Minutes and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Environmental Health & Safety (MS), 2018-2019

Date: 5/17/2019

Time: 8-9 am

Place: Hyland Hall 3303

Attended: Vice Provost Greg Cook; Dean, John Chenoweth; Department Chair Alvaro Taveira; Faculty and staff in the Environmental Health and Safety Program: Kwan Ahn, Donna Vosburgh, Todd Loushine, Tracy Buchman, Sang Choi; Audit & Review team members S.A. Welch (Chair), Matt Vick, Jennifer Betters-Bubon

1) Call to order: The meeting began at 8:02 am.

2) Introductions

3) Donna Vosburgh, program coordinator, addressed the program's assessment section of the report. Dr. Vosburgh noted that the A&R team may have made their recommendation based on incomplete data. Dr. Vosburgh then told the attendees at this morning's meeting that she had inadvertently reported on the program's direct assessment data in the indirect assessment section of the program's report. In addition, Dr. Vosburgh noted that this information was presented in descriptive paragraphs as required for that section of the A&R report, rather than in a clearly defined numerical format. Dr. Vosburgh then distributed a chart (see Appendix A) of the program's direct assessment work.

In light of this error and the subsequent discussion on assessment at today's meeting, the Department Chair Taveira requested that the A&R team reconsider its initial recommendation. This request will be honored and the review team will review both the additional information and the notes from this session and will then notify the program of its final recommendation.

4) Discussion of the Review Team's evaluation:

a) <u>Assessment:</u> The Audit and Review team noted and appreciated the work that the department has done in terms of assessing student work. Dr. Vosburgh noted that the department does incorporate sampling for data chosen to analyze. However, Dr. Vosburgh and Dr. Taveira both explained that because the program is cycle-based, the data used for assessment would be more cyclical than per semester. They both also shared that beginning in the Fall 2019 semester, more sections will be offered, and thus, available data for assessment would increase. The Audit and Review team suggested that the program incorporate a long-term systematic assessment approach so that data collected for assessment analysis could be relevant over the course of the program.

In addition, the Audit and Review team suggested that this long-term systematic approach would lend itself to programmatic decisions. Related to this, Drs. Vosburgh and Taveira discussed how the program has used data to make program decisions, such as the change to 30 units for completion. The faculty members present discussed how, from previous data, a new online orientation course has been implemented. The faculty noted that students participating in this online orientation course have expressed a higher degree of confidence in subsequent coursework.

The Audit and Review team suggested that while this utilization of data is beneficial, the faculty in this program should continue working closely with their advisory boards including sharing data from assessment.

The Audit and Review team noted that some of the assessments were based on single assignments that occurred during the semester. The team suggests that assessments be done on multiple assignments and over the course of several semesters. This, the team suggested, would allow for a more holistic view of student learning and thus lead to stronger curricular decisions.

b) Growth: There was considerable discussion on the growth of the program and related course structures. Drs. Vosburgh and Taveira shared that since its introduction in 2014, the program has grown significantly. One change that has occurred that seems related to the growth of the program is the change in offering a course only (vs. research project as a capstone) option. Drs. Vosburgh and Taveira noted that approximately three-quarters of the students now choose this option. Noting this change, the faculty have incorporated research into every class and the 701 is a research methods course.

The Audit and Review team complimented the program for having a higher percentage of Under-represented Minorities (URM) students than the campus average.

There was discussion about their recruitment practices. The faculty reported that the program places ads in major academic journals, attends national conferences where they can have individual conversations with perspective students, and upgrades their departmental website. Dean Chenoweth noted that considerable resources from the College of Business and Economics have been dedicated to the growth of this program. Dean Chenoweth shared that there is a task force for marketing that has worked with the faculty of the program.

5) **Recommended Action**: The evaluation report lists one recommended action regarding the development of the assessment plan as well as ensuring adequate resources as the program grows (see above and page 16)

6) **Recommended Result**: Continuation with minor concerns
   - It is suggested that this program provide a team to attend the Assessment Institute in summer 2019.
   - Next full self-study is due to the college dean by October 1, 2023 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2023.

