

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
MSE Professional Studies, 2018**

Date: 2/26/2021

Time: 10-11:30am

Place: Webex

Invited: Interim Associate Provost, Joan Cook; Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, Matt Vick; Lynn Collet-Klingenberg (Substitute for Dean Robin Fox (Education & Prof. Studies); faculty and staff in the Master of Science Education - Professional Studies program; Audit & Review Team Chair Tia Schultz; Audit & Review team members, Assessment Director Katy Casey.

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
 - a) The program is going through a transition, as the Higher Education Leadership program separates into its own program and the physical education emphases combine into one kinesiology emphasis. There is a focus on increasing numbers in their cohort model.
 - b) The program is working on getting an assessment process going. The outside advisory board got together, but the program has not followed up yet due to the pandemic. The key take-away from the advisory board was that they liked the program's emphasis on writing and thinking deeper and appreciate program options besides education leadership for people who want to advance without going into leadership work.
 - c) Over the last few months, the program's council has been discussing what is working and not working and next steps such as course delivery.
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) This program provides an important professional development service to K-12 teachers and librarians and seems unique to the region. What is known about the demand and competitiveness of this program? Are there other needs in the field that this program can fulfill to recruit students?
 - i) The program is considering an early childhood emphasis extending an existing module program.
 - ii) The program has not done a formal survey of demands, but they are working with Laura Montez from Marketing for recruitment of cohorts.
 - (1) The program's biggest success is in the cohort model. It is a C&I emphasis, individualized to meet the needs of school districts. The Mukwonago cohort will be completing in summer 2021 and the Jefferson cohort in December 2021. There is currently some interest from other districts in the region.
 - iii) The program is looking into other connections like with the PIE courses.
 - b) The program notes that "Higher Education Leadership and Higher Education Athletic Administration, which together account for close to half of the enrollment in the program, are about to be spun off into their own master's program, pending UW System and local curricular approval." What is the program's plan to evolve after this split?
 - i) This question was addressed, in part, in earlier discussion.
 - ii) The split also pulled out most of the students from historically underserved groups. The program is refocusing efforts to address this for the remaining emphases.
 - c) Faculty and staff supporting the program have been willing to be flexible and respond to changing instructional modalities to address program enrollment and retention. Moving forward, are there plans for different delivery models?

- i) This question was addressed, in part, in earlier discussion.
 - ii) Currently there is an interest and faculty are open. The timing might be right for developing online courses. This could also help increase student diversity.
 - d) The program would benefit from a more robust assessment process to guide program decisions. What plans are currently in place to improve assessment procedures?
 - i) The program plans to fully implement current assessment plan (which is underdeveloped).
 - (1) They currently gather data from capstone. However, getting data from instructors in field is difficult. Instructors in field for cohort model need coaching and support for data collection.
 - (2) The program has a Council with two representatives from each of the three departments that already meets. The Council plans to identify embedded assessments in different emphases to create a program wide way of collecting data. They will identify core courses as a starting point.
 - (3) They will plan their external advisory board. They have names identified and want to meet once a year.
 - e) A separate discussion ensued regarding the external advisory board.
- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists four recommended actions (see page 14, point 3) related to program planning and assessment.
- 6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns*
- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
 - **Next FULL self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2023 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2023.**
 - **A progress report will be due Oct. 15 to Dean, Nov. 1 to Assessment, of Fall 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
Graduate Programs, 2020-2021
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 12/11/2020 Short Self Study (SS*) _____
 Program: MSE – Professional Studies Major Minor

Evaluations submitted by: Matt Vick, Katy Casey, Tia Schultz, Elena Levy-Navarro, Carrie Merino, Pavan Chennamaneni

Review meeting attended by: Matt Vick, Katy Casey, Tia Schultz, Elena Levy-Navarro, Carrie Merino, Pavan Chennamaneni

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	6
2		Some/Partial Evidence	0
3		No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

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

1		Sufficient Evidence	6
2		Some/Partial Evidence	0
3		No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.A.3

1. Excellent work recruiting and serving such a diverse student population.

4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review report; Progress Reports have been included (if relevant).

