

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
English Majors and Minors, 2021-2022**

Date: 11/16/2021

Time: 3:15-4:15

Place: LT 4012

Invited: Provost John Chenoweth; Dean Frank Goza (L&S); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Elena Levy-Navarro; faculty and staff in the English program Jonathan Ivry, Michael Bennet, Dan Baumgardt, Marjorie Rhine; Audit & Review Team Chair James Collins; Assessment Representative Katy Casey

- 1) Call to order at 3:20 pm
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
 - a) Review team chair, Dr. Collins, summarized the strengths of the program discussed by the review team (see pg. 12). These included, faculty engagement, contributions to general education, and ambitious goals that are largely met.
 - b) The Program Chair, Dr. Navarro, shared her program's concerns related to reduced instructional staff. She pointed out the high student-teacher ratio (double what is nationally recommended) and shared concerns on how this impact student learning, and faculty engagement and retention. The program faculty highlighted the value of a strong freshman and remedial English program to the University. They are advocating for a more innovative approaches to staffing these courses in particular.
 - i) Both the Dean and Provost recognized the unique challenges in this program carrying the load of English proficiency courses, that benefit all programs on campus. The Provost noted the issue of staffing the right programs at the right time is worth exploring from a budget perspective.
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) The report included a number of comments related to challenges within the workplace environment and expectations of faculty/staff of color and female faculty/staff having expectations to take on more work than others. We are interested in learning more about these challenges and how work expectations are communicated. Has the program looked into strategies to improve the environment and address these [*perceived?*] biases?
 - i) The program recognized the issue is one of perception and not limited to faculty/staff in the English Department. The Provost shared the results of a retention analysis covering the past 10-years. The results show that inequity was not a reason faculty/staff chose to leave their positions. Dean Goza shared his College's approach to helping address the issue of recruiting and hiring a more diverse staff.
 - ii) Dr. Ivry voiced concern about a position remaining vacant for two years, which puts a significant burden on faculty in the program. Dean Goza recognized the concern and explained the decision process for approving hiring in vacant lines.
 - b) Concerning the University's aggressive efforts to increase freshman enrollment, it seems we have responsibility to support the students we are enrolling. The English program has demonstrated a commitment to supporting students upon admission. For example, they took the initiative to take students out of remedial English courses and into credit-bearing courses- putting more demand on those instructors to provide academic support. This, along with contributions to General Education, is a great advantage to the University. What support is needed to continue this level of academic support and service to the University?
 - i) This was discussed at the beginning of the meeting, and is summarized in point 3b.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 3 recommended actions (see page 13, point 4) related to staffing, resources, assessment, and the minor.
- 6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns*
- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
 - **Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:**
 - ✓ **Next FULL self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2026 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2026.**
 - **NO PROGRESS REPORT**
- 7) Adjourn at 4:20 pm

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
Undergraduate Programs, 2021-2022
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 10/1/2021 Short Self Study (SS*) _____

Program: English Major Minor

Evaluations submitted by: Katy Casey, Fe Evangelista, James Collins, Pascal Letourneau, Russ Kashian
Review meeting attended by: Katy Casey, Fe Evangelista, James Collins, Pascal Letourneau, Russ Kashian

I. General Program Information

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

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

2. The program is aware and reflective of changes affecting improvement since the last review.

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

3. Characteristics of the program set it apart from others when compared regionally and nationally. The unique aspects of the program attract students.

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

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	4
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0
5	First self-study for the program	0

5. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate (only select N/A if there is no accreditation available).

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

General Comments related to Section I

2. The authors mention: "well above the industry standard" when describing the ratio of instructor/student. A reference would be great here. I do not doubt the ratio is high, I simply suggest that having a reference would make our argument much stronger.
2. The program appears to have been responsive to all aspects of previous Recommended Actions
3. The program provided a list of unique aspects, including the various emphases allowing students to specialize in an area of interest. This seems a very sought-after aspect of the program.
3. Good list of program strengths for each emphasis.
3. The program houses three different majors/minors (Creative Writing, Literature, and Professional Writing and Publishing) and strong relations are intentionally built with students. The Warhawk Reading Series is also a draw, among other innovative initiatives being implemented.
4. The program responded to recommended actions from the last review. The lack of lab space is understandably frustrating. Investment in the campus' technology infrastructure in classrooms seems critical, especially considering the events of the last year.

II. Alignment within the University

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

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

2. The program supports general education and/or proficiency programs at the University.

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

3. The program is collaborative and supports other academic programs across the College and/or University.

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

General Comments related to Section II

The notes and comments were laid out in a very complete fashion that allowed for an understanding of the challenges and approaches.

2. Strong contribution to both proficiency and general education programs.
2. The program is committed to their goals to support URM students through diversifying the curriculum, and faculty and staff to the extent possible. Part of the goals listed includes promoting teaching writing

throughout programs- not just in the general education program. Priorities of the program included support of institutional outcomes (e.g., writing, information literacy)

2. The program supports general education, particularly via teaching (e.g., Critical and Creative Thinking Skills, Information Literacy, Personal and Civic Responsibility, and Effective Communication Skills). These were evidenced by coursework, assignments, and involvement.

