

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for  
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
French, German, and Spanish Majors and Minors, 2015-2016**

**Date:** May 6, 2016

**Time:** 1:00 – 2:00 pm

**Place:** Laurentide Hall 4012

**Attended:** Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean David Travis; Program Coordinator Peter Hoff; Program faculty & staff Lisa Huempfer, Alicia de Gregorio, Pilar Melero, Ellen Boldt, Manuel Ossers, Hala Ghoneim, Sheila Turek, Matt Lange, Louis Betty, Jodie Parys, Maria White, Marilyn Durham; Audit & Review Team Chair Dale Splinter; Audit & Review team members Xueqing Chen, Joan Littlefield Cook.

- 1) Call to order at 1:02 pm
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
  - a) Audit Review Team Chair acknowledged many positives, especially in assessment, since the last self-study report in 2011.
  - b) Program Coordinator opening comments:
    - i) Thanked A&R Committee for feedback
    - ii) Noted that the program does not always appear to function as a cohesive unit because they are called on to do many different things in the department, however they are working on developing a more cohesive organization structure for the program
    - iii) Assessment has been a major focus within the program, but more work needs to be done so that assessment results can be used to make program changes and close the loop.
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
  - a) Discussion of support
    - Peter noted that not all departments have advisory boards.
    - There was discussion about whether the program needed an advisory board and how one would be used. Concern arose about how much control an advisory board might have on the program and whether a conflict of interest (curriculum) might develop among an advisory board and staff/faculty.
      - It was noted the staff and faculty need to keep control of curriculum and that an advisory board might provide an "outside" perspective and provide good public relations with local community. Many staff and faculty noted that they already have developed relationships with the local community and listen to community leader concerns. It might be useful to bring the community leaders together for a conversation.
      - It is understood by the A&R Committee Chair that an advisory board did not need to be established at the current time, however, the program needs to heed information gained by local leaders to help advance the program and include this information in the next self-study.

b) Vision of program

- Staff and faculty for the program noted that the vision was clear but not all ideas have been pulled together because of a lack of time
- Faculty have full teaching load and often have four preps per semester.
- Could the Advising Center help with advising?
- Peter noted that staff and faculty in the program have discussed holding another monthly meeting besides the one held by Languages and Literatures.
- Discussion of making French, German, and Spanish a separate department from Languages and Literatures was held:
  - Arguments for: (1) it's a very large program that serves a lot of students; (2) would provide for more time to work on curriculum, vision, assessment, etc. if the program was their own department; (3) the program, at one time, was its own department; and (4) Languages and Literatures is the largest department on campus.
  - Argument against: The number of French and German majors everywhere are down and this is a problem for many universities in the UW System.

c) Assessment

- What are the next steps for assessing the program?
  - Peter noted that the four-year cycle has been completed. This consisted of assessing writing, speaking, and interpretative skills.
  - The data need to be examined and analyzed in detail, which will provide a direction on how to move forward.
  - The AY 2016-2017 will be a year of examination of the four-year cycle data.
  - It was suggested that embedded class assessment needs to be continued while analyzing pre-existing data.
  - Program should think about how the assessment data can help in curricular reform.

d) Tracking graduates

- The program does not track graduates. A tracking mechanism should be established.
  - Staff and faculty noted that it is difficult to track graduates
  - Many programs have difficulty tracking their graduates. How can campus offices help?
  - Many staff use social media to communicate with students but do not monitor where students get jobs.

e) Resources

- Need better classrooms with more reliable technology.
- Need another tenure track line in Spanish. Class sizes are much too large to support the ideal teaching and learning environment. Many students come to Whitewater for small class sizes.

5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 3 recommended actions (see page 15, point 4) related to program vision, organizational structure, and assessment.

6) **Recommended Result:** Continuation with minor concerns.

- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
- **Progress report on recommended actions due October 1, 2018**
- **Next full self-study will be due October 1, 2020.**

7) Adjourn at 2:10 pm

Submitted by Dale Splinter

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies**

**Undergraduate Programs, 2014-2015  
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 04/04/2016 Short Self Study (SS\*)\_\_\_\_\_

Program French, German, Spanish Major X Minor X

**Evaluations submitted by:** Dale Splinter, Eric Appleton, Xueqing Chen, Asmahan Sallah, and Joan Littlefield Cook

**Review meeting attended by:** Dale Splinter, Eric Appleton, Asmahan Sallah, and Joan Littlefield Cook

**I. Program Purpose & Overview: A. 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
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments**

- 1. Concise and specific regarding the place and value of the program within UWW. Good work at being specific regarding response to previous recommended actions. Be careful not to let assessment obfuscate instruction.
- 4. Recommendation to establish a vision addressed by discussion of short term goals and sharing of some good ideas. Still don't have a feel for the overall vision of the department (and acknowledge this must be

a challenge with such a disparate group of majors/minors/courses, instructors etc.). The creation of a spring assessment committee meeting as a regular process is a great idea! Is once a year enough to maintain momentum for change? Newly created SLOs are great!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments**

- 1: Contribute to the cultural fabric of our region
- 1: "With regard to French and German majors/minors, French and German-speaking immigrant communities were also part of Wisconsin's history and still contribute to the cultural fabric of our region." it would be good to hear more about what French and German major can accomplish beyond the state's boundaries. This statement seems rather inward looking.
- 2: Good contributions to GenEd and to other programs.
- 3: What about opportunities for student scholarship, writing, and research?
- 3: The faculty is noted as being very diverse (globally) -- and student interaction with the campus Hispanic community is noted, but it's unclear what the program is doing to attract diverse students. In general, working toward long-term inclusive excellence goals seems rather vague -- service learning, encouragement to travel abroad, LEAP. I'm not sure where exposing majority students to diverse cultures leaves off and bringing minority students into the program begins.
- 4: It appears, from the recent yearly reports that progress has been made, but it still seems as though the program is only moving forward on the various recommendations because it is being closely monitored. As I read the report, I'm not sure that the whole program yet fully understands that assessment is a tool for teaching improvement and not for creating benchmark testing. . .
- 4: The program has made good progress on assessment, but I have concerns that without clear vision and direction a systematic process for program goal setting, progress will not be sustained.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a “vision” for where it wants to be in the future and how to get there.**

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

**5. The program earned recognition or awards.**

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

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

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

**Comments**

- 1: I rather liked the mission statement; it was interesting seeing its development through the earlier drafts.
- 1: The goals seem rather broad; some are specific, some are general. Who are the stakeholders mentioned in #1? What are their suggestions? What is the rationale behind setting up the Arabic and Mandarin

- area studies or minors? "Communicate regularly" is vague, and it was noted that communication has stalled. What is being done to restart it? Begin the gradual roll out of the assessment plan -- what are the first pieces intended to be rolled out and why? Results are noted for those goals, but what is next?
- 2: Does this program need to cooperate with other foreign language program?
  - 2: Seems that several goals are 'stalled' or not addressed. What's the hold-up?
  - 3: Is there a systematic process and clear leadership for setting program goals, monitoring progress toward achieving them?
  - 3: The response talks about a process for discussing assessment data, but not about setting & monitoring program goals. How often do individuals in the program meet to set, monitor, and revise goals?
  - 3: "Our weakest link continues to be a formal way to take the results and use them to inform our decisions about changes in the program although many faculty, as a result of their participation in these assessments, take it upon themselves to adapt their courses to meet the perceived deficiencies identified with the assessments. We need to make sure that this discussion of each report gets on the agenda of monthly meetings so that we can "close the loop" better (more intentionally and systematically)." This seems to point toward an organizational issue -- who is in charge, and why hasn't other faculty members bought in? Is it just a matter of reporting, or is something deeper in play here?
  - 4: The vision statement reads more like a mission statement. This statement was crafted a few years ago - perhaps it is time to merge this with the assessment goals, or examine the mission statement and extract a five or ten year plan from it?
  - 6: The program states that there is no accrediting body
  - 6: Are you certain that accreditation is not available?

