

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Leadership and Military Science Minors, 2017-2018**

Date: March 22, 2018

Time: 3:30-4:30pm

Place: Winther 1013

Attended: Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean Katy Heyning; Captain Kristoffer Bates; Major Orrin Viner Audit & Review Team Chair S.A. Welch, Kathryn Casey, James Collins, Joan Littlefield Cook

- 1) Call to order
The meeting began at 3:32pm
- 2) Introductions
- 3) The review Chair, S.A. Welch, noted that a consistent strength of the program is its willingness to continue developing in the significant areas of assessment and faculty development. The Audit and Review team expressed their appreciation for the effort that Captain Bates and Major Viner put into addressing the concerns from the previous report.

Captain Kris Bates and Major Orrin Viner reported on the actions taken by them since the last Audit and Review meeting. They thanked the College of Education and Professional Development for its help in collecting necessary information used to develop a Department Chair handbook as a way to make transitions between Chairs smoother and thus allowing the program to maintain a level of continuity throughout the transitions. Captain Bates also reported the growth of the program and noted that 50% of the enrolled students are not in the military. Captain Bates also addressed how the minor focused on SLOs by utilizing 3 levels of goals for each student. Captain Bates indicated that the leadership of the minor determined that this 3 level goal approach was better suited for the uniqueness of the minor while still allowing for the military and civilian students to learn.

- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) Assessment: The Audit and Review team appreciated the program's efforts in addressing assessment. However, there was still some uncertainty as to how assessment data was disseminated to other stakeholders. There was discussion about the amount of assessment data and of possible ways to streamline the process of presenting the data. A few ideas that were discussed included: identifying the 4-5 most important learning outcomes that would serve the students the best, focusing on these as primary, and possibly stream-lining the rubrics used to collect data.
 - b) Program Purpose & Overview, Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments: During the face-to-face meeting, Provost Elrod addressed the importance of developing leadership skills and commended the program for its efforts in accomplishing this. Provost Elrod also put forth the idea that the Leadership and Military Science program expand by including leadership skills for students of all majors. Captain Bates noted that the program does have a civilian tract and further discussion addressed the possibility of offering a broader leadership program that could possibly incorporate students earning a certificate of leadership.

The Audit and Review Team commends the program for receiving the program award from the Badger Battalion. Receiving this award indicates the high level of both faculty commitment and student achievement in the program. Provost Elrod commended the program on its officer conferment ceremonies, noting that the speakers are inspirational and motivating.

The