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

Comments for I.A.4

1. The program notes the formation of a smaller task force in lieu of an advisory board. However, the program does not provide details of the consultation and resulting feedback from this task force. The program does discuss its actions relating to the other two recommendations.

2. It sounds like steps were taken to address the recommended actions, but the results are unclear.

3. Recommendations from the prior A&R are mentioned but many have not been achieved. More details regarding this would be helpful.

4. I.A.4. Logical alternate steps to forming an advisory board, but this still may be an important long term goal.

5. The program has engaged in conversations regarding recommended actions, but it is not clear from the information provided that work was started or completed in the review period.

General Comments related to Section I.A

1. Recommendations from the prior A&R are mentioned but many have not been achieved.

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

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0
	Total	6

Comments for I.B.1

1. Program mission is to further develop knowledge and skills of professionals in their chosen fields.

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

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

Comments for I.B.2

1. The cohort model and practitioner focused experiences are great ways to support professionals and disseminate knowledge to those who need it.

2. Some evidence is generally provided. Lacks specific examples about this process. Granted there are several different emphases, but in general how goals are established and accomplished is missing from the report. Not specific.

3. The program engaged in a number of activities to address quality and enrollment in some of the emphasis areas (e.g., Higher Education leadership, library media).

3. The program has a process for setting and evaluating progress on achieving program-level goals, and making decisions about program changes based on assessment data.

1	Sufficient Evidence	0
2	Some/Partial Evidence	6
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.B.3

1. The program does not provide details of the discussions with the external panelists.
2. Limited information beyond general statements provided. A specific example of how this has been done in an emphasis would be helpful.
3. I.B.3. Additional use of program assessment data to inform decisions would be useful but focus on recruitment trends is important.

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.B.4

1. Plans for online coursework and school-specific programs are responsive to the current trends and needs in the field.

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

Comments for I.B.6

1. The college opted not to seek accreditation
2. The write-up indicates that the CoEPS made this decision. It would be useful if a statement from the college as to the rationale would be included in these reviews.
3. No mention is made of the Library emphasis and how quality is assured- they mention DPI, but there is one sentence about Library.
4. I.B.6. Focus is on professional development and state licensure.

General Comments related to Section I.B

1. Specific examples are needed for much of this narrative- it is short and does not give a clear sense of how these processes work.
2. The program has a clearly stated purpose and process in place to make revisions to address low enrollment.

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

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, complete with a capstone experience.

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

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

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

Comments for II.A.3

1. Some data appear to be informal, but the revisions were based on data.
2. The program lacks a specific data assessment plan across all emphases. They mention some of the curriculum changes, but DO NOT say how these were tied back to data.
3. II.A.3 Changes based both upon data and changes in state licensure requirements.
4. IIA3. Changes to the curriculum appeared largely in response to consumer demand (interests of districts and students) and changes in licensure. It was not clear if changes in course content were driven by student performance data.

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

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

Comments for II.A.4

1. Only in the higher education leadership emphasis.

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	4
2	Some/Partial Evidence	2
3	No/Limited Evidence	0
5	Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments for II.A.5

1. I offered this assessment only because the write up indicates that there is no different form of assessment and the question implies that there should be. The response makes me think that perhaps it is adequate to consider that all courses are assessed as part of the program rather than to single out online courses.
2. IIA5. Is the expectation that online courses receive a different evaluation targeted to online learning? There is a process in place to evaluate course efficacy regardless if it is online or not.

General Comments related to Section II.A

1. Specific examples would help. The writing feels somewhat generic.
2. IIA. The emphasis areas in this program seem to drive changes. There does not appear to be a central process for program development or review. I recognize the difficulty due to the nature of the program, but without a centralized structure- tracking and measuring student learning to inform the program will be difficult.