3. The program supports other academic programs, via FY English programs and writing courses.

III. Program Goals & Accomplishments

1. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve/advance the program.

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

2. Goals currently in place will contribute to the program's advancement. Criteria for determining success were measurable and attainable.

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

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

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

General Comments related to Section III

1. Program's goals were ambitious and appear to have largely been met. There was not mention of how meeting the goals advanced the program in this response, but plenty of information related to these goals was shared thus far in the report
1. One of the department's goals is to improve retention and graduation success of all students. Numerous other goals were undertaken and completed since the last review in 2015.
2. Program goals were listed. However, it is beneficial to have a clear plan to accomplish these goals including a timeline and criteria for success. The "multiple ways" that the program creates goals was shared, but was not action oriented or measurable.
2. Goals are listed but there is no timeline or criteria for determining success.
2. Program has ambitious short and long-term goals, including the development of a Professional Writing and Publishing major and expanding course offerings to include an emphasis on promotion and persuasion.
3. The goal-setting and assessment process appears intentional and collaborative.

IV. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum.

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

2. The program prepares students in majors, minors, and related emphases tracks in post-graduation and other applicable experiences.

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

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

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

4. Students participate in the high impact practices.

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

General Comments related to Section IV

1. Average credits to degree is above target and the program is in the process of decreasing this. The reason was noted to be due to the large proportion of English BSE majors and COEPS licensure programs that have historically required more credits. Overall, the program indicates that the curriculum is streamlined and students are able to enroll in classes without delaying their graduation.
3. A significant amount to planning took place since the last review to create a structure that supports the program's goals and SLO assessment. The three tracks selected a focus (SLO 2) and created discipline specific rubrics to assess students' progress on this outcome from an introductory to advanced level course. Findings were summarized.
3. It is not clear to me, while reading section IV.3 how assessment data was used in making curricular revisions.
3. Program committees regularly meet to discuss course rotations, sequencing, assignments given, etc. and, based on the information provided, I assume that this also includes review of available assessment data.
4. The program uses (or has used) multiple high impact practices (i.e., first year seminars, common intellectual experiences, learning communities such as "The Writer's Den" – has been discontinued though -, writing intensive courses, collaborative assignments, etc.). Lots of HIPs addressed and students have many opportunities to develop valuable writing skills.

V. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program has clearly articulated learning outcomes for students.

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

2. Student learning outcomes are "mapped" to the curriculum.

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

3. The program provided a timeline indicating when faculty and staff assess SLOs. The timeline is manageable and sustainable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. Overall, the program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.

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

General Comments related to Section V

- 1-2. SLOs are clearly written and mapped to coursework to include when they are introduced, developed, and assessed.
- 3. The assessment plans for the different majors have a point about the schedule, but it is not clear from the description when each SLO is assessed. The plan does not need a fixed schedule, but the more details would be useful to better understand the process. Is there a rotation? Perhaps the program could list the schedule of past assessments?
- 4. In the Template that was uploaded, it is mentioned that assessment will be collected in 2025, and it seems to be for a single SLO. This seems to be a very long time period to focus on one SLO.
- 4. In the PWP template, it seems only SLO2 is assessed.
- 5. The program prepared three assessment plans for each emphasis. The plans included learning outcomes, assessments, timelines and findings. The process in plan to manage the assessment structure seems reasonable. Has this process been in place for long? I ask, because most of the plans only focus on the outcomes of one SLO. Assessment data included rubric scores from graded assignments in FY and in major specific courses, and surveys. The program faculty and staff have a committee to help lead this work. The assessment plans include goals for the next assessment cycle.
- 6. Program's SLOs aligned with numerous ELOs in multiple ways.
- 7. Take the PWP assessment plan as an example. SLO 8 - 11 are specific to PWP. According the mapping, these are assessed multiple times in multiple courses. However, the frequency of the assessment is not mentioned. And not much is said on those SLOs in the rest of the plan.

VI. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation:

A. Trend Data

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

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

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

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

3. [MAJORS ONLY] Program has strategies to recruit and retain students.

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

4. Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University.

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

5. 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

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

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

General Comments related to Section VI.A

1. I feel the comments along the enrollment trend are rather positive compared the average 7% annual decline over the past few years. How does this compare to the total enrollment decline at the campus level?
1. The program works actively to review outcomes, reflect of findings, and refine the curriculum. This likely contributes to the history or successful enrollment, declines align to those experienced by the institution.
1. Enrollment trends in the past five years look good and ranges from 11,995 undergrads (most recently) to 13,059 in 2018. There has been relatively steady enrollment aside from impact of COVID.
2. I would like an update on the proposed curricular changes to the English BSE program to address the high credit load.
3. An impressive list of efforts to support diversity in the program- ranging from faculty and staff hires to redesigning curriculum. In addition, the program organizes a number of additional supports through advising and co-curricular activities.
3. Multiple strategies are being used to recruit/retain, including participation in SOAR, other recruitment events, advertisements across campus, social media, learning community involvement, recruitment of peer mentors, sponsoring events for students, hosting English clubs, etc.
4. The English Programs have, on average, 12.6% URM, compared to the university's 18.4%. They are making impressive efforts to bring this more in-line with the University as a whole.
4. Numbers are small but the percentages are close enough.

