

**Audit and Review Program Meeting
Discussion of the Self-Study Report Submitted October 26, 2017 by
Elementary Education Majors and Minors**

**December 11, 2017
4:00 – 5:00 PM
Winther Hall 1013**

Attendance: Matt Vick (Department Chair), Yao Fu (Program Coordinator), Nancy Stevens, Julie Minikel-Lacocque, Ozgul Kartal, Katy Casey (College Expert, Review Team member), Rashiqa Kamal (Chair, Review Team), Joan Cook (Director of Academic Assessment, Review Team member), Katy Heyning (Dean, College of Education and Professional Studies), Greg Cook (Associate Vice Chancellor), Susan Elrod (Provost)

1. The meeting was called to order by Kamal at 4:02 PM.
2. Introductions were made.
3. Rashiqa provided an overview of the review team evaluation and noted the changes in the leadership of the program over time. She also mentioned that the A&R committee recognizes the efforts and improvements made in the program in spite of the challenges faced by it.
4. Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) Structure and Oversight of the Program. Matt mentioned that regular Ed faculty meetings have commenced again. He mentioned that Yao Fu has been hired as the new coordinator. Matt is mentoring Yao. The program is also working more in collaboration with the college advisory board through the Dean. Dean Heyning mentioned that now the coordinator of the program is a faculty and this is a positive thing. She mentioned that Yao has fifty percent teaching assignment, and that she will also be assessed on her performance as the program coordinator. There was a discussion of why faculty are averse to serving as program coordinator and Dean Heyning explained that there has been quite a bit of faculty turnover especially as a result of retirements.

New admission requirements were also discussed that have allowed students to enter into the program based on test or GPA. It has resulted in an increase in enrolment by 180 students this semester. This means that moving forward; the program might need additional resources and faculty lines.

Joan inquired about the process for setting goals for the program. She mentioned that right now the process appears to be more reactive to state mandated requirements. Dean Heyning responded that the program is still waiting for rules from DPI; however, long-term goal setting process is still a work-in-progress. She mentioned that the Teacher Education Committee has representatives from all programs in the college and it is actively involved in the process of goal setting. The newly formed College Assessment Committee will also be a part of the process.

- b) Development of an assessment Plan. Matt stated that the program SLOs were initially driven by teaching standards. EdTPA still has value but SLOs 2 and 3 can be modified. He stated that there is constant change from state licensure; as a result, the college has not been able to focus on college specific plans/SLOs. Rashiqa asked if there is a way to make the assessment process more proactive than reactive. Dean Heyning mentioned that the college assessment committee is working on documents and templates that will help.

Provost Elrod mentioned the upcoming program array review process and stated that the college needs to look at the needs of the state, and find ways continue to make this institution a "powerhouse in the state"

for education.

Joan asked enquired that moving forward, who will be responsible for the assessment of the program. Dean Heyning stated that the college is planning to come up with a calendar for when to focus on which issues for all the licensure programs.

AVC Cook mentioned that the program should try to visualize the end goal that is, what should students achieve from this program.

- c) Continue to streamline the advising process. Rashika noted that progress has been made in this area. The faculty present mentioned that there are group advising sessions, if students fail to attend those, there is a hold on their account. Advisors are also invited to attend the group advising sessions. There has been some dissatisfaction among students because during the transition phase, AARs do not reflect the recent changes, and some students need to do one or two filed studies. The program will continue to try to improve the advising process.
 - d) Other. Rashika brought up the issue that based on feedback from students, some students in the program have low levels of comfort with people from different cultures. How can this issue be addressed? Dean Heyning responded that they have got better with this and have tried to steer students into minors that make them more culturally competent. However, she also mentioned that it has to be done through properly guided experiences or it might “backfire”.
5. Recommended Actions: The evaluation report lists four recommended actions (see page 14, point 4) related to program assessment.
 6. Recommended Result: *Continuation with minor concerns*
 - Progress Report due to Dean by October 1, 2019, due to A&R committee by November 1, 2019
 - Next full self-study will be due to college dean by October 1, 2022 and to A&R committee by November 1, 2022.
 7. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

