

**Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
World Religions Majors and Minors, 2020-2021**

**Date:** 9/30/2021

**Time:** 2-3 pm

**Place:** LT 4012

**In Attendance:** Provost John Chenoweth; Dean Frank Goza (L&S); Department Chair/Program Coordinator David Simmons; Nathan McGovern (Religious Studies), David Reinhart (Religious Studies); Audit & Review Team Chair/Assessment Office Representative Katy Casey; Audit & Review team members Yamin Ahmad, Leda Kanellakou

- 1) Call to order, meeting began promptly at 2:00pm
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments:

The program's faculty are clearly passionate and committed to their discipline. The World Religions curriculum is clear and offers students the opportunity to choose a course of study aligned with their interests. In addition, the program's concentration on concepts such as critical thinking and cultural competency make it a good fit for many majors on campus. A considerable amount of time is spent supporting General Education on campus, most notably in teaching World of Ideas, which is a required course for all UG students. The review team did note that enrollment has declined in the last couple years. The program is eager to address this issue and would like to discuss strategies that are feasible, and in line with current faculty responsibilities. The program goals and structure for supporting assessment and curriculum development were not shared in the report, but has since been addressed. Most notably, two staff from the Religious Studies department attended the Assessment Institute. The work completed at the institute addresses many of the review team's recommended actions.

- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

Following the overview, a meaningful and productive discussion of recruitment efforts and responsibilities ensued. Dr. McGovern provided context related to students' lacking an understanding of the minor. Specifically, the struggles recruiting students to an area of study they are not exposed to in K-12, the way they are to other programs on campus. Dr. Simmons noted that the best recruitment strategy is getting students in one of the introductory courses. Once enrolled, many students get interested in learning more. However, many students enroll too late in their studies to complete the minor.

Discussion of potential strategies included the following suggestions:

1. Promote the minor to new majors on campus by meeting with academic advisors, and other program coordinators.
2. The program includes 2 required courses, and a number of electives. Consider packaging these into courses of study that would complement a major on campus. Such as a course of study that compliments Criminology, General Management, or Human Resources.
3. Create an "elevator pitch" to share at Premier days and with other advisors that speaks to the value of this minor in order to address potential misconceptions about the content.

There was also discussion regarding the responsibility of programs having to market their programs. While there is understanding of this need, due to enrollment decline across the institution, there is concern that faculty are not best suited to this work. Could there be more institutional support for individual programs needing to promote their programs, as opposed to the current culture requiring programs to "justify their existence"?

The Provost noted the program may benefit from engaging in reflective activities to identify what is compelling about the minor. Why would students select it, and if completed, what is the inherent value? Is this in fact a program that students want, or is what the students want different from what the program is offering? This information could be helpful in creating a compelling course of study. He also encouraged the program to identify if students are completing the minor, and for those students, is it beneficial? Additionally, is the work of managing, reporting, and marketing this minor worthwhile when compared to the enrollment?

- a) Please share the program's process of creating program goals and determining responsibilities related to program management (including student engagement, recruitment, and marketing).
  - i) Discussion: The program meets in fall to discuss program goals and create a plan for evaluating learning outcomes.
- b) Assessment of program outcomes appear to be based on course grades. What have you learned about the program based on students' grades in your courses? Are you able to track growth in students' knowledge and skill on the program outcomes throughout the curriculum based on this approach? Has the program considered other methods of evaluating program outcomes, such as embedded assessment, surveys, or portfolios?
  - i) Discussion: There was not much discussion since the program created a plan to address many of the review teams' recommendations related to assessment. Dr. McGovern shared that he felt student grades did provide the program with meaningful data, and shared specific examples in terms of what the students strengths and weaknesses were, suggesting faculty engaged in thoughtful review of how-to support students toward successful completion of this minor. The program is aware of the progress report due in fall 2022 and feels confident in meeting this requirement.
  - ii) The review team would like to emphasize the importance of a variety of assessment measures, such as course-embedded assessments aligned with SLOs.
- c) The program noted the needed for additional resources, particularly faculty, many times. What work could get done with additional faculty that cannot be done with current staffing?
  - i) Discussion: We did not have time to discuss this. However, Dean Goza did comment that the current enrollment did not support additional faculty lines.