II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.B.1

1. Clearly written SLOs, mapped to core courses.

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	0
2	Some/Partial Evidence	6
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.B.2

1. Program has SLOs mapped to courses. However, there is not a plan in place to collect data on these outcomes.

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

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

Comments for II.B.3

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

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

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

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

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

Comments for II.B.5

1. Mostly informal; plans to create a more comprehensive and systematic way of collecting, evaluating, and using assessment data

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

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

Comments for II.B.6

1. The program has no plan for sharing data with the advisory board.

2. Program is aware of their need to create a systematic way to share assessment results.

3. This is mentioned as occurring. One example that is vaguely provided is the use of the results of the Wisconsin Reading Test, but vaguely mentioned.

4. II.B.6. No information on advisory board/use of external voices is mentioned.

General Comments related to Section II.B

- 1. Not Solid Data assessment plan which informs curriculum is presented in this section.

- 2. It seems the focus of the program has been on the individual areas, and not the overall program structure. Therefore, there has not been any program data collected. This is consistent with the last review.

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

Comments for III.A.1-2

1. Enrollment is staying relatively consistent in the past few years, and has grown since 2015-16. It was interesting the program noted that there were 4 emphasis areas accounting for 94% of enrollment. Why not target efforts on building a program in these areas, instead of the 12 options? Also, at least one (Higher Education leadership) is no longer included in this program- how will that impact enrollment?

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

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

Comments for III.A.3

There are some contradictions in the diversity data provided in this section versus what is presented on the first several numbers.

IIA3. "20% other than white" - Is this across all areas? Some efforts were noted, but did not seem targeted as diversifying student enrollment but opportunities to address retention of all students.

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

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

Comments for III.A.4

1. Very vague information provided in this section. Earlier in the report they mention the number of degrees awarded by year.
2. Not sure based on answer. "Most students have been able to enroll in courses they need.." In addition, some classes have been cancelled due to low enrollment. Does this impact retention?

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

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

Comments for III.A.5

They mention some drop in enrollment of specific emphases, but numbers and additional context are not provided.

III.A.5. Cohort make the program sustainable. non-cohort form of the program is unclear about sustainability.

IIIA5. If classes are sometimes not reaching enrollment, and cancelled- this suggests that there are not enough "students to fill classes offered" as is reported in this response. It seems one emphasis area is carrying this program.

General Comments related to Section III.A

General vagueness- lacks concrete examples.

IIIA. The Higher Education Leadership emphasis was approved as a separate degree program in 2019- which is exciting, congrats to this program. However, it is unclear what impact this will have on the program as a whole since much of what is reported in this report is a direct result of that program.

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

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

Comments for III.B.2

This is not clear. The most powerful drive for those enrolled in the program is additional licensure and not all emphasis areas provide this. Is there a draw to the program solely for professional development purposes?

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

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

Comments for III.B.3

This is a strength of the program

4. The program effectively tracks graduates of the program.

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

Comments for III.B.4

The program does not provide any evidence.

Not answered

I get a sense that this is left to the individual emphases, and not concrete information was provided on this process.

III.B.4 Missing/ is this relevant for this program?

General Comments related to Section III.B

IIIB. It would be helpful to gather data from program completers to help identify the emphasis areas worth developing. It seems not all the areas are of interest to prospective students and may be an unnecessary drain on faculty and program resources.

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

Comments for III.C.1

Unique features of the program are listed, these no doubt set it apart from other regional programs. Do programs like this exist in other system schools?

IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Graduate Faculty Characteristics

1. Characteristics of the faculty (e.g., gender, ethnicity, rank, percentage of time devoted to the program and course responsibilities) are clearly indicated.

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement

1-2. Graduate faculty engage in activities to enhance teaching, advising, involvement in course or curricular revision, new course development, etc.

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

Comments for IV.B.1-2

Very generally mentioned- that they have participated- again, some specific examples would be helpful.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities

1-2. Graduate faculty engage in scholarly/creative activity in ways that support or advance the graduate program.

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

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 graduate student population.