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

Date of Evaluation 10/26/2017 Self Study (SS)
Program Elementary Education Major X Minor

Evaluations submitted by: Rashiqa Kamal, Andrea Ednie, Pascal Letourneau, Katy Casey, Joan Littlefield Cook
Review meeting attended by: Rashiqa Kamal, Andrea Ednie, Pascal Letourneau, Katy Casey, Joan Littlefield Cook

I. Program Purpose & Overview: A. Centrality

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

1. Good discussion over how the program aligns with UWW's strategic plan.
2. My understanding of the question 2 is that we want to know how the program supports general education. Not what the students going through the program are getting in term of general education.
2. The response explains that students take GenEd courses, which is one way of supporting the GenEd program, but I'm not clear on how the DPI requirements address the question. Please explain how the program supports other academic programs in the College.
3. You could complete the answer buy addressing several aspects: recruiting faculty and staff, recruiting students, etc.

4. Looks like there is not much progress on recommendation #s 3 and 4. Maybe it is just the structure of the program (changing licensure requirements and DPI regulations) that makes setting annual goals difficult?
4. There was not a description of the "systematic process" the department uses to evaluate program goals (recommendation 3)
4. The self-study gives several examples of how data are being used but it doesn't describe the processes used to review, discuss, and make action decisions based on data. This lack of description of a process was explicitly noted in both the progress reports, but it still is not described. Note that I don't doubt that the program has a process, but please describe how you go about making these decisions.
4. Same comment as above for setting and monitoring program goals.
4. Seem to have met three of the four recommendations made in the previous review.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a "vision" for where it wants to be in the future and how to get there.

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

5. The program, faculty/staff, and/or students have earned recognition or awards.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0

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

Comments

2. Goals and objectives seem very curriculum focused, but vision includes increasing the number of students interested in the middle school level. Should the program consider adding a goal that reflects the desire to increase students interested in middle school?
 2. Was the decision to remove PEPROF 328 to meet objective 2, based on feedback from school districts? Why?
 2. The goal and 3 objectives listed are big ones, no doubt. Were there other short-term goals? Any goals focused on staffing, resources, enrollment, etc.?
 3. are reading faculty part of the Elementary Education faculty and staff group? If yes, I am assuming that they share their analysis of student performance with the larger group? It wasn't clear to me that all of the different discussions and analyses are brought back together.
 3. The answer let us think that there are not a lot of sources of assessment data. Is edTPA the only source? How about exit survey data, course specific assessment? Are students assessed only from the Reading exam, or are there other assessments to show their progress?
 3. Can you describe this process more fully? For example, is there an annual meeting that focuses exclusively on assessment data, to allow an in-depth discussion of all the data available? What kind of information do you get from the Office of Field Experiences about school district needs, and how often is this shared and discussed with the program? Is there a committee in charge of the process, the chair, the program coordinator, the whole program, etc.? The amount of time spent discussing assessment in the department's monthly meetings was not clear.
 4. Future goals and vision is not clear. What's the overall 'vision' for the program? I see that one goal is to increase the number of students who select middle school settings, and an emphasis on passing the tests required for licensure. Is there an overarching vision that is guiding these goals?
 4. Curricular revisions at this point are mostly being driven by the need for students to pass the WiFor and other DPI-required tests. This makes sense and is necessary; are there other bases for the ongoing revisions?
 5. There were not any award received during this review period. Are there recognitions and awards available?
 6. I still question whether the program is leveling down to keep enrollment. I have no prior opinion, nor knowledge of those requirements for CAEP. It's just that the way it's presented it makes me feel like the requirements for CAEP would hurt enrollment. However, it might be legitimate to ask how the program makes sure to keep high enough standards.
-
6. The COEPS does not seek accreditation. The Continuous Review Process is a requirement of the WI Department of Public Instruction; DPI is not an accrediting body.

