

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Geography and Geology Majors and Minors, 2020-2021**

Date: 5/11/2021

Time: 1pm-2pm

Place: Webex

Invited: Interim Provost Greg Cook; Interim AVC Kristin Plessel; Dean Frank Goza (L&S); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Margo Kleinfeld; faculty and staff in the Geography and Geology program; Audit & Review Team Chair Andrea Ednie; Audit & Review team members Lynn Gilbertson, John Pruitt, Leda Nath, Assessment Representative Katy Casey.

- 1) Call to order at 1:05
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
 - a) Dr. Kleinfeld thanked the team for the review. She noted the diversity of programs in the department in terms of course offerings, which can make assessment difficult. Felt confident in the work completed in the past five-years. Noted the need to align assessment work to SLOs. Dr. Olson has been leading assessment work and become a leader in this area.
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) Assessment workload – how is assessment work shared across the department?
 1. Planning for the sustainability of assessment initiatives.
 - (1) The program reviews assessment at faculty meetings and discusses how to incorporate the information into course and program goals. The work is led by Dr. Olson who forms sub-groups as needed. The assessment projects include E-portfolios, maps, and pre-post writing samples (reflective)- program faculty and staff work collaboratively.
 - (2) E-portfolios created in Google Sites where students can show a body of work. The program is working to standardize scoring of the portfolios based on a rubric (in development). Discussion ensued regarding how to organize the portfolio.
 - (3) Shared the need to be more intentional in helping students create their portfolios by working it into courses, or establishing course check-ins or check-points, and talking to students about how to select artifacts.
 - b) Changes to how writing is assessed within the programs, moving from pre-post to qualitative assessments. How will this (more time consuming) work be managed?
- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 1 recommended action (see page 4) related to completing an assessment plan.
- 6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation without qualification*
 - 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, 2025 and the Assessment Office on November 1, 2025.
- 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, 2020-2021
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 12/10/2020 Short Self Study (SS*) X
 Program: Geography and Geology Major Minor

Evaluations submitted by: Andrea Ednie, Lynn Gilbertson, John Pruitt, Leda Nath, and Katy Casey
Review meeting attended by: Lynn Gilbertson, John Pruitt, Leda Nath, Katy Casey, and Andrea Ednie

Recommendation #1

Continue to develop and implement the assessment plan. a. Continue to develop assessment tools for rest of SLOs such as critical thinking. b. For the pre and post test for writing ability, continue doing this but maintain student identifiers so that the students can be paired with the pre-post test. (longitudinal study) c. Document how the results for your assessment study are used in the curriculum or to improve the program.

Recommendation #1 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

1	Good Progress	3
2	Making Progress	2
3	Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #1.

1. This department is very active in addressing their assessment. They've reviewed extensive data from their department and "closed the loop" from results to make changes. They've created a reflective writing rubric which aligns better with their SLOs, and include a cartographic assessment developed by Dr. Olson as well, and have students create digital portfolios (in development). These also all address the critical thinking aspect of student learning outcomes, and also replaced the earlier the pre- and post-test assessment which was discovered to have validity issues. Results from assessment are systematically reviewed over summer and shared early in Fall in time for any curricular changes--a smart calendar for looking at the data.

2. It's a little difficult to assess the program's progress on 1.a. because I don't see how the assessment developments discussed (or the attachments) align with program SLOs.

- Good progress/developments with respect to writing and visual communication assessment.
- Good examples of how assessment results are used to inform course-based changes.
- The attached assessment report appears to outline specific assessment activities, but it is not a full assessment report in that it doesn't align assessments with SLOs, discuss assessment goals, or include any indirect assessments (such as alumni surveys, etc.).
- Conversation in the follow-up meeting should focus on the program's status with respect to assessing each SLO and recommendations for the next SS should address existing gaps. It's hard to know what to recommend without a full assessment report to consider.