**II. Assessment: A. Curriculum**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**4. The program provides opportunities for students to learn in ways that extend beyond the classroom, and discussed the extent to which students are involved in these activities and opportunities.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	1
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	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

**Comments**

- 1: The curriculum listed seems a bit vague. Are there specific courses that cover 'upper-level literature' and 'civilization?' Are there multiple phonetics courses? What are the choices offered that fulfill these requirements? Which electives are most highly suggested? It is noted that students begin with 'more general courses.' What are these general courses? Are they courses within the program or university GenEd courses? How exactly do the advanced language/composition courses plug in? They're not on any of the lists. I wonder who is advising students and what materials students are offered at advising sessions.
- 1: "X credits above 4th semester": What does this result in, in practice? That is, how many credits does this typically usually require?
- 1: I can't tell from the description if the curricula are "both efficient and purposeful."
- 2: The program offers no graduate level courses.
- 3: There's a vague reference to data on writing proficiency but otherwise no mention of assessment data (quantitative or qualitative) playing a role in curricular decisions.
- 3: Changes occurred but little support for the reasons was offered. Conversations with instructors, exit interview data are mentioned, and the Writing Assessment was used in evaluating lower level literature course prerequisites. It would be good to see the chain of events behind all of the changes.
- 4: How many students participate in internships?
- 4: Opportunities are there but given the number of students in the Spanish program (especially minors), they seem somewhat limited.
- 5: Reflections from the instructor on hybrid vs. F2F are interesting.
- 5: No fully online courses are offered, only hybrid courses offered by a single instructor. Her document reflects on the differences between the on-line and in-class experiences, but doesn't really offer suggestions on improving the on-line experience. Are there plans to include an online course?
- 5: The program offers many specialized courses in Spanish. Is there a plan to offer more specialized course in German and French?

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

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

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



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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	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	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

**Comments**

- 1: The SLOs seems reasonable and thoughtful. I understand the cumulative nature of the objectives, but it would be nice to see a map that was laid out to better indicate introduction, growth, and expected mastery of each objective. This mapping does not yet appear to have any connection to the assessment plans -- which years/courses the various learning outcomes are assessed.
- 1: The SLOs seem appropriate.
- 1: Several SLOs are tied to performance levels on the ACTFL Proficiency Exam. Is this given to all students (majors? minors?)?
- 1: Are the SLOs listed for majors only? What SLOs are expected of minors?
- 1: Good rotation of emphasizing specific SLOs during a given assessment cycle.
- 2: The SLOs are aligned with LEAP outcomes. While noted as optional, it would still be nice to hear more about how these outcomes are measured throughout the curriculum. What is "Interpretive Assessment?"

