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

Date: 1/28/2022
Time: 3:00-4:00
Place: Hyland Hall 4303

Invited: Provost John Chenoweth; Interim AVC Kristin Plessel; Interim Dean Paul Ambrose, Department Chair/Program Coordinator Andy Ciganek; faculty and staff in the Information Technology program; Audit & Review Team Chair Lynn Gilbertson; Audit & Review team members John Pruitt, Edward Gimbel, Ahmad Karim, Assessment Representative Katy Casey.

1) Call to order

2) Introductions

3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
   a) Dr. Ciganek appreciates the work of the faculty and staff in the program. He noted that the Professional Development offerings and campus investment was helpful in preparing the report. Praised program leaders in making completing the report not too difficult- the work in ongoing.

4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

   a) How is the program working with ICIT to eliminate barriers to access unique curricular technology?
      i) The self-study provided an opportunity to reflect on program needs. Since identifying this need, we are working to build a partnership with ICIT in order to avoid technology issues that are a result of cumbersome structures and processes. For example, the program is working with ICIT to preventatively address technology needs when creating a new lab.

   b) Does the program feel a need to further distinguish IT from computer science to support recruitment and retention?
      i) Outside the campus community prospective students see the field as computer science. There is a lot of effort that would need to be put forth to change that perspective (outside of current practices in admission days and high school student visits). More effort would be best invested to strategically partner with computer science to create experiences and connect with students early in their programs (student events, organizations, classes). Additionally, computing programs across campus have worked to meet specific interests of students and demands of the field through a breadth of program offerings (e.g., data science, business analytics). Information about various program offerings is shared through word of mouth by students and through various introductory courses across COBE. The programs goal is to forge collaborative relationships rather than competitors.

   c) Is the current structure of assessing the SLOs sustainable?
      i) Initial plan to assess all the goals so we have a baseline of data. Moving forward, the plan is to focus on select SLOs and not collect data on all SLOs every term.

   d) Faculty member noted the cumbersome process of curriculum changes, which makes responding to changes in the field quickly challenging. Feels this is out of the program's control.

- Provost Chenoweth commented on some of the challenges in distinguishing programs between computing programs (e.g., IT and Computer Science). Both fields prepare students with similar skills and tend to be qualified for the same jobs.

- Information Technology self-study will include business analytics during the next review cycle.

- Dean Ambrose suggested aligning program review and the AACSB timeline.

5) **Recommended Actions**: The evaluation report lists two recommended actions (see page 12, point 4) related to updates on self-identified areas for improvement and how the assessment plan informs achievement of student learning outcomes and curriculum.

6) **Recommended Result**: *Continuation without qualification*
   - **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
   - **In the short self-study please respond to the recommended actions.**
   - **Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:**
       ☒ **Next SHORT self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2026 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2026.**

7) Adjourn.

Review team report is attached below, including Recommended Actions and instructions for Progress Reports (if required).

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2021-2022
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors

Date of Evaluation _____12/10/2021_____Short Self Study (SS*)_____
Program:___**Information Technology**_____   Major ☒   Minor ☒

Evaluations submitted by: Lynn Gilbertson, John Pruitt, Ahmad Karim. Edward Gimbel, Katy Casey
Review meeting attended by: Lynn Gilbertson, John Pruitt, Ahmad Karim. Edward Gimbel, Katy Casey

I. General Program Information

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

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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.

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

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

General Comments related to Section I

Great work addressing actions from the previous A&R. Especially, considering the turnover in program faculty during past 5-years and the disruption of the past 2-years.

1. The program might consider including more information technology specific "purpose" and "scope" as the current statement could apply to many other programs on campus. 4. The program should be commended for so thoroughly responding to the previous recommended actions. Of particular note are the diversification initiatives and outreach efforts.

II. Alignment within the University

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

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

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

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

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

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

General Comments related to Section II

None

III. Program Goals & Accomplishments

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

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

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

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

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

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

General Comments related to Section III

The program has an impressive set of goals informed by analytics and stakeholders in the field. I commend the program's work focusing on program improvement.

1. There are clear goals, but the improvement and assessment seem to be implied. It was difficult to evaluate if how each goal contributed to improving/advancing the program and the criteria for determining success in completing the goal.

IV. Curriculum

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Students participate in the high impact practices.