II. Assessment: A. Curriculum

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

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

2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students; otherwise NA

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

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

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

4. The program provides opportunities for students to learn in ways that extend beyond the classroom, and discussed the extent to which students are involved in these activities and opportunities.

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

5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable)

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

Comments

1. The ability to go through both elementary and middle school level fieldwork is a good addition to the curriculum.
 1. Opportunities beyond the classroom - not sure how many of the student projects described were offered by the program (two Honors students were mentioned plus a variety of other student projects - who mentored the other projects and how did they come about)?
 2. The sample syllabus indicates that there is only one assignment that differentiates grad from undergrad, for a total of 15 points (13% of the graduate grade). This assignment is a 5 page book review. Please explain more fully how this addresses the graduate school expectations for graduate work, and how it is of a sufficient level and degree of work to earn 3 graduate credits.
 2. Dual listed course - offers an additional assignment, but are the student expectations different from graduate students?
 3. Does the program require 4.5 years to complete?
 3. It appears that most curricular changes are driven by outside forces (school districts and testing/ licensure agencies), and not much because of intra-department assessment. Given the program's structure, it might not necessarily be a bad thing.
 3. Data from school districts were used, and the WIFOR pass rates are mentioned as a reason for not changing the reading courses. Other than there, there is no mention of using data on SLO achievement as a basis for making changes. What are all the assessments (specific skills in WiFOR, edTPA, Praxis II, etc.) telling you about students' skills and knowledge that could be used to modify courses? 4. Impressive list of extra-curricular achievements by students.
 3. Not clear as to whether feedback that informed curriculum changes was part of a formal assessment?
 5. I think the answer is good. However, it would be nice to have other measures. For example, do they use Quality Matters for online teaching?
-
5. Surely some questions should be different in an online course than face-to-face, no? They are two different mediums and should be evaluated differently.

II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program has a clearly articulated learning outcomes for students, courses are "mapped" to these learning outcomes, and some outcomes received specific attention during the review period.

Sufficient Evidence	2
---------------------	---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

1. In Appendix D (mapping of SLOs to courses), A2, A3, and A4 are never used in the mapping. Are they carryovers from the old program? SLOs could be stated in a better, more measurable way. For example, can the second one be "Students will be able to successfully develop and implement instructional plans that are consistent with current cognitive and social learning theories as measured by task 1 of the edTPA"?
1. I don't fully understand Appendix D - I can't find how the items listed as "assessed" in the table are actually assessed? I also am not clear on how A2, A3 and A4 work? Also, what about indirect assessments?
1. The SLOs listed seem to combine several different things into one SLO. For example, SLO #3 includes knowledge and abilities, development and implementation of assessment plans, ability to use a variety of strategies, and fostering student learning.

1. The SLOs might be more useful if they are more clearly articulated. For example, for SLO#1, consider: Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively teach and assess literacy skills. The 'as assessed by' could be removed from the actual SLO statement. I suggest removing the 'will be able to' and just say 'demonstrate.' We can't know if they're able to do something if they don't demonstrate it in some way.
1. For SLO #2, what is it you want students to accomplish? Do you want them to demonstrate an understanding/ability to use current cognitive and social learning theories? Or do you want them to develop and implement instructional plans? Or develop and implement instructional plans that demonstrate their understanding of current cognitive and social learning theories? Again, I'd suggest removing the 'as assessed by...' from the SLO. That's the method by which achievement of the SLO will be assessed, but it's not part of the SLO.
1. Where is SLO #1 introduced?
1. Good mapping of SLOs to courses. You have multiple points of embedded assessment, which sets you up nicely to do longitudinal tracking of skill development, if you choose to do that.
1. Are three learning outcomes enough?
2. The previous item states 3 SLOs for the program, what are the italicized learning goals in the attached document to this question?
2. I don't understand the alignment of the program SLOs with the LEAP ELOs. Where do the italicized SLOs come from? Are these also program SLOs (in addition to the 3 listed for question #1 above)? Please clarify.
3. It appears that the program aims to "teach to the test". They make changes in curriculum based upon the success rate of their students.