Dean Goza pointed out that since the self-study was written, Dr. McGovern earned the College research award. Additionally, Dr. Simmons earned the University service award.

Dean Goza and Chair Dr. Simmons commented on their appreciation of the review team's evaluation. They appreciated the committee's work and meaningful suggestions.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 4 recommended action (see page 19, point 4) related to assessment, recruitment and marketing.
- 6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas*
  - Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
  - Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:
    - x Next FULL self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2023 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2023.
    - x A progress report will be due October 1, 2022 to the Dean and November 1 to the Office of Academic Assessment for 2022. **\*\*For this progress report is only to complete the assessment plan (first part of recommendation 1). Consider using the Assessment Plan template and the Office of Academic Assessment for guidance.\*\***
- 7) The meeting adjourned at 3:05.

*Review team report is attached below, including Recommended Actions and instructions for the Progress Report.*

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

Date of Evaluation 5/12/2021 Short Self Study (SS\*) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Program: World Religions Major  Minor

**Evaluations submitted by:** Katy Casey, Yushan Zhao, Yamin Ahmad, Barbara Bren, and Leda Nath (separate survey)  
**Review meeting attended by:** Katy Casey, Yamin Ahmad, Barbara Bren, and Leda Kanellakou

**I. Program Purpose & Overview: A. Centrality**

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

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

**Comments for I.A.1**

Contribute to UW-Whitewater values: collaboration, diversity and opportunity, learning and academic excellence, and service and social responsibility. Contribute to strategic plan: transforming lives and impact society, and foster diversity inclusive.

1.A.1. The narrative shows that the program clearly contribute towards the core values, the Mission and the strategic objectives of UW-Whitewater

A better understanding of the diverse religious traditions is certainly aligned with cultural competency and inclusion. The program has a course designated as satisfying the Diversity requirement

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

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

**Comments for I.A.2**

Religious Studies faculty all teach the CORE class World of Ideas (CORE390). Most courses satisfy a General Education requirement.

The narrative clearly demonstrates that the program contributes towards general education

The program provides excellent support for general education, both teaching CORE 390 and having many program courses designated as general education electives. Their courses address the GELOs as well as baccalaureate learning outcomes. Some courses are cross-listed with Asian Studies, some

are provided in collaboration with History or Sociology. For business students who take Religious Studies courses to complete a distribution requirement for CoBE, program courses with international content are listed as electives with CoBE advisors.

Interdisciplinary, including cross listed courses as well.

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

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

**Comments for I.A.3**

1.A.3. The narrative focused on the following long-term goals: Students - Intercultural Curriculum/co-curriculum and Faculty: Intercultural Competence.

All of the program's courses address cultural competence/diversity under goals for Students, and the program's instructors are trained in comparative study of religion, which falls under the Faculty goal category of intercultural competence.

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

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

**Comments for I.A.4**

Regarding assessment: the program has SLOs aligned with ELOs. The last self-study was completed in 2014, and data were collected for two academic years (2016-17 and 2017-18). The program asserts to evaluate the program based on how students perform in courses. If this is the approach, there should be data reported on how students perform in the courses and what they program learns based on their performance. The data collected is reportedly used by the faculty teaching the courses, but it is not clear how the program reflects on this data or how meaningful the data is for program improvement. Enrollment targets and approaches were not shared.

1.A.4. There were 2 recommended actions (RA's) at the last self study: (1) Complete the development and implementation of the assessment plan; (2) Determine a target level of enrollment. The program has attempted to address these. The narrative indicates that they collected Assessment data that they will present later in the self study and this pertains to the first of their recommended actions. Regarding the second RA, I would have liked to see additional details on the recruitment strategies to achieve their target level of enrollment.

Both recommended actions (enrollment/recruitment and assessment) from the previous review seem to need further attention. At present, assessment seems limited to course assessment. There was some kind of assessment of student work with respect to 4 LOs in two academic years during this review period. See Assessment of Student Learning. Recruitment efforts include talking about the

minor in their own courses, having someone at SOAR, and some contact with other programs, but I think the program needs to have some discussion about other possibilities.