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

General Comments related to Section IV

IV1. I appreciated the breakdown of each emphasis, which made the review easy to understand for someone outside the program. It is clear the program designed the emphases intentionally to address students' interests, alignment with complimentary professions, and market demands- this strategic planning is a consistent theme throughout the report. IV3. significant work has gone into curricular revisions. Each change was informed by data, including credits to degree, timeline for accessing courses, and enrollment. The changes also reflect responsiveness to students feedback. Decisions are made with resources and sustainability in mind.

4. The program should be commended for the individual faculty/staff involvement in high impact practices. The individual contributions contribute to a variety of options for students based on their needs and interests.

V. Assessment of Student Learning

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

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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.

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

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

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

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

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

General Comments related to Section V

V. Impressive assessment plan that includes all program members, and is clearly ongoing. Is the structure of assessing the SLOs sustainable? I suggest creating some breathing room, even if the data is always collected, it might help to have a semester to reflect. I would like to see how the VG, GE, NGE criteria are applied when assessing SLOs.

It is clear that the program was intentional when developing the assessment plan and learning outcomes. The process involved collecting feedback from stakeholders and appears to have a focus on sustainability.

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

A. Trend Data

1. [MAJORS ONLY] Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

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

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

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

3. [MAJORS ONLY] As a follow up to program enrollment and graduation, describe the strategies used to recruit and retain students.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

General Comments related to Section VI.A

VIA1.The program provided an honest reflection of decreasing enrollment. It seems they are experiencing the same declines as other programs across the institution. It also seems new programs are taking students from existing, suggesting we may have internal competition between "like" programs. VIA3. The program does a great job of capitalizing on existing resources to recruit students. I commend the additional efforts to connect with high schools and other external stakeholders.

1,6 I would like further discussion of the relationship between current enrollment trends and the claim that the program is oversubscribed.

1. Have there been any conversations with the Computer Science department to determine if students are choosing Cybersecurity and Data Science instead of Information Technology programs? Is there concern about the competition for students? Would highlighting the differences between programs be beneficial? 3. The program should be commended for their implementation of evidence based social media campaigns and outreach to regional high school students. 4. The diversity efforts seem to involve few faculty and center around a single event. Are there strategies that could be implemented throughout the program? 5. The substitutions are described as a strategy to limit delays in graduation, however they are described as less than ideal. Is there an alternative solution that would better align with IT vs Computer Science?

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.

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

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

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

General Comments for VI.B

None

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.

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

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

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

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

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

General Comments related to section VII.A

VII. It seems the faculty in this program fill many roles- not only teaching and managing in this program, but also Cybersecurity and stand-alone (often interdisciplinary) minors. impressive number of faculty contributions

VII. Resource Availability & Development:

B. Student Resources

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

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

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

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

General Comments for VII.B

2. Does it make sense to partner with ICIT as a "working laboratory" for students in the IT program? Would this help eliminate barriers to IT resources?

VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Areas of strength are discussed.

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

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

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

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

General Comments for VIII

VIII1. hardworking, caring, and passionate faculty. the program is managed well, works collaboratively and efficiently. The field is growing and the IT program works tirelessly to meet demands. VIII2. The program is aware of areas to remain focused. The report documents how each area is being addressed and I have confidence the work with continue.

VI. Reviewer Conclusions 1. Strengths of the Program

Hardworking, dedicated faculty in the program. The faculty seem invested in the success of the program meeting student learning goals, as well as addressing changes in the field. I think their efforts to remain current and relevant in the field are impressive. Overall, the report showed deep reflection, efficient and strategic planning. The author should be commended for the high quality of this report, it was well written and organized,

strong faculty research and teaching. Outstanding placement.

The programs address a vital need in business and society, and align with areas of anticipated job growth. The programs' curricula are well designed and responsive to developments in the field. The program has managed challenging staffing and resource issues effectively.

Graduate job placement; strong assessment plan; open to curricular changes

The program has exceptional employment post-graduation and appears to be attune to stake holders and needs of the profession.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

I do not see any areas that the program has not already identified.

The programs face significant challenges with respect to student resources (see IX.2-4). It may be necessary to undertake cost/benefit analyses to assess the relative value of resources. The program's relationship to Computer Science would benefit from clarification.

DFWI rate in ITSCM 180 core course, particularly among underrepresented groups

Continue to develop sustainable strategies for currency and fluidity of curriculum and experiences.

3. Other comments/questions

None

4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

Provide an update on the self-identified areas (enrollment, reputation, assessment, and diversity) for improvement described in section VI 2. of the report.

Provide an update on how the assessment plan has informed or facilitated achievement of student learning outcomes and curriculum in section IV 3. and V 5.

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.	5
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	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