3. I don't see evidence of an assessment plan. I understand the importance of passing the required tests, but I don't see how you're getting actionable feedback from these tests that can be used for continuous program improvement. Your curriculum map indicates that SLOs are assessed within courses. How is this done, what processes are used, what do these data tell you, and how are these assessments used to improve the program? Another way to think about this is to consider how you are making sure that students are ready to pass the required tests--how do you know they're ready?
4. How about placement data? (placement rate, placement type, geographic location, ...)
4. Data from the WiFOR test was not provided. Further, SOAS data were not discussed as a measure to evaluate SLOs
4. Pass rate for edTPA is very good!
4. I need some help in understanding what the edTPA rubric scores are showing (e.g., what is 'plan for understanding'? What is covered in 'learning environment'? etc.). Also, how do you pull these scores apart to figure out where students are doing well, in what areas they need more/different instruction, etc.? I'm trying to understand how you can use the tests to identify areas in the program to modify for continuous improvement.
4. From the SOAS data:
 - What was the response rate for these two years?
 - Advising is clearly an issue. These items are usually the lowest rated ones (when averaged across all majors).
 - I'd be concerned about the relatively lower ratings for the items on degree of challenge of the program and the amount of work they put into their major. These are usually among the top 5 highest rated items (when averaged across all majors).
 - I'd also be concerned about students' lower ratings on understanding and interacting comfortably with people from other cultures, given that the profession these students are entering.
4. The curriculum map indicates that SLOs are assessed within courses. Please summarize these data and what you are learning from it.
5. Processes are not described in sufficient detail anywhere in this report. Talking periodically about data or scores from mandatory exams is not a process.
5. More detail needed on the process.
5. Is there a program assessment committee? Who is responsible for managing the assessment processes, organizing discussions about data, etc.?
6. Why not include the CRP report or survey results?
6. I see several sources for getting feedback about the program (e.g., Dean's Advisory Board, survey of school districts, etc.), but not much about sharing the results and conclusions from your assessments. Do you get any feedback from or have discussions with DPI as a result of the CPR?

6. Are data shared with students? Is there a conversation with them about what the data mean, how it's used as a basis for program changes?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. [MAJORS ONLY] Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

1-2. Although, I don't doubt the claim, for record-keeping purposes, I would have liked to see some evidence showing a downward trend in enrollment in other programs.

- 1-2. Do you consider the program to still be 'vital and sustainable'? What impact have the drops in enrollment had for the program?
- 1-2. Number of degrees granted seems stable, despite lower enrollment.
- 1-2. Seems that sufficient course sections are offered (and with sufficient frequency) to allow expedient student progress.
2. How do graduate numbers compare to the demand in school district? It would be nice to have data about the demographic. Do we anticipate an increase in the next few years?
3. Students cannot finish the degree in four years or less but that is OK, it is the structure of the program.
3. Does the program have a goal of reaching 120 credits? Completion in 4 years
4. Not many efforts to promote diversity of student body.
4. The FTP sounds great but can you provide more information about it? As is, it's difficult to evaluate how successful it is as a strategy to recruit and retain diverse students. For example, how many students participate? What are the retention and graduation rates for the program, as compared to the overall college rates (and to diverse students who do not participate in the program, if those numbers are available)?
4. Are there strategies other than FTP to recruit and retain diverse students?
5. What is the overall URM rate for the program and how does it compare to the university average?
5. What is the Dream Scholars Program? What is the impact of this and the FTP on enrollment and retention of URM students? Need to provide some evidence regarding these programs.
7. Again, it would be nice to put in perspective with the demand for elementary and middle school teachers.
- General: Reading the next portion, I see the information is there. However, it would be nice to tie everything together to make it easier on the reader.

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

1. [MAJORS ONLY] Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.