**General Comments related to Section I.A**

- 2. They have a newer faculty member (McGovern) and courses that have improved their Minor program. --Very little specific in how they set goals, gather data, and review it. Just mention of holding a meeting and having discussions. They did a couple rounds of target assessments by examining papers and exam scores of the Minor students during 2016-17 and 2017-18.

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

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

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

**Comments for I.B.1**

The mission has a clear focus and accurately reflect the program's curriculum.

I can't tell if this is a program-approved mission statement or text that was written for this self-study. It doesn't appear on the program website.

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

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

**Comments for I.B.2**

The program listed activities that occurred during the review period including hiring a new faculty member and revising/adding courses. It is not clear how goals were selected.

1.B.2. Unfortunately, no programmatic goals were listed. Instead, the narrative indicated some outcomes for the program, including hiring and curricular changes. I would have liked to see annual strategic goals listed along with the rationale for how they fed into the program’s long-term goals.

It's not clear what the previous goals were, but some courses were added (at least in part in response to student surveys) and one replacement hire was accomplished.

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	0
2	Some/Partial Evidence	3

**Comments for I.B.3**

3. - There does not appear to be any evidence of "intentionality" towards goal-setting, nor of gathering and reviewing data regarding assessing programmatic goals - at least none were described in this section. There does not appear to be any evidence that data is being utilized to determine long-term goals. While the self-study spoke to changes to the program in part 1.B.2, the narrative, unfortunately, fails to address the "process" part. With regards to goal setting and strategic planning, the following needs to be addressed: Does the program have a specific strategic planning process by which it utilizes these activities and data? What is the timeline for this?

**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.**

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

**Comments for I.B.4**

Three program goals were listed. It is not clear what the "vision" is for the program.

4. While no changes were being considered to the mission, a number of goals were listed that indicated the direction that the program wants to move towards. These seem appropriate and feasible.

New goals are stated, involving increasing enrollment, creating a capstone which would be very helpful for assessment of student learning over the course of the minor, and hiring an instructor specializing in Islam that could serve more than just the World Religions minor. The steps needed to get there will need to be devised.

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

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

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

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

**Comments for I.B.6**

The program did not report any program, staff, or student recognitions or awards for the review period. Consider discussing potential awards in and outside the College to nominate colleagues.

---

Accreditation is not available for the program.

### General Comments related to Section I.B

---

3. Hold a meeting annually to talk, and have looked at exams and papers from two Minor cohorts. Little else explained about assessment outside of the grading inherent in courses.
1. In terms of program planning, there does not seem to be one driving force other than to represent World Religions. While this makes sense, and should be a focus of the curriculum, it is also important to consider if the program SLOs are being met by the curriculum. The program is interested in keeping assessment in courses- is it possible to align particular assignment (signature assignments) to program SLOs? In addition, it is important to consider where the program sees itself in the future, what students are attracted to this course of study and how has completed the program of study helped them meet their personal and/or professional goals.

### II. Assessment : A. Curriculum

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

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

#### Comments for II.A.1

The curricular structure allows student to create a course of study aligned to their interest.

II.A.1. The structure of the program is clearly articulated. It consists of 18 credits, 6 of which constitute the core components. The remaining credits are (essentially) elective credits.

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

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

II.A.2. The program does not have any dual-listed courses.

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

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

**Comments for II.A.3**

Decisions to add courses seemed to be due to the faculty ensuring a variety of religions studies and perspectives were represented in the curriculum. Additionally, students' interests were taken into account. Data collected on SLOs did not seem to factor into curricular decisions.

II.A.3. Curricular changes initiated by the program were listed with some rationale. However, it appears that no assessment data was utilized for the period under review. It appears that these curricular changes were driven by external information. The part that is missing here is any curricular changes driven by assessment data – based upon student learning outcomes. The study previously indicated that assessment data was collected regarding learning outcomes. Were any used to inform changes within existing courses?

Some student survey information was used to create new courses, but use of assessment data seems limited to revisions within specific courses, not to the program.

**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.**

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

**Comments for II.A.4**

There were successful options available to students at different points in time. Is it possible to align student engagement opportunities to faculty research or service responsibilities? For example, Undergraduate Research and mentorship. There are a number of programs on campus that provide students with opportunities to engage beyond the classroom that do not receive additional funding or resources. I suggest reaching out to such programs for suggestions of how to make this alignment possible without over extending faculty and staff.