7) Adjourn.

Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Environmental Health & Safety (MS), 2018-2019

Date: 5/9/2019
Time: 3:00-4:00pm
Place: Hyland Hall 3303

Invited: Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; faculty and staff in the Environmental Health and Safety Program; Audit & Review Team Chair Jennifer Betters-Bubon; Audit & Review team members SA Welch, Ki-Bong Nam, Matt Vick, Joan Cook

1) Call to order

2) Introductions

3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments

4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

The Environmental Health and Safety (MS) Program has many strengths—as a high demand program in an all on-line format, the program meets the needs of demands of our state and beyond. Further, the program engages with relevant stakeholders (e.g., holds two advisory boards) to keep their program current to the needs of field. The program could enhance their offerings with an intentional focus on the following:

    a) **Assessment**
        i) Continue to develop and implement the Assessment Plan.
        ii) Using appropriate sampling, collect and report direct data on student learning outcomes. Gathering direct student data has started with having an assignment tied to each goal. Randomly sample an assignment from multiple courses and gather the data.
        iii) Track discussion of data and decisions based on data;
        iv) Document the process of how data are being used for programmatic decisions
        v) How do we know students are learning the skills recommended by the advisory boards? Share the D2L data with the group. Are there grading or scoring rubrics? What are the results of the plan?

    b) **Growth: The program has seen encouraging growth**
        i) Work with the college to make sure the program has the needed resources to continue to grow.
        ii) Overall URM percentage is above campus average;
        iii) Many positive aspects to the program; curriculum is flat and yet has a national reach (not wanting to stand in student's way).
        iv) Discuss advertisement
        v) Program is growing—what do you need? Move to online curriculum

5) **Recommended Actions**: The evaluation report lists 2 recommended actions regarding the development of the assessment plan as well as ensuring adequate resources as the program grows (additionally see above and page 16).

6) **Recommended Result**: *Continuation with minor concerns*
    • **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
    • The review team recommends ONE of following, to be selected by the program:
        o Provide a team to attend the Assessment Institute in summer 2019. This will involve producing and

submitting a current status report and completing a summer and an academic year action plan. Share the final reports (summer, final) with the A&R Committee; OR

- o Submit a progress report on the Recommended Actions to college dean by October 1, 2021 and to the A&R Committee by November 1, 2021. In particular, provide additional data the program has collected and analyzed.

- **Next full self-study will be due on 10/1/2023.**

7) Adjourn.

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Graduate Programs, 2018-2019

Date of Evaluation _____3/6/2019_____   Short Self Study (SS*)_____
Program:___Environmental Health & Safety (MS)_____   Major ☐X   Minor ☐

Evaluations submitted by: Jennifer Betters-Bubon, SA Welch, Andy Yu, Ki-Bong Nam, Matt Vick
Review meeting attended by: Jennifer Betters-Bubon, SA Welch, Ki-Bong Nam, Matt Vick, Joan Cook

I. Program Purpose & Overview: 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
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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.

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

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

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

Comments

4. A narrative was provided as to how they are working to address the last audit and review. Many positive steps are listed. Assigning each course one SLO (with some overlap) is progress, but doesn't seem to necessarily focus on PROGRAM assessment since there should be growth the in SLOs over the course of the program. This may be more evident later in the report, but was not clear in this answer.

I. Program Purpose & Overview: 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.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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.

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

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).

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

1. Be explicit about how it ties to the UWW school of graduate studies

2. They seemed to have aligned their program goals with specific goals of the University's Strategic plan

2. The two overall goals are well described. They are connected to feedback from students and their employers and a goal to get accreditation. Both are logical. They are not completely connected to assessment data, but they are important goals, nevertheless.

3. Am not clear as to why 2 advisory boards are needed. Do these boards have some of the same members?

3. Are there any assessments utilized in the goal setting process?

3. Advisory boards are good; more details or sample agendas would be helpful to actually provide sufficient evidence that they drive innovation and decision-making.

4. The certificate programs are in flux. I wonder what the vision is for the program in the next few years? Expand on that.