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

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

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

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

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

Comments

1. Impressive that our numbers are better than other System campuses.
3. Good work at the college level on surveying alumni, but please explain what this program has learned from the survey (and how many Elem Ed grads responded).

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

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

Comments**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.)**

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

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

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

Comments

- 1-2. Efforts at improving diversity among faculty/staff might attract more diverse student population to the program.
- 3-4. Please explain the strategy for assigning a program coordinator. I worry about having this role assigned to an assistant professor (new-to-campus; new to the state?).

IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement**1-2. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.**

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

Comments**IV. Resource Availability & Development: C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities****1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.**

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

Comments

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding**1-2. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.**

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

Comments

Congratulations on the WITQ award

IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service**1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.**

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

Comments**IV. Resource Availability & Development: F. Resources for Students in the Program****1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.**

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

Comments

1. Seem to be at a good level, with the addition of their new advisor.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings**1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, and technological resources to effectively serve its students.**

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

Comments

1. Need more classroom space (larger rooms)

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Program strengths are discussed.

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

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

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

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

4. Other comments by the program (not rated).

Yes	2
No	2

Comments

- The goals are vague. For example: "Improve the first-time pass rate on the ..." Ok, but what is the plan, what specific changes will you look into?
- The program does not mention a need to be more systematic in its discussion and use of assessment data. Are they already doing this but just not describing it sufficiently in the self-study? What is happening with data from course-embedded assessments?

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

- The program appears to be dynamic in the sense that it adapts to changes in the field of elementary teaching in Wisconsin. The program has a sufficient size to allow hiring specialist. I agree that specialist in some fields will provide a much better learning experience for the students.
- The ability of the program to offer different expertise areas instead of just a generalist viewpoint.
- The ability of the program to offer elementary/ middle school field experience hence, improving their job prospects.
- Well-qualified faculty that are active teachers-scholars.
- The program has engaged in a thoughtful and deliberative process to improve the curriculum.
- The faculty are committed to program improvement and addressing the needs of teacher candidates.
- The program has access to a lot of data for program improvement.
- This is a very large program. The department faculty are proactive in making curriculum changes in order to continue to prepare students for the required tests and certifications for teaching in Wisconsin.
- Program is strong at representing female, and Hispanic students.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- In terms of assessment, the department appears to rely mainly on the reading test. Though it is a crucial element of the success of students, there are other assessment data available. From my reading of the self-study, I think the department is using more assessment data than they let us know. For example, they have placement data and data to help predict the demand for elementary teachers. My personal opinion is that the self-study was rushed. There are numerous typos.

- The program does not have an assessment plan in place that is driven by internal feedback. Most of the changes are driven by external constituencies and mostly focused on student success rate at the various licensure requirements. I am not sure that this can be changed as the program has to be mostly driven by these requirements.
- There does not seem to be a process in place to set annual goals for the program.
- The three SLOs should be revised to be more measurable and concrete.

- There continues to be a need for the program to create a systematic process for evaluating SLOs.
- Connecting with stakeholder groups or summarizing the data from advisory groups.
- Recruitment of a more diverse pool of teacher candidates.
- Assessment. Should more SLOs be added, and more detail to the assessment plan in terms of how each assessment was completed and evaluated?

3. Other comments/questions

- How are the 3 SLOs different from the goals listed in the document mapping the courses to LEAP ELOs?
- The assessment plan needs attention: Clarify SLOs, identify sources of data on student learning and how to integrate the information gained from the existing assessments, and develop a systematic and sustainable process for making use of data.
- Some of the issues in the current self-study were also raised in the last A&R review. Some progress seemed to be made as described in the two progress reports submitted, but the current self-study does not indicate sustained progress. Because these appear to be ongoing issues, my recommended result is major concerns.
- I would suggest a progress report by Fall 2019. I would expect significant progress in developing, implementing and clearly describing systematic processes for setting and monitoring program goals, and for reviewing and making use of assessment data, since these have now been raised in two A&R cycles.
- Impressive faculty team!
- Can the program be more articulate and showcase the High Impact Practices (HIPs) that they are engaged in?