Activities mentioned were from the previous review period, except that the student organization ran until 2015. Funding for student groups is usually from student fees, yes? Could there be some partnering with other groups or events?

**5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning.**

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

**General Comments related to Section II.A**



There are a number of times in the report that "lack of resources and support" is noted as a reason not to engage in the work. I encourage the program to look into manageable ways to assess program goals, offer students opportunities to engage outside the classroom, and support recruitment efforts - this is important work that should be done by faculty in the program.

## II. Assessment : B. Assessment of Student Learning

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

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

### Comments for II.B.1

Have six SLOs.

---

II.B.1 The program has clearly articulated student learning outcomes. However, the curricular map appears to be a little "loose". In particular, it would be useful to know which courses assessment of these learning outcomes actually takes place. Moreover, are all the SLOs being measured in every course? Or do specific courses address specific SLOs. That part is unclear.

Could the information collected from the recertification process be helpful in determining which ELOs are met, where and how?

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

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

### Comments for II.B.2

There is alignment of SLOs to ELOs. These are not mapped to courses, the program suggests all courses meet all outcomes. Data on all outcomes are not provided.

---

Please share the extent to which you have reviewed the assignments and activities in each course to determine each meets the ELOs, except for quantitative literacy. I am interested to hear how these are all incorporated into every course, and whether and how they are assessed.

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

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

**Comments for II.B.3**

Cannot find assessment plan in the report.

An assessment plan was not shared.

II.B.3 It seems like assessment is not being done systematically. Is data being collected on all the SLOs each year? Or only a sample? If so, what is the cycle? If it is only a small group of minors every year, then it would be useful to gather as much data as possible on all the SLOs. Additional information is needed.

Assessment takes place within courses and is used to revise courses. There's no real program assessment planned, although that may change if there is a capstone created. There was some attempt to assess student work beyond individual courses, but it was not explained well. What student work did they pull for this? Where were the students in the minor? They don't state a plan for using assessment from courses to look at particular LOs on some kind of schedule. There's no plan, or it isn't presented here, determining how well students progress from beginning to end of the minor.

Hold a meeting annually to talk, and have looked at exams and papers from two Minor cohorts. Little else explained about assessment outside of the grading inherent in courses.

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

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

**Comments for II.B.4**

The program reported that assessment data is collected in courses, which is how student progress through the program is tracked. Considering the subjectivity and large numbers of variables that can impact students' grades, it is worth exploring a more targeted plan to assess student learning. In addition, aligning all outcomes to all courses can seem overwhelming in terms of collecting and analyzing data - this may be why a regular cycle of assessment has not been established. Data were provided on a few SLOs over a 2-year period. The type of assignment evaluated was not provided, and there was not an analysis of results.

II.B.4. While some data is shown here regarding achievement of SLOs between the 2016 – 2018 period, it is unclear what instruments are being used to assess the data. In the earlier section (II.B.3.), the Program indicates that student grades are used for assessment. It's unclear how the grade the student gets translates into the values listed in the table for each of the students. What instruments were used? How were they measured? Additional details needed to be provided. Also, 2 data

points (like that used for SLO3 seems unlikely to provide much useful information about how students are doing in the SLOs. In general (from a statistics perspective), you need a minimum of 30 data points for each SLO to make reasonable inferences.

Several of the LOs are knowledge-based, and I'm sure course assessment can determine this in terms of the content of each course. A better explanation of the 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 assessment of some student work, e.g., description of the sample and how the work was evaluated, might have indicated "the extent to which students" achieved the targeted LOs, but this should be part of plan to collect work over time, perhaps from particular courses. The plan would also include a schedule for assessing LOs.

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

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

**Comments for II.B.5**

Specifics on how this work is done or the results of the work were not shared in this report.

II.B.5. No details were provided within the narrative on how the assessment data is being used to make decisions regarding changes to the curriculum. The narrative did go on to mention that changes to the program are primarily driven by what kind of content coverage is needed, rather than the assessment data on SLOs (which at this point to be fair is very limited).

Very little assessment outside of grading, but twice evaluated papers and exams which is a good start.

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

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

**Comments for II.B.6**

II.B.6. Once additional data has been collected, it should be shared with stakeholders beyond the program itself, i.e. with the College Assessment Committee (as an example).

