klingenberg, Eileen Troemel (ADA), and Sara Molnar (SCEC student representative).

- 1) Call to order and introductions.
- 2) From the Department/Program:
 - a) Dr. Rogers-Adkinson discussed the program's accomplishments and progress achieved during the review period (2005-2010), including recognition of the program by NCATE & CEC, linking the adaptive license to the minor, having sophomores advised by the Department Chair or Master Advisor (responding to NSSE results), developed a minor-to-Masters procedure, developed a 4-year matriculation plan, created a master course schedule to manage faculty loads, and updated all course syllabi per CEC standards.
 - b) Dr. Rogers-Adkinson also outlined areas where work and progress is needed or ongoing, including working on evidence-based practices for students in field experiences, working with enrollment and resource issues, working with the COEPS revision of the Elementary Education program, and meeting with stakeholders to review program assessment data.
- 3) Discussion of Review Team's review:
 - a) Accreditation from NCATE and the Council for Exceptional Children are strengths—the only Special Education program in Wisconsin to hold both.
 - b) Research productivity increased dramatically since the comments made in the last Audit & Review.
 - c) Discussed the vision for where the program can be in 5-10 years.
 - d) Discussed enrollments in the major and minor. Department described the need to restrict course registration by students who are minors until all majors have registered for classes. The growth in number of minors has clearly put a strain on the ability to provide for majors.
 - e) Assessment: The self-study does not describe examples of how the program uses assessment data to drive change or improvements. Closing the loop seems to be an issue, and this was also listed in the last Audit & Review. The Department discussed an example where evaluation data were used to revise students' field experiences; they also discussed how the previous system of

assessment pertained to a curriculum that was phasing out, and time is needed to collect actionable data with the new curriculum and assessment system. The group also discussed the need to define at least some student learning outcomes that are specific (unique) to the major and minor.

- f) The process for setting department goals was discussed, including the need for a regular process that involves faculty in setting, monitoring, and revising goals.
- 4) **Recommended Actions**: 3 are listed in the attached report.
- 5) **Recommended Result**: Continuation with minor concerns.
- 6) Other:
 - a) Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
 - b) The **next full self-study will be due in 2015-2016**.
- 7) Adjourned.

See report included below.

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Review Team Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2010-2011
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors

Program: Special Education Major X Minor X

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.			4
2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W.		1	3
3. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Report; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant.		1	3

Comments:

- Offers SPECED 201 (Disability in Society) as a gened elective course. Also offers SPECED 205 (Psych of the Exceptional Child) for all teacher education programs.
- On p. 5, enrollment numbers are provided for Special Education majors at 3 other UW campuses (Oshkosh, Eau Claire, and Stevens Point). Are these the only other programs in the state? What are the enrollments at private institutions and other public institutions in our area?
- How has the department reflected on the comments from previous Audit & Review reports regarding enrollments?
- One recommendation from the previous A&R was to show how assessment data are used to drive programmatic change. How was this accomplished (p. 5)?

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	3
2. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve or advance the program.		1	3
3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals, and/making decisions about changes to the program goals.		4	
4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a "vision" for where it		3	1

wants to be in the future and how to get there.			
5. The program achieved or maintained accreditation (if applicable) and/or earned recognition or awards.			4

Comments:

- Goals are hard to assess (broad). Mission is better.
- Mission statement is clear. Are you satisfied that your program goals and student learning outcomes tie strongly enough to this mission?
- Revision of program goals isn't discussed.
- A few large program goals were listed. Are there other goals that tie to the department's mission?
- The department meets weekly, but the process for setting, monitoring, and revising program goals is vague.
- Details from the weekly meetings or examples of how the meetings facilitate decisions about changes to the program are needed.
- Weekly department meetings seems a substantial burden on faculty time...is this really an efficient mechanism for reflecting and acting on program goals?
- As for "vision," two long-term goals are discussed (establishing an assessment center for the region, creating alternative programs for adult students), but an overall vision of what the program wants to be isn't provided.
- Program earned approval from NCATE and also the Council for Exceptional Children. These are comparative strengths.
- Accreditation as a specialty program is impressive.

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	3
2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students; otherwise NA.			4
3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.	3	1	
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	2
5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable).	2		2

Comments:

- The Special Education licensure program has two emphases (Emotional Disorders & Learning Disabilities, and Cognitive Disabilities). Students progress in four curricular phases: general

education, pre-education courses, special education curriculum, and directed teaching. This structure is clear and well-organized (in the self-study).