4. Recommended Actions

1. Review, revise, and implement the assessment plan:
 - a. Revise the SLOs so they are stated as measurable outcomes.
 - b. Clarify how the SLOs listed in the LEAP alignment table are related to the three program SLOs.
 - c. Clearly articulate the processes used to review assessment data and make decisions based on it. If such processes do not exist, develop and implement them.
2. Clearly articulate the program's processes for setting and monitoring program goals.
3. Identify the specific problems that students associate with advising and work toward alleviating them.
4. Identify ways to attract more diverse faculty/ staff and students in the program. The SOAS data indicate that there are concerns about students' lower ratings on understanding and interacting comfortably with people from other cultures.

5. Recommended Result*

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
Continuation without qualification	0
Continuation with minor concerns	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	1
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

***Progress report on Recommended Actions due to dean by October 1, 2019; due to A&R Committee by Nov 1, 2019. Next full self-study due to college dean by October 1, 2022 and to the A&R Committee by Nov 1, 2022.**

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Minutes of Audit and Review Progress Report Follow-up Meeting
Elementary Education, majors and minors, 2019-2020**

Date: 2/14/20

Time: 2:30 – 3:30 pm

Location: Winther 1014

Attendance: Assistant Dean Katy Casey; Program Coordinator Yao Fu; Review Team Chair Yushan Zhao; Review Team Member Dale Splinter; Assessment representative Catherine Chan.

- 1) Meeting called to order
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Review of A&R Response and Conclusion:

Review team chair Zhao commented on the great effort the program coordinator Fu has put forth towards this progress report. Assistant Dean Casey noted that the program, especially the program coordinator, has worked closely in concert with the college administrative leaders on program improvement and evaluation. The review team expressed appreciation for Fu's efforts, especially for a tenure-track faculty member. The review team encourages all members in the program to continue to actively contribute to on-going work, especially as it relates to curricular revisions due to changes in DPI requirements.

- 4) Program responses and comments:

Regarding recommendation #1, program coordinator Fu noted that the program is actively working on new curricula and corresponding SLOs. The program was encouraged to have a set of core SLOs that are applicable across all tracks and begin to align those SLOs to LEAP ELOs. Refinement of the assessment plan and its implementation can then follow.

Regarding recommendation #2, the program is holding regular monthly meetings to review program data and monitor progress, and the process is supported by college administration. Program coordinator Fu is encouraged to continue to seek support from the college as appropriate.

Regarding recommendation #3, the program is utilizing applications such as 'My Planner' and 'Navigate' to help with advising. The data gathered are also useful for planning course sizes. Progress in the area of advising is promising and the program is encouraged to continue to collect data and revise the advising scheme as necessary.

Regarding recommendation #4, the program is considering offering online courses to serve more non-traditional students, those who live farther way, and para-professionals seeking licensure.

The review team encourages the program to use the recommendation from the program report evaluation to help guide the preparation of the next self-study. Program coordinator Fu is encouraged to continue working with colleagues in the program and the college administration.

- 5) Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:30 pm.

Next FULL self-study is due to the College Deans by October 1, 2022 and to the Office of Academic Assessment by November 1, 2022.

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Progress Report
Undergraduate Programs, 2019-2020
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Program Name: Elementary Education

Date of Review Team Meeting: December 4th, 2019

Date of Follow-Up Meeting: 2/14/2020 Time: 2:30-3:30pm Location: Winther 1014

Evaluations submitted by: Yushan Zhao, Dale Splinter, Hephzibah Kumpaty, Catherine Chan, and Katy Casey

Review meeting attended by: Yushan Zhao, Dale Splinter, Catherine Chan, and Katy Casey

Recommendation #1

1. Review, revise, and implement the assessment plan:
 - a. Revise the SLOs so they are stated as measurable outcomes.
 - b. Clarify how the SLOs listed in the LEAP alignment table are related to the three program SLOs.
 - c. Clearly articulate the processes used to review assessment data and make decisions based on it. If such processes do not exist, develop and implement them.