- 2: Alignment with LEAP is fine, but I wonder if the program really does much to emphasize (or to assess) things like quantitative literacy. You do not HAVE to address every one of the LEAP ELOs.
- 2: Please explain what the "interpretive assessment" is. It's the only assessment tool listed, and is used for every SLO. This is an area to work on (i.e., develop specific assessment tools that allow evaluators to focus on one SLO at a time).
- 3: The assessment plan stops on 2016. What happens next?
- 3: I'd suggest revisiting and elaborating the current assessment plan. It was a very good start, but it's time to elaborate it (e.g., add information about what specific assessment tools are being used; include the two specific SLOs within each category and how/where each is assessed).
- 4: Need to follow through on adding the milestone, and make it mandatory for graduation if that's what the program intends. Otherwise, you're most likely getting a non-representative sample of students taking the test.
- 4: What is the Interpretive Assessment?
- 4: Were any of the changes discussed regarding the interpretive assignment made (e.g., changes in which course levels were assessed, when the assignment was given, embedding it within course requirements, focusing more on interpretive comprehension within instruction)?
- 4: Good mix of direct and indirect assessment methods.
- 4: "We will continue to discuss these results with all world languages faculty at the next department meeting and decide upon strategies to improve scores and better prepare students for the next assessment. (Still in progress)" This statement worries me. Are you planning on teaching to the test to raise assessment outcomes? On the other hand: "We also determined that embedding this assignment in courses would prove useful to improve performance in all the rated areas. In addition, we encouraged faculty and staff to make sure that students in all of our courses are introduced to the language and format of the ACTFL proficiency guidelines found in the rubric to allow for transparency in assessment by familiarizing students with the terminology of proficiency assessment. This will help establish a culture of assessment within the department between both students and colleagues, allowing us to work towards a common goal of increased student performance in all modalities." This seems more in keeping with the spirit of assessment practices. And then there's "A majority of students who take the assessment continue to score at the desired Intermediate-High or higher level." I'm not sure the program quite knows the difference between testing and assessment of teaching.
- 4: What further steps are being taken to implement the Milestone test/survey?
- 4: Why was the Interpretive Comprehension test given to students in classes that had not yet taken the advanced literature courses? Do they want the 300 level courses to be brought up to that level, or is the test meant for 400 and above?
- 4: "Finally, it was discussed that for future interpretive assessments it would be best if they were integrated with course content so as not to constitute a separate, disconnected task."
- 5: In the self-study you state that "Consideration of assessment data for making changes has not been as intentional or systematic to date as anticipated. Results of each assessment have been shared with all Foreign Language faculty and staff, but we have not spent enough time at group gatherings (e.g., department meetings, department retreats) discussing them further." It sounds like more systematic and intentional distribution and discussion of assessment efforts is still needed.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

**4-5. [MAJORS ONLY] Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students. Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University.**

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments**

- 1-2:** "The number of French, German and Spanish majors has dropped during the last several years, but it also varies from year to year." Does the University have any recruitment policies in place to attract incoming students to these language programs?
- 1-2:** Not sure if the program feels that it is sustainable and vital, even with the enrollment data offered.
- 1-2:** "Vitality and sustainability"--definitely for Spanish, less so for French & German. But these have always been lower enrolled, and likely will continue to be.
- 1-2:** Enrollment in the Spanish minor has increased significantly. What is the impact on staffing and other resources?
- 3:** "Through luck or good advising" This makes it seem as though good advising is not the norm in the program.
- 4-5:** Given low enrollments in French and German, more attention to recruitment might be useful.
- 4-5:** The department has no recruitment strategies at present. Again, what is happening with recruitment at the university level? What is Admissions doing?
- 4-5:** Diversity appears to be most in Hispanics taking Spanish courses, and women taking German. As noted before, the department does not appear to have any strategies in dealing with inclusive excellence.
- 7:** "The French and German programs could easily handle more students since classes are not full. Many upper-level (major/minor) courses in Spanish reach or are near their cap regularly, so the current level is probably optimal. That said, some of the upper level Spanish classes are probably capped at too large of a size for optimal instruction." Are more resources needed? If so, what are they?

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	3
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

**Comments**

- 1:** Data is only available for one year. What efforts are being made to track graduates? How was this data gathered? Are there government reports on the demand of language graduates to suggest demand?
- 3:** There is no systematic way to track graduates.
- 3:** Program does not systematically track graduates, with some faculty remaining in touch through social media. What about the Alumni Association?
- 3:** No efforts are being made to track graduates.

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

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

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

**Comments**

- 1:** Why is the university not touting the writers and scholars as a draw to UWW?

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

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

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

**2-3. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.**

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

**Comments**

2-3: "Many major/minor courses in Spanish are at their cap, which will limit future growth. In addition, there is only one Peninsular Spanish (literature) specialist at this time and additional staffing could allow further development of the Professional Spanish track." Is additional staffing needed?