4. I think they have done a thorough job in looking to the future from their work with their advisory board(s)

4. An action-based vision is stated. Specifying methods to revise the certificates could be expanded upon. Good work on meeting QAP requirements. The program has evaluated the usefulness of seeking ABET accreditation.

5. This indicates involvement from the faculty in the field

6. Are there any other advantages to accreditation in terms of meeting industry standards?

A great job on Mission: Why does the MS ESH ignore "Occupational" in the name of this degree? Do you have any component of this program to support OESH? If yes, I think it is very helpful to include occupation aspect. Also, your dept name is "O"ESH. Please say more. Just a comment: Your program may have a great fit with the non-for-profit program in the future (if this certificate program moves to Graduate level) and also a great fit with sustainability-related courses, or vice versa. Just a comment: Hope to see few examples of student learning outcomes. You can provide some statistics here. I understand this program is pretty new and the dept is collecting data. So far, how many students are in the program? Other similar program enrollment #? What are the national trends or regional trends in terms of enrollment? Congrats on the awards of Drs. Vosburgh and Choi. Congrats on the accreditation of this program. Great job!

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

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

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

Comments

1. The program has a good job market, so they can recruit many students. The program can attract international students as well.

1. All I saw was a general description of the program but not much in terms of what would relate to curriculum assessment

1. It is not clear that there is a capstone project although I believe this was mentioned elsewhere?

1. The capstone experience is being replaced by additional credits due to industry issues.

2. they seem to have their finger on the pulse of this aspect of their program

2. The chart does a good job documenting additional graduate requirements in dual listed courses.

3. Please describe the assessment data used--course feedback or were there other measures?

3. I didn't see any clear use of assessment data for their decisions/actions (and given that assessment was in their recommended actions, I am a bit concerned)

3. Curricular changes are based upon anecdotal and survey data--this is a form of assessment; data on SLOs should also be included.

4. yes, but this is puzzling...how can students join a club that "meets once a month with guest speakers" if the program is all ONLINE as they previously wrote?

5. Are the assessment provided only at the end of courses? Or are there other ways to provide feedback at the mid and other points in the courses? What is assessed?

5. As I wrote earlier, I was not able to access the link they provided. In addition, it was unclear to me what new approaches they are making (particularly in light of recommendation b "document the process of how data are being used for programmatic decision." What they have in their self-report seems to be the original work and has not incorporated the A&R recommendations

II. Assessment: Assessment of Student Learning

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

1. Assessment seems sporadic?

2. The Advisory Board and GOAS data are shared; the data on SLOs being measured from coursework is not included. This is a comment that applies to other areas as well. It appears that most changes are driven from the

advisory board (employer needs) which is good, but driving improvement based upon student assessment data (and sharing examples) would also be important.

3. Research seems to play a role only in those who choose this option. I know it was difficult for some students to complete given their work environments. Is that the reason it is only an option? Aren't research skills important either way?

3. It was unclear to me how these are assessed in terms of "attaining learning outcomes."

4. Other student data other than the graduate studies measure?

4. While I really liked how they incorporated different vantage points, it was unclear how they are using specific assessment data for students to learn "student learning outcomes." and given that assessment was in the A&R recommended actions, this still seems weakly done.

5. Are there more systematic ways to make changes to the program?

5. Their response was rather weak "data are reviewed periodically." This does not seem to fully address the A&R recommendation a and b.

6. They seem to be doing more on internal reporting (faculty and students) than external

6. They are trying to follow up well.

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

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

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

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.

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

1-2. Is there a better way to track students than the data provided?

2. The program seems to be running well.

3. Like many programs across campus, I think they, too, are challenged with recruiting diverse students.

3. Discussed in terms of gender inclusion; race not mentioned

4. Why are there fewer students who graduate than are enrolled in the program?

4. All I saw was that the data was really available which is surprising given that they have been around for a while

4. Explain the graduation statistics a bit more—11/59? The graduation rates seem low. Are there characteristics of student enrollment patterns that might explain this? (e.g., part time basis? Flow through the program?)