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

**Comments for III.A.1-2**

There is a decline in 2019-2020 possibly due to pandemic.

There seems to be instability in enrollment, which a current downward trajectory.

III.A.1-2. Prior to the pandemic, the number of minors seemed to be fairly steady at approximately 20.

Recent enrollment seems to be going down. The IRP dashboard shows 6 students enrolled in the minor in 2020-2021. This seems to be more than a slight dip, though it may still be COVID-related.

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

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

**Comments for III.A.3**

N/A

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

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

**Comments for III.A.4**

I disagree that the only way to recruit students is through classes. I recognize the challenges put forth in the report. However, there are ways through current structures to reach students- such as attending Premier and/or SOAR events, meet with admissions recruiters and AAEC advisors, etc.

III.A.4. The focus of recruitment efforts appears to be geared to increasing the overall number of minors, as a precursor towards focusing on increasing diversity of students.

The program uses a few strategies, such as sending someone to SOAR and bringing it up in their own classes, but mostly the program says it does not have the resources to engage in many recruitment activities. Some programs have done things such as talking to AAEC. I'm not sure what programs or departments have been contacted, but perhaps the program could talk about this and consider WOTA, Music, Art & Design, Social Work, Criminology, etc. I'm not sure about the regularity of

such contacts. Also, the department web pages seem to use Religious Studies more frequently and more prominently than World Religions, which may be confusing.

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

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

**Comments for III.A.5**

N/A

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

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

**Comments for III.A.6**

There appear to be a sufficient number of electives to allow students to stay on track while completing the program.

III.A.6. Core classes in the minor are offered each semester. Narrative indicates that there is more than enough capacity for additional students if they wished to take the minor. Frequency of elective offerings were not addressed. Overall, indirect evidence that those that the program did not contribute to any delays in graduation.

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

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

**Comments for III.A.7**

Looks like the minor is undersubscribed.

I am not sure this was answered. I believe the sense is the program is undersubscribed. It would be helpful to learn of the specific goals (related to recruitment and enrollment) the program would meet with additional FTE. In the last self-study, the program reported a target enrollment of 70 students (noted in F2F meeting minutes). Is this still the case? Is there a new goal?

III.A.7. The evidence appears to suggest that there is additional room for growth for the program and that the program is currently undersubscribed.

**General Comments related to Section III.A**

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

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

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

**Comments for III.B.1**

N/A

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

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

**Comments for III.B.2**

III.B.2. Given the program is a minor, graduates from the program have presumably focused on employment in areas that coincide towards their major programs. It seems that graduates go into a number of different fields.

The program provided good information about religious studies being appropriate for business and education students to support appreciation and understanding of world religions. One would expect that other majors requiring cultural competency like social work or criminology could be approached if they have not been, or not approached recently. The program might consider the reality of many programs, though, where students have limited options for general education electives. It could be that a more obvious single survey course on world religions could be helpful, since students who will not pursue the minor probably won't want to invest in more than one course and the minor already provides courses that go into greater depth.

2. General US data presented.

**3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.**

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

**General Comments related to Section III.B**

I feel like there might be a missed opportunity here. At many points in the report, it was noted that the program is beneficial to all students and yet lacks resources to reach all students. Gathering data from program completers is a great way to support these claims with external sources of collaboration.

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

**Comments for III.C.1**

UW-Whitewater offers the only minor in World Religions in the UW System.

The data on programs in Religious Studies across the system was helpful to provide context. There are a likely a number of reasons students would choose the World Religions program of study at UWW, but those were not reported.

UW-Whitewater may have the only minor, but there are majors and minors in religious studies at other campuses, and UW Eau Claire also offers a 15-credit certificate in world religions (and offers an Introduction to the Religions of the World course)

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments for IV.A.3-4**

IV.A.3-4: The Program lost one full-time faculty in recent years, and were able to recruit a new hire. It needs at least one more specialist to teach about Islam.

**General Comments related to section IV.A**

The program noted a need for an Islamicist. Should this line be secured, would they teach classes currently offered or develop new courses? Are current courses in World Religions at capacity?

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

**1-2. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.**

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

**Comments for IV.B.1-2**

Excellent faculty.