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

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

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

**Comments**

1: All but three faculty are engaged with teaching/advising enhancement. The other 3 have nothing listed (though one notes attendance at department retreat which does not feel like an teaching or advising enhancement activity to me)  
 1: Please clarify advising practices within the program.

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

**1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.**

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

**Comments**

All but two have activities listed on the chart. Again, are the literary awards used for University recruitment?

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding****1. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.**

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

**Comments**

No information for Assistant Professors -- is it too early to expect this activity from them, or is there missing data?

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service****1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.**

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

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: F. Resources for Students in the Program****1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

There is a need for more facilities. It appears that more resources are needed because of the high number of Spanish minors.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings****1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, and technological resources to effectively serve its students.**

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

**Comments**

"While all four assigned Foreign Language classrooms have Level 3 technology, it is sometimes not reliable and fails repeatedly during class sessions. We ask that iCIT determine what the systemic issues are, fix them and seek to acquire more dependable hardware in the future. The Foreign Language Program does not have sufficient classroom space for its regular course offerings. Every semester the Foreign Language Coordinator has to contact other departments for their left-over rooms in order to house a number of our classes." This comment suggests that there are some issues with the facilities that you are using.

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

**1. Program strengths are discussed.**

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.**

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

**4. Other comments by the program (not rated).**

Yes	3
No	2

**Comments**

- Continue with assessment efforts
- Identify and implement changes based on assessment results
- Be more intentional on course objectives
- Creation of advisory board
- Determine how curricular changes will impact staffing needs
- Develop 5 year plan; track progress.

**VI. Reviewer Conclusions**

**1. Strengths of the Program**

- There is a high level of dedication and scholarly activity, but it's still hard to tell how well the department functions as a cohesive unit.
- There appears to be a renewed willingness in the past five years to move forward and address the major concerns brought up in the past A&R reports.
- Expertise and devotion of the faculty and staff.

## 2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- Assessment. The program is starting to use it as a tool to evaluate curriculum and courses, but there does not appear any systematic or intentional methods of distributing results.
- The vision/5 year plan will be essential in keeping the program on course, but after reading the report I worry about staff buy-in and collaboration in implementing needed changes.
- Recruitment and retention seem to be major issues as well, but like most other departments on campus it's not known just what efforts are made at the university level or in the admissions office to market the program.
- There seem to be some specific selling points to the program (embodied by faculty achievements and geographic region) that should be better tooted about.
- A visionary plan for the program. Determining how curricular changes will affect future resources and staffing.

## 3. Other comments/questions

- The advisory board seems to have fallen by the wayside, but still seems highly desirable considering the progress made and the progress yet to be made. How can this be implemented?

## 4. Recommended Actions

1. Develop clear program vision to allow sustained progress:
  - a) Identify a clear vision for program growth and goals;
  - b) Clearly identify who is responsible for monitoring and steering program progress over time;
  - c) Develop systematic processes for setting & monitoring program goals.
2. Consider an Advisory Board (or something similar) to assist with program planning, tracking opportunities for graduates, and potential internship sites.
3. Assessment:
  - a) Continue to develop and implement the assessment plan;
  - b) Develop ways to systematically track discussion and use of data.

## 5. Recommended Result\*

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	
Continuation without qualification	
Continuation with minor concerns	X*
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	
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.	

**\*A progress report describing progress towards recommended actions is due to the Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences on October 1, 2018 and subsequently to the Chair of the Audit and Review Committee on November 1, 2018. Next self-study will be due on October 1, 2020.**

**Audit and Review  
Discussion of the Progress Report for  
French, German, & Spanish**

February 10, 2020  
3:30-4:30PM  
Laurentide 4012

**Attendees:** Alicia de Gregorio (Program Coordinator), Frank Goza (Dean, College of Letters & Sciences), Catherine Chan (Interim Director of Academic Assessment), Andrea Ednie (Audit & Review team chair), additional members of the French, German, & Spanish program.