6. Program indicates that it can support students at current enrollment levels. The following wasn't stated explicitly, but it sounds like they have an optimal level of students enrolled, at least after considering the current faculty/staff FTE.

VI. 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	2
2	Some/Partial Evidence	3
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

General Comments for VI.B

- 1. It is clear that students who complete this degree have a number of career options. The program provided lists of possible careers and a list of data on where students are placed. There was not much of a summary- do most students end up in careers upon graduation, in graduate school?
- 1. Graduates are finding jobs in a variety of areas and some students continue to graduate school; the list of recent graduates who had done so was impressive. Does the program maintain records on the percentage of students who obtain gainful employment following graduation? I see what appears to be a frequency count disaggregated by employment type and location, but no overall indicator for the success of their graduates.
- 2. The program is working towards improving communication about the value of their degrees.

VII. Resource Availability & Development:

A. Faculty and Staff Resources

1. Information on numbers of full and part-time faculty and staff are provided. Expertise of teaching staff are aligned with the needs and future vision for the program.

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

2. Information is provided about changes in the faculty since the last Audit and Review.

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
---	---------------------	---

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

3. 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

General Comments related to section VII.A

1. Current faculty expertise is adequate, but three gaps were identified to attain future program goals: Expertise needed in African-American Literature, Writing Center Coordination, and in the area of Sociolinguistics/ESL.
2. The program now has five faculty fewer than they had in 2018, and this has resulted in substantive impacts to the program, specifically in terms of diversity in the curriculum and expertise.

VII. Resource Availability & Development:

B. Student Resources

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

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

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

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

General Comments for VII.B

1. I would have liked to see more detail on the need for student help.
1. Faculty changes have had the greatest impact on the Literature BSE; some required courses cannot be offered and changes to the curriculum will be needed as a result.

2. The program noted the benefit of restructuring the writing center to better support writing instruction. This seems like it would be a clear benefit to students. What specific changes are recommended?
2. Program noted that more technology labs are needed. Priorities include more computer lab space and changes with the structure of the Writing Center to include more academic oversight.

VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Areas of strength are discussed.

1	Sufficient Evidence	4
2	Some/Partial Evidence	1
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

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

General Comments for VIII

1. The program identified multiple strengths, including numerous English programs that work collaboratively, the interdisciplinary nature of the programs, quality staff, the ESL/PWP programs, and use of many HIPs.
2. The program identified some weaknesses, including the goal to increase enrollment and to better communicate the value of the degree. Additionally, the program indicated that the workplace environment was one area that impacted their ability to recruit and retain faculty. Can they elaborate? They also indicated that “faculty/staff of color and female faculty/staff have expectations to take on more work than others”, which seems to imply that Caucasian males are expected to do less work, unless I misunderstand their statement. I am interested in learning more about this and how work expectations are communicated within the program.
2. The program identified a number of areas in which it would like to improve and secure additional resources. Some of which include, increased technology for students, creation of a writing center aligned to program goals and initiatives, support for URM students through engaging curriculum and courses of study, and collaborations/creation of programs and courses to support areas of potential growth (e.g., Humanities based programs).

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

- Strong contribution to general education and proficiency courses - Distinct emphases that address students' career goals.
- Well-articulated assessment plans for the 3 emphases.
- Contribution to diversity offerings on campus.
- English in general reaches students early in their college life and is involved at a higher level in many majors. The program is aware of the new challenges and new needs for English writing and tries to adapt the program, e.g., social media writing. Good English communication is an important skill in a wide range of careers. The program in general will always be current.
- Strong interdisciplinary program in terms of collaborations among faculty and staff in different emphasis areas. In addition, the program supports general education and number of other programs on campus. Clear structure in place for evaluating student learning. The program has a vision for the future on how to grow, increase enrollment, and support students.
- The program graduates many students and teaches critical skills that generalize across lots of different career paths. They have a large and active faculty with lots of expertise, and they operate in an interdisciplinary manner. Moreover, they approach assessment of student learning in an objective and thoughtful way.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

Explain how assessment data is used to improve programs.

There seems to be some missing information about the assessment of SLOs. What is assessed when? And what is done with the assessment data afterward. Computer resources are lacking.

The program seems to be doing well considering staffing shortages and the general struggles experiences by all programs due to enrollment shortages and COVID.

More resources, including computer lab space and student worker support, are needed.

3. Other comments/questions

There was no mention of minors in this self-study.
The department has lost URM faculty which is concerning.

4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

1. Work with appropriate College leadership to identify staffing and other resources to adequately support students.
2. Share more information, or investigate, improvements to the Writing Center to support students in writing across campus. Include suggested structural or procedural changes, and additional resources.
3. Include the program's plan to assess all student learning outcomes in the next self-study report. For example, make sure the timelines in the assessment plans include when the SLOs are being assessed.

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.	2
3	Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	3
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	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
8	Report not submitted; refer to Provost for action.	0