5. Plans for expanding faculty for growth are explained and defined.

Some of my questions are answered in the later part of your report, such as enrollment. If repeated, my apologies since I was not able to see the provided data in the front end of this survey. How would you increase female students in the future? Just want to brainstorm if any possible approaches. Great job on enrollment increase and current success!

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

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

4. The program effectively tracks graduates of the program.

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

Comments

1. Is there an internship?
1. Is there any possibility to make a practical Ph.D. program in the near future?
1. Please provide data. It seems like the typical way to measure employment does not apply for students in this program. Is there a better/different way to demonstrate the positive impact of the program on career progression?

2. A salary of full time professionals is a very good amount.

4. As is the case with most programs, additional tracking of graduates seems important but it is also challenging.
4. They are trying to communicate with graduates through LinkedIn or email.

4. Given that an A&R recommendation was to track graduates in a more effective way, it seems that little has been done to advance this

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: Comparative Advantage(s)

1. The program has unique features that distinguish it from competing programs giving it a competitive edge.

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

Comments

1. Do faculty bring any specific value to the program?

1. They do seem to have an advantage in terms of format of the program (online), how they work with industry experts (advisory boards)

Could comparison to other safety programs be provided?

Can say more about the similar degree in other states, since this online degree has high potential to grow nationally. Don't limit your program's potential.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: 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.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	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).

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

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

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

Comments

2. What are the specialty areas of the faculty and instructional staff? Faculty clearly are well qualified and bring interesting areas of expertise. Please elaborate a bit more.

3. While they did address changes in the faculty, it was unclear how this affected the program

IV. Resource Availability & Development: Teaching & Learning Enhancement

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

1-2. Faculty are engaged. Good evidence for professional development to improve teaching.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

IV. Resource Availability & Development: External Funding

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

1. It seems that there are many research fund related to the professionals (?).
Great job on outside grants.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: Professional & Public Service

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

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

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

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

Comments

1. Need a new faculty member to support the program well.
1. They have clearly indicated that there is a problem that will need to be addressed for them to continue growing
Growth will be facilitated by additional faculty.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: 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	0

Comments

1. Given that this is an online program (except still confused as how they have monthly meetings with speakers), I am not sure if this is so much of an issue for them

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Program strengths are discussed.

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

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

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

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

Comments

2. Include additional improvement area in the assessment plan for the program.
2. They did address some, but given the A&R recommendations, this seems under-developed

I support the program strongly.
Please keep up the great work!

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

- The program is a good asset for the university.
- High demand program; only program in the state; active faculty who are engaged in research and service to the profession; all on-line format makes it accessible to individuals across the country and the world.
- Like very much how they work with individuals in the industry
- This is a program with increasing demand that is very responsive to employer/industry recommendations for curriculum. Faculty have demonstrated scholarship at a high level and a commitment to continuously improving teaching. There is a plan for growing the program.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- They need to provide some academic activities related to the department for the program.
- While improved from the last A & R report, I see a need for an additional focus on assessment and more systemic ways to continually improve the program.
- I saw little improvement in the area of assessment. This is particularly troubling given that the A&R recommendations were quite specific about assessment
- The assessment plan should grow to include looking at student learning data in addition to industry feedback.
- How do we know students are learning the skills recommended by the advisory boards? Share the D2L data with the group. Are there grading or scoring rubrics? What are the results of the plan?

3. Other Questions

4. Other Comments

- I recommend trying to make a practical Ph.D. program at some point in the future.
- I voted with major concerns because of their apparent lack of addressing the A&R recommendations regarding assessment

5. Recommended Actions

1. Assessment:
   a. Continue to develop and implement the Assessment Plan.
   b. Use appropriate sampling, collect and report direct data on student learning outcomes. Gathering direct student data has started with having an assignment tied to each goal. Randomly sample an assignment from multiple courses and gather the data.
   c. Track discussion of data and decisions based on data;
   d. Document the process of how data are being used for programmatic decisions
   e. Share the D2L data with Advisory Boards and other constituents.
2. The program has seen encouraging growth. Work with the college to make sure the program has the needed resources to continue to grow, including sufficient marketing.