We discussed the review team's observation related to the progress report submitted October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2019 by the French, German, & Spanish program. Alicia de Gregorio outlined the program's progress, successes, and challenges with respect to the recommended actions and general program coordination. The program team work extremely well as a unit, but struggle to find the time to meet due to heavy service loads to the department and college, and limited faculty/instructional resources. The program is making great progress in assessment and program coordination despite these resource limitations.

We discussed ideas and considerations that could help the program to find more time for A&R work, including being more selective with which department/college committees require representation from this group. Dean Goza encouraged the French, German, Spanish group to develop a list of all committees that are important for this group to take part. Dean Goza emphasized that it is important for this group to find time to meet about the French, German, & Spanish program in order to share the workload and to maintain a coordinated list of program initiatives, goals and progress on ongoing projects.

The program's assessment results have identified the need to develop new courses. However, resource limitations have prevented these additions to date. The program team were encouraged to continue to document these assessment results and to consider other example course or program-based implications that can be drawn from analysis of the collected assessment data.

We discussed the university and Chancellor's goal of making UWW more of a Latino serving institution. This group's expertise will be needed to achieve such a goal. The program's existing goal of developing a minor in professional Spanish (including courses in translation) would likely be very important to the Chancellor's goal. Perhaps recognition of the importance of these courses to the university goal would help to identify a way to invest in their development. Dean Goza is supportive of the program, understands the resource needs, and will continue to encourage the Chancellor to consider the important role this program plays in the achievement of this goal.

A plan is in place for sharing the work to prepare the upcoming Fall 2020 self-study report. Alicia is taking volunteers to prepare components of the self-study report. Andrea and Catherine offered support to the program and asked that Alicia contact the Office of Academic Assessment ([assessment@uww.edu](mailto:assessment@uww.edu)) with any questions or concerns about preparing the self-study. We also discussed the new self-study guidelines and upcoming self-study Q&A session.

***No further progress reports are required. The program's next full self-study is due October 1, 2020 to the program's Dean for feedback and by November 1, 2020 to the A&R Committee.***

---

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Progress Report  
Undergraduate Programs, 2019-2020  
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Program Name: French, German, and Spanish

Date of Review Team Meeting: December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019

Date of Follow-Up Meeting: 1/28/2020 Time: 3:00-4:00pm Location: LT 4012

**Evaluations submitted by:** Pascal Letourneau, Catherine Chan, Barbara Bren, Andrea Ednie, Elizabeth Hachten

**Review meeting attended by:** Pascal Letourneau, Catherine Chan, Barbara Bren, Andrea Ednie, Elizabeth Hachten

**Recommendation #1**

Provide an update about progress on Recommendations #1b (program leadership, staffing, and organization) and #1c (develop systematic processes for setting & monitoring program goals).

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

Good Progress	1
Making Progress	3
Little/No Progress	1

**Comments related to recommendation #1**

- The progress made in recommendation 1b (program leadership, staffing, and organization) is satisfactory; insufficient information submitted to properly evaluate progress in recommendation 1c (develop systematic processes for setting & monitoring program goals).
- It appears a lot was achieved since the new WLC coordinator took the lead of the program. I commend, for example, the recertification of all FL General Education courses. With respect to the recommendation, however, I do not see anything in the text about the process for setting and monitoring goals.
- The awarding of extra release time for the coordinator was a significant step forward for the program - despite the continued major challenges.
- The progress report addressed program leadership and staffing components of the recommendation, but did not discuss processes for setting and monitoring program goals.
- Regarding 1b: I am confused about the organizational/leadership structure. There is a WLC coordinator, but the progress report also talks about someone recently hired who will be the German Coordinator. Does each language have a coordinator? How are tasks split among the language coordinators, the WLC coordinator, and the department chair? I can't tell from this progress report and the previous one what is the net gain/loss of faculty/staff.
- Regarding 1c: I don't think this was addressed, other than the mention of unit meeting time as part of monthly department meetings, and the WLC having its own assessment committee (with representation on the College assessment committee). The face-to face minutes from April 23, 2019, mentions "various program structure and leadership options" under consideration, but there was no mention of further developments in the progress report.