**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.**

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



**Comments for IV.C.1-2**

Outstanding accomplishments.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding**

**1-2. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.**

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

**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.**

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
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 undergraduate students.**

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

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

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

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

**Comments for IV.G.1**

1. Yes

## V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

### 1. Program strengths are discussed.

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

### 2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

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

### Comments for V.2

Two areas of improvement were noted. However, there seems to be a lack of self-reflection. It would be helpful to learn more about how the program plans to support these areas. What can the program do to improve?

### 3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

## VI. Reviewer Conclusions

### 1. Strengths of the Program

1. Outstanding and dedicated faculty. Support university general education.

---

  2. The program curriculum aligns with many institutional learning outcomes. The course of study allows students to create a minor based on the area of World Religion they are most interested. The faculty and staff make a significant contribution to General Education.

---

  3. Given that the program is a minor, it is one that complements a number of different majors. In fact, it was interesting to see the different areas that people are majoring in, and also minoring in World Religions. Faculty in the program are dedicated and looking to grow the minor.

---

  4. It's main strengths are in its interdisciplinary nature, and in educating students in key LEAP ELOs that serve students for life. In addition, this program serves Gen Ed, and other departments as many of their courses are cross-listed with other departments. Finally, understanding of religion around the world is important.

---
- Course offerings that support cultural competency and respect for diversity; provide practice in such fundamental and lifelong skills as critical thinking; and should appeal to students studying in other

disciplines, such as art, music, social work, business, education, and criminology. Strong support for general education and other programs on campus.

---

## 2. Areas for Work or Improvement

Need to have a detailed assessment plan, and report how each SLO is assessed and how assessment results are used to improve student learning.

---

The program has a lot to offer students at UWW. There are a number of resources currently available to potentially draw students to the minor- as noted in the section on recruitment (e.g., Premier, SOAR, collaborations with admission and advising, promotion and engagement in HIPs). These are manageable and sustainable activities that could be incorporated into service and possibly scholarship requirements. The program claims value to students who complete this program of study, and should create a manageable assessment system to demonstrate the value-added on this program of study in meeting students personal and professional goals. I do not see this as "career preparation" but evidence that the programs course of study does support student learning- and transparency of the evaluation system.

---

Assessment - how and where the specific SLOs are being assessed (i.e. what instruments are being used, and what courses are they specifically being assessed in). The program needs a lot more data before inferences can be made. In order to do this at this point, I would suggest collecting data on all SLOs every year. Strategic planning - a process needs to be determined for figuring out long term goals. Once that process is in place, short term goals may then be derived from long term goals; action plans can then be implemented from short term-goals. An annual timeline for strategic planning needs to be established.

---

A method and regular system of assessment is incomplete. Pulling tests and papers from prior semesters is a good approach. As for enrollment, it is steady, but an increase in enrollment would provide a stronger basis to hire another faculty member with expertise in Islam.

---

Low enrollment in the minor and in some courses, exacerbated by frustration or perceived lack of means to recruit. Lack of subject specialization in Islam. Create assessment plan that addresses student learning over the course of the minor.

---

## 4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

1. Create a detailed assessment plan that specifies
  - a. the routine of when and where each SLO will be assessed,
  - b. the instrument(s) to be used (which could be rubrics applied to evaluate student work samples, embedded assignments, etc.), and
  - c. how often the results will be reviewed.

The plan should address assessment of student learning over the course of the minor. Consider using the Assessment Plan template to guide this work.

2. Implement the assessment plan and share an analysis of findings with respect to student learning and implications for the program, including action(s) to be taken based on the findings.
3. The program should consider recruitment and marketing activities that could attract students and grow enrollment. Investigate opportunities that currently exist on campus, such as existing student organizations (NACAA, SAO), HIPs, and campus events. Additional possibilities to explore include gathering information

from students who recently completed the program or are currently enrolled; communicating with other programs, departments, or the EDI division about other possibilities; guest lecture or content for WOTA or other courses (followed by an invitation to learn more about your valuable program and courses); something like a lunch discussion table with changing topics or online visits.

## 5. Recommended Result

1	Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
2	Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	1
3	Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	0
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	4
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
8	Report not submitted; refer to Provost for action.	0