6. Recommended Result

Continuation without qualification	
Continuation with minor concerns	**X**
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress reports to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress in addressing the major concerns	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion.	
Non-continuation of the program	
Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	

<u>The review team recommends the following:</u>
- *Provide a team to attend the Assessment Institute in summer 2019.*

Next full self-study is due to the college dean by October 1, 2023 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2023.

Appendix A: Recommendations and corrective actions

Recommendation	Response/corrective action
1) The lack of internal, direct assessment data in this report is a pretty stark oversight. Need to start organizing that information for presentation in exercises such as this. 2) Strategic planning of program needs to include a more explicit role for assessment data and closing the loop. 3) A. Assessment: • Work toward specifying student performance outcomes, aligning these outcomes with the topics already stated. • Continue the development of more direct assessments of student skills, based on the performance outcomes that are developed. • Specify how assessment results are shared and how they impact the program. B Curriculum: • Continue the development of curricular changes, clarifying how the changes are linked to assessment data. • Track changes in interest, enrollment & graduation, student performance, and graduate placement as the program moves to more/fully online. C. Enrollment planning & management: • Consider the program's goals regarding encouraging & managing growth in the program, especially as it moves toward being more on-line. 4) This program needs to enhance its academic assessment efforts. Specifically, graduate faculty need to: • identify global learning outcomes for students completing the program (tied to the pool of constructs identified on the top of page #4); • identify, refine, or develop curriculum-embedded assessment instruments used in courses identified in Appendix D, linking them specifically to the learning outcomes it identified above; • systematically collect data from curriculum-embedded measures, external constituencies (e.g., practicum supervisors), and exit questionnaires (focused specifically on the learning outcomes); • routinely analyze assessment data in ways that lead to improvement of student learning through improvements in the curriculum, instruction, course sequencing, instructional	1) Data has been collected for the new online program using a shared D2L page. All of the initial learning outcomes have been addressed at least once. Weaknesses in the program were identified and recommendations were made for those issues. Because the classes are offered on a rotating basis, not all recommendations have been implemented yet. During the assessment process it was determined that an additional learning outcome was needed. Data will be collected in the Fall of 2018 for the new learning outcome because that will be the first time that SAFETY 701 will be taught since we decided that the additional learning outcome was necessary. Assessment data on the program will be provided in the upcoming self-assessment report due this fall. 2) A plan was created and implemented to look at assessment data. Each required course has one assessed learning outcome. Each course collects data for the assessed learning outcome and shares it on the D2L page with the rest of the department graduate faculty. In a department meeting after the course has finished (ideally the first meeting), the results of the assessment data are discussed. If improvements are needed, recommendations are created. Those recommendations are then implemented the next time the course is taught. Due to the rotation of the required classes, there is a lag before the recommendations are implemented. Additional issues regarding anecdotal assessment is shared in department meetings as they have occurred. This assessment has led to the creation of the 36 credit Coursework Only option along with the creation of an additional learning outcome. 3) a) Each course has been assigned one assessment learning outcome. Some courses share an assessment learning outcome. Within the course assessments (quizzes, tests, assignments, etc.) have been identified that show the student's knowledge of the learning outcome. After a course is offered, assessment data is uploaded to the ESH's department Graduate Audit and Review Only D2L site. The results are discussed at a department meeting.

delivery methods, advising, etc.; and • share assessment information and changes with advisory boards.	b) Curricular changes have been made to create the 36 credit option, create new electives, and put the certificate programs on hold. That is because of data that will be specified in the Audit and Review report. Data has been collected in regards to changes that have occurred as the program moved to online. That data has been used to justify curricular changes, focus on attained goals, and identify future plans for the program. c) The program had large growth over the assessment period. We are still trying to determine if the program enrollment has leveled off. Tentative plans have been created. The first phase of that management was two fold. The first was to begin offering SAFETY 701 Research Methods in ESH every fall so that new students would not have to wait long for that class. Second, 700 level online SAFETY electives were created. The first two will be offered in Fall 2018 and the third will be offered in Spring 2019. 4) Answers to 4 are specified above and I don't want to repeat them.