**Recommendation #2**

Implement a way to gather feedback from the established community connections to assist with program planning, tracking opportunities for graduates, and identifying potential internship sites.

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

Good Progress	1
Making Progress	4
Little/No Progress	0

**Comments related to recommendation #2**

- I commend the program for moving towards establishing an Advisory Board. Apart from seeking assistance from Ben Strand, perhaps reaching out to program alumni is another way to recruit potential advisory board members.
- The coordinator needs to make sure that the information collected from community connections are collected and discussed. Perhaps making it a recurring (maybe annual) department meeting topic?
- Program has changed their position and now is pursuing goal of creating an advisory board; has taken a first step in this direction. Not certain from the response whether they have fully embraced the potential benefits. There is much excitement in the program about the student ambassador program.
- The program faculty clearly have strong ties with community partners and provide CBL and internship opportunities for the students. However, it does not yet appear that opportunities are being tracked and shared across the program in a systematic way. The progress report mentions the plan to establish an advisory board - I think this would be helpful.
- There are 2 faculty participating in CBL, although it wasn't disclosed which languages the faculty teach (except that Dr. Parys is a Spanish professor), and I suspect there are not opportunities for CBL for German or French? But the report says that opportunities for WLC students have developed from the breakfast and tour contacts. The report says the WLC would like to establish an advisory board, but no substantive steps have happened yet (an email was sent to Ben Strand for guidance).
- LinkedIn and Facebook pages have been created to try to keep in touch with current and former students, intended to help track graduates and provide a means for communicating about internships and employment opportunities.

**Recommendation #3**

Assessment: 1) Provide specific examples of how the assessment data are used to improve the program; 2) Implement ways to systematically track discussion and use of assessment data.

**Recommendation #3 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).**

Good Progress	4
Making Progress	1
Little/No Progress	0

**Comments related to recommendation #3**

- The two examples presented are short but clear.
- Some small progress: #1 - Program has promised these changes to the conversation classes for several years now but still not submitted the proposals. Given the uncertainty about new staffing in Spanish, the current faculty should move forward with the Spanish Composition proposal.
- #2 - Not sure what has concretely changed but Canvas site is certainly a good thing. I am concerned that the program did not take the opportunities offered by Academic Assessment and the L&S Dean's Office to engage in stipended assessment work during summer 2019 (including offer of a spot in the Assessment Institute) - especially given that their next self study is due in 2020.

- It appears these recommended actions have been addressed and that the program team have done a considerable amount of assessment work.
- Assessment data resulted in adding conversation courses and planning to add a Spanish Composition course to help students improve speaking and writing. Assessment results are made available to WLC via Canvas. WLS has its own assessment committee, and assessment planning and other discussion happens at the unit portion of department meetings. Do people in WLC find that sufficient? In previous documents there was some talk about additional meetings for WLC.
- The combination of regular discussions in the retreats and department meeting, the Canvas site, and the involvement of several members of the program in assessment related units will ensure a continuous focus on assessment and promote the use of assessment data to improve the program.

**Recommendations for next review. Additional progress reports required?**

Yes, Please List Due Dates (e.g. in 1 year, 2 years)?	
No	5

**Next report should specifically address the following:**

1. When preparing the self-study, please make sure to:
  - a. Clarify the program’s leadership structure and how responsibilities are split among the language coordinators, WLC coordinator, and the department chair. Detail and prioritize the staffing needs of the program.
  - b. Develop systematic processes for setting & monitoring program goals.
2. Gather feedback from the established community connections, perhaps via establishing an advisory board, to assist with program planning.
3. With respect to assessment:
  - a. Provide specific examples of how the assessment data are used to improve the program.
  - b. Implement ways to systematically track discussion and use of assessment data.
  - c. Try to demonstrate progress by submitting Courseleaf proposals and/or accomplishing other goals.

**Additional comments:**