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

Comments for IV.F.1

Very briefly mentioned- not thorough.

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

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

Comments for IV.G.1

Very short- not a lot of details provided.

IV.G.1. Online appears to be the future (possibly HyFlex delivery); will resources suffice for that vision (if chosen by the faculty)?

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Program strengths are discussed.

1		Sufficient Evidence	6
2		Some/Partial Evidence	0
3		No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for V.1

The program offers a unique opportunity for those in education who would like to continue their professional development of knowledge and skills in their discipline. I commend the program for being flexible in course offerings and increasing online course delivery.

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

1		Sufficient Evidence	6
2		Some/Partial Evidence	0
3		No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for V.2

V.2. The challenges identified are key. They should be the focus of the next five years.

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

Comments for V.3

V.3. What about a formal advisory board?

General Comments related to Section V

Overall, the report indicates programs that are changing to accommodate the changing needs of the population.

V. It seems the audience the program was designed to serve does not receive the focus of program planning. If data were reported, it was on the Higher Education Leadership program, which the Curriculum and Instruction emphasis reported the highest enrollment.

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

The enrollment trend seems healthy. The program has made several changes to adapt to the changing environment.

Changing emphasis in response to the regional needs. Exploration and implementation of alternate forms of course delivery.

The program serves professionals in the field by offering programs related to needs in the field. The program has evolved to include more online courses and on-site courses to meet the needs of students who are also working full time.

Class format- partnership with districts, diverse emphases and DPI involvement.

This program provides an important professional development service to K-12 teachers and librarians. It also was an important starting point for the current MSE-Higher Education Leadership program. The transformation toward cohort-based district programs and a fully online library program have provided a mechanism for continued success.

The program seems unique to the region. Faculty and staff supporting the program are willing to be flexible and respond to changing instructional modalities to address program enrollment and retention.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

The program built into its assessment a responsiveness to the students. They should (and likely will) continue doing this in order to ensure access to more students.

The main area for improvement is creating and implementing a program assessment system to evaluate their program and inform program changes.

No program specific SLO's that could be monitored across program emphases. Emphases also did not include any SLO's as examples in the report. Lack of data assessment plan.

It was explained why an advisory board wasn't created, but it still seems like an important area to continue working toward to maintain current and constant feedback on curriculum and delivery. With streamlined emphasis options, it seems like this board would be focused on K-12 teachers and librarians. Concerns over non-cohort based class sizes were mentioned several times. The program could discontinue all non-cohort based programming or find a way to deliver it through HyFlex or through an efficient (not too many electives) online cohort format.

3. Recommended Actions

1. Formalize an external advisory board of stakeholders in the field and leverage this body for making program change decisions.

2. Develop the program vision or plan for the next 5 years.

3. Review the program learning outcomes to ensure they are aligned with current offerings. In addition, create a plan to evaluate the learning outcomes and share data on at least two outcomes in the next reporting cycle.

4. Determine efficient course schedules for the emphasis areas by focusing on a core set of electives that do not spread interest/enrollment too widely and lead to unsustainable enrollment in courses.

5. Other Comments

1. The team found the report lacked sufficient detail to make recommendations in some areas. Our suggestion is to spend the time to write a report more reflective of the work going on in the program.
2. Provide concrete examples in the next report to support the somewhat vague narrative provided at times throughout this report.
3. Clarify the mission and include emphasis areas that reflect this mission. Since this review was written, there are ten emphasis areas and most have very few students. Curriculum and Instruction and Information, Technology, and Libraries should be the focus of the program recruitment efforts. Other than the cohort model, is there a reason the C&I emphasis is growing? Is there a way to consolidate the add on licensure options (e.g., art, ESL/Bilingual, reading), or make a new more attractive option for students (e.g., Heritage Language).

6. Recommended Result

#	Answer	Count
1	Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
2	Continuation without qualification	0
3	Continuation with minor concerns	6
4	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	0
5	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
6	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
7	Non-continuation of the program	0