- Out-of-class opportunities are listed, but it would help to provide more data on student participation and discussion of student involvement in these.
- Changes to curriculum based on previous A&R rather than internal assessments.
- No description of how assessment data were used to inform program evaluation and revision.
- The self-study does not provide evidence or discussion of how assessment data were used for curricular revision, although significant curricular revision did occur during the review period.
- Quality Matters is used for online courses. Faculty receive stipends for this course development. Aside from Quality Matters certification, no discussion or evidence of ongoing assessment for online courses.
- Program should do more to encourage faculty and undergraduate interaction in research activities, particularly given the large number of majors.

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.	1	1	2
2. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students’ progress in attaining the outcomes.	1		3
3. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgments about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes.	2		2
4. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students’ learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.	2	1	1
5. Results of assessment efforts have been shared with appropriate internal and external constituencies.	1	2	1

Comments:

- NSSE data are discussed, but do any of these data relate to the SLOs listed in the major and minor? How?
- A clear list of student learning outcomes for the major and minor is not available in Appendix D. The appendix provides a 41-page table mapping detailed outcomes to courses, but these outcomes are very detailed (specific) and not practical for assessment of student learning at the program level. Are the faculty deriving direct and indirect measures related to these learning outcomes that are beneficial to them in driving program improvement?
- Assessment data (means) are provided on pp. 15-19, related to the 10 WTS. How are these student learning outcomes mapped to courses? Are these data for Special Ed majors only? The scales in the graphs are misleading—some run from 0 to 4 but others from 2.6-3.4, etc.
- Program has a very detailed and rich mechanism for accumulating direct assessment data. However, self-study was entirely devoid of any interpretation of the data on direct learning outcomes. If the program is not reflecting on the results, then it needs to start doing so. Some available data, such as PPST results, were not reported at all.

- In the self-study (p. 19), the only program change that was related to the use of assessment data involved advising (from NSSE data). How can the complex system of assessment be more use in driving improvements in student learning?
- It does not appear that assessment data are used or shared with stakeholders in any meaningful way.
- [Minor] The outcomes were not listed for most courses.

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 enrollments and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.		2	2
3. [Majors Only] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years [A & C, CoBE, L & S], or reasonably efficiently [COE].		3	1
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.		4	
6. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation.	1	2	1
7. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level is justified or supported by examples or data.		1	3

Comments:

- Graduation rates seem low. How can this be addressed?
- Enrollment appears stable.
- With the growth in number of minors, it appears that the program is oversubscribed and not able to meet the increasing demand for graduates.
- Several BSE majors (actually, all except cross-categorical majors) have had very limited enrollments during review period, and none in recent years. Do they still exist? If so, program should justify their continued existence.
- Credits to degree seem high. How can this be addressed?
- Department sponsors workshops to help underrepresented students prepare for the PPST and Praxis II exams. This is a strength.
- Program clearly has a challenge with imbalance between resources and demand. Program will need to devise a strategy to cope, either finding efficiencies or turning away students. Program needs to determine their maximum student capacity and then apply it. Perhaps examining the relationship between enrollments and assessment outcomes should be analyzed to determine if over-subscription is undermining student outcomes.
- Inconsistency between claim of stretched resources and claim that there is a capacity of 25 new admits each term but only 12 actually happen (p. 21). Please clarify?
- [Minor] 6 & 7. Concern named for minors due to priority given to majors in already packed classes.

B. Demand for Graduates

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

Comments:

- The minor is an added bonus if added to other ed majors, due to the demand for students with training in this area.
- Please provide details about item 2 and 3.
- What is the evidence regarding placement rates?
- What is the evidence regarding employment projections?
- What do you do in this program to track graduates and placements?
- Tracking of alumni seems to exist, but no indication that program makes any use of the data.

C. Comparative Advantage(s)

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. The program has unique features that distinguish it from competing programs—giving it a competitive edge.		2	2

Comments:

- Besides unique status in the state, emphasis on severe disability, and co-teaching, need more explanation on how the program is considered “one of the best in the country.”
- The only Special Education major in the state to have NCATE recognition in the specialty program review process.
- National recognition unique in state.

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.).			4
2. Information is provided about the courses for which faculty and staff are responsible or usually teach.			4
3. Context is clear for understanding the expectations regarding		3	1

faculty and staff support of the program.			
4-5. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.		1	3

Comments:

- What concerns does the program have regarding staffing into the future?
- Gender and racial diversity of faculty are both low.
- Only two male faculty members.

B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement

Criterion	Patterns of Evidence		
	No/Limited Evidence	Some/Partial Evidence	Sufficient Evidence
1. Faculty & instructional academic staff are active in teaching enhancement and other contributions to teaching and teaching-related responsibilities.		1	3
2. The context is clear for understanding faculty & instructional academic staff activities to enhance their teaching, advising, involvement in course or curricular revision, new course development, etc.	2	2	

Comments:

- A table lists the teaching enhancement activities, but no discussion on the understanding for faculty and instructional staff to enhance their teaching.
- Context is not provided.
- Self-study does not offer much description of expectations.

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.			4
2. The context is clear for understanding faculty engagement in scholarly/creative activity.	2		2

Comments:

- It appears that the quantity of publications and presentations has increased significantly since the last review period. This is a strength. Are the faculty satisfied with the quality of publications?
- Discussion of the context does not indicate the amount of scholarship that is expected, e.g., for tenure and promotions.
- Self-study suggests that research expectations exist, but they are not specified. Still, research output seems to have increased considerably.

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.		2	2
2. The context is clear for understanding faculty expectations for attracting grants, contracts, and/or gifts.	1	2	1

Comments:

- Grant proposals were submitted for UW System and teaching-related programs. What is the faculty interest in pursuing external funding for research on special education?

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.		1	3
2. The context is clear for understanding faculty engagement in professional and public service in ways that benefit internal and external constituencies.	2	1	1

Comments:

- Faculty are very active in professional, state, and national service. Evidence related to campus service is missing.
- Context does not include information about the amount or extent of service that is expected, e.g., for tenure and promotions.
- Are on-campus service activities not reported? Odd omission. Again, not clear what expectations of faculty are.

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.		2	2

Comments:

- Classes are larger than desired, and advising is overwhelming undergrad advisors and faculty advisors.
- Self-study indicates that department resources are overextended, e.g., in advising and course enrollments.
- Evidence suggests that resources are not adequate. Program seems to have too many students.

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.		2	2

Comments:

Other comments/questions:

1. What is the “vision” for where this program needs/wants to go in the next 5-10 years? How is this vision being supported by the College and campus?
2. Where do we want to go with enrollments? There seems to be a problem with resource allocation (not sufficient for enrollments). Some of the emphases have little to no enrollment. Are resources being used by these emphases?
3. The current system of assessing student learning is complex and not explained clearly in the self-study.
4. Failure to “close the loop” was noted in the previous Audit & Review, and is still not rectified. The current system for assessing student learning seems to be designed to demonstrate that students meet licensure standards from DPI and NCATE. The department, however, doesn’t seem to use this system to inform curricular or program improvements or changes to enhance student learning (not demonstrated in the self-study, at least). Is the system too cumbersome to generate meaningful and useful information? How can this system be improved?
5. Is student assessment data being utilized to close the assessment loop at all? There are weekly faculty meetings, yet nothing on the matter is reported in the self-study.
6. In the weekly department meetings, what are the systematic processes for determining program goals and reflection on data related to program and student learning goals?

Recommended Actions:

1. Improve the structure and use of the system for assessing student learning in this program. In particular:
 - a. Consider whether the current list of student learning outcomes represents what you want students to know and be able to do upon graduation. Would it be more useful to use a less cumbersome list?
 - b. Provide a clear mapping of student learning to courses in the curriculum (gained through graduation) for both the major and minor.
 - c. Collect direct and indirect measures of learning tied clearly to the student learning outcomes listed for the program. Focus on a subset of outcomes at one time but all outcomes over time.
 - d. Establish a system for reviewing, interpreting, and using assessment data to inform improvements in the program, curriculum, and student learning.
 - e. Establish a system for sharing assessment information with stakeholders.
2. Establish a systematic process for setting program goals, monitoring progress, and revising the goals in the program.
3. Enrollments are not sustainable. Something is going to have to give. Program should develop a plan for aligning enrollments and degrees with resources over the next year to address pressures expected over the next review period. Noted as a major concern that will likely require involvement of the Dean and other administrators in the COEPS, but not one requiring regular progress reports.

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.