3. Progress includes:

- Better aligning Reflective Writing in capstone rubric with department SLOs.
- Development of cartographic assessment rubric.
- New professional development rubric to assess digital portfolios in progress.
- Improved two reflective writing exercises in order to assess dept learning outcomes for individual students.
- Documented instructor-specific assessment projects for course improvement

4. Very impressive work in assessment. The program has an established record of quality assessment and continues to reflect and revise. There were mention of program structures created to support this work including sub-committees on assessment and using advising to support students in this work (e.g. ePortfolio). However, it was not clear what the program plan is for assessment. Which SLOs are assessed and when? Are the program SLOs the same as those in the 2015 self-study? a) Created a new writing rubrics to better align to program goals and SLOs. Detailed reports were provided summarizing pre-post data and supporting the need for a new tool. The evaluation of writing will be more time consuming than the pre-post test. I have no doubt it will get done, but I am curious as to how the program plans to evaluate the writing assignments (e.g., embedded in courses, evaluated as a program)? b) After reflection, the program chose to replace the pre-post test with a reflective writing assignment. This decision was made after consideration of data and department resources (difficult to analyze pre-post test data by student). c) The program engages in disciplinary and course-based assessment regularly. These efforts appear to take a lot of time, and individual instructors/disciplines make use of the data to inform their courses, and curriculum if needed.

5. Two individuals analyzed assessment data and led the changes. Are there plans to include other members of the program? How has the new plan been received by the larger group?

6. Rubrics are widely utilized. The program implemented a reflective writing rubric that evaluated abilities to cite sources, critically engage with education and identify aspirations, and communicate aspirations. Does the program agree that this rubric effectively evaluates critical thinking or is it assessing written communication?

7. The program provided a rationale for no longer using the pre-post test. It was replaced with two reflective writing assignments. It is unclear if this replacement will include pre-post analysis.

8. It is clear the program has a rich history of curricular changes to support student learning. It is unclear what piece of assessment data motivated each of the changes.

Recommendation #2

Work with on-campus resources to continue to improve efforts for recruitment and retention of underrepresented minority students and faculty, including the recruitment of more female students.

Recommendation #2 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

1	Good Progress	5
2	Making Progress	0
3	Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #2

1. Their efforts have resulted in a 11 percent increase in non-white students and a 9% increase in female students from 2015 to present. Regarding faculty, many are involved in activities which aid in this recruitment.

2. It appears the department is making good progress in this area - with minority and female student #s now similar to those of the whole university. Good examples of how specific faculty members are contributing to the recruitment and retention of underrepresented minority students.

3. Faculty and staff are engaged in a number of activities across campus, regionally, and nationally that may increase the numbers of URM students. This was an impressive list of targeted efforts by faculty to recruit students to the program.

4. The program should be commended for the vast array of individual faculty efforts in improving recruitment and retention of URM students. What specific evidence based mentoring practices are being utilized to support female students?

Additional Comments:

1. The department has a solid grasp on its programs and student outcomes. They completed the recommended actions. I don't see any need for further progress reports before their next full self-study.
2. Continue to record assessment results and develop the program's assessment plan. Develop assessments for any SLOs that are not currently being assessed. Continue the work to implement portfolios if this continues to be a tool the program would like to use. Outline how indirect data such as alumni surveys are also used to inform the program.
3. Thank you for sharing the great work and impressive contributions of the faculty in and outside of the program. The program seems to support a number of assessment activities in the program. Two methods are used to evaluate program SLOs and include a reflective writing assignment and ePortfolio. The ePortfolio was implemented in fall 2020.
4. Continue with the litany of program and individual assessment activities and explicitly state how the data inform the changes.
5. Yippee! Well done Geography, Geology & Env. Sciences Dept!
6. While I selected "continue without qualification," I would like the program to submit a full self study for the next review cycle in 2025. The A&R recently implemented a new self-study form that cannot be included sufficiently in a self-study (e.g., mission and program goals, HIPs involvement, program assessment plan).

Recommended Action

- 1) Complete an assessment plan that includes current SLOs. Refer to the Office of Academic Assessment's assessment template to make sure that components are covered (but don't need to use exact same template).

Should the program be required to submit a progress report before their next full self-study?

	Yes, the program should submit a progress report by [insert due date].	0
	No, a progress report is not needed.	5

Recommended Result

1	Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0.00%	0
2	Continuation without qualification	100.00%	5
3	Continuation with minor concerns	0.00%	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	0.00%	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.	0.00%	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.	0.00%	0
7	Non-continuation of the program.	0.00%	0