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

Good Progress	1
Making Progress	4
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #1

- It's great to see the new SLOs; please elaborate on how they align with LEAP ELOs.
- Program appears to have made a lot of progress in addressing the A&R recommendations from their last self-study including attendance at the Assessment Institute, revising SLOs, developing rubrics for each SLOs along with course embedded assessments and rubrics. I commend the program coordinators and faculty for their work on this.
- I did not see where the SLOs are aligned to LEAP in the progress report. With respect to the SLOs, I am not sure how student learning is being measured.
- The program has developed six new SLOs that are measurable. Rubrics are attached in the report. - The program is exploring possibility of creating a new SLO to measure civic engagement. - The program is in the process to review the assessment data and close the loop. --Not clear how these SLOs are aligned with LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes
- Congratulations on the gains made in a relatively short period of time! The SLOs are clearly aligned to program content and are distinct from standards. In addition, the newly adopted signature assessments will provide a much needed internal source of data for program improvement. It is clear the program is working on assessment regularly and using data-based decisions to support program changes.

Recommendation #2

2. Clearly articulate the program's processes for setting and monitoring program goals.

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

Making Progress	4
Little/No Progress	1
Good Progress	

Comments related to recommendation #2

- The program's process for setting and monitoring goals looks adequate. Two of their monthly meetings are dedicated to review and discuss assessment results and program effectiveness.
- Are two meetings being used to monitor program goals? Based on the response to this recommendation I am not sure. For example, the word "should" is used a lot to describe what "should" be occurring, but I am uncertain if this is actually happening.
- MCEA committee is making progress for setting and monitoring program long term and annual goals.
- The program coordinator continues to play a critical role in leading assessment efforts. There have been efforts made to engage faculty and there are some instances where faculty are taking on more responsibility.

Recommendation #3

3. Identify the specific problems that students associate with advising and work toward alleviating them.

Recommendation #3 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

Good Progress	5
Making Progress	0
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #3

- I think the program has invested significant amount of time addressing the advising issues and the data shows improvement. I am also concerned why there is frequent turnovers with program coordinators in this program? Are they getting enough release and support from the Dean's office to do the work?
- It appears that advising is getting better in the program.
- The program has updated the advising package for new admits to the college - Provided one-on-one advising to help create program plans - created new sample course listings to reflect curricular changes in the program - organized three group advising sessions each semester to inform students and advisors with the most recent program changes, address advising questions or concerns, and help students update their program plan - created an online data storage system to effectively share updated advising materials with all MCEA advisors to ensure consistent understanding of the program - offered extra support to advisors
- The program identified the problems and created a plan to improve advising practices.

Recommendation #4

4. Identify ways to attract more diverse faculty/ staff and students in the program. The SOAS data indicate that there are concerns about students' lower ratings on understanding and interacting comfortably with people from other cultures.

Recommendation #4 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

Good Progress	3
Making Progress	2
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #4

- Making progress.
- How does creating online programs help satisfy this recommendation?
- Efforts being made to recruit diverse faculty members. - Significant efforts being made to increase diversity of student population.

Recommendations for next review. Additional progress reports required?

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

Additional comments:

- The next study, due in 2022, should address the alignment of the new SLOs with LEAP ELOs, how the new assessment plan is working and new data/insights gathered, whether the new advising model is satisfactory or needs further revision, and whether current efforts to increase student diversity and their comfort in interacting with different cultures improve with current efforts.
- In the next self-study, it would be helpful to include the assessment plan that specifies how SLOs will be measured in the given time period, and describes alignment between the SLOs and assessments.
- Please avoid use of “should” in the report and specify what is actually occurring in the program.

*****Next FULL self-study is due to the College Deans by October 1, 2022 and to the Office of Academic Assessment by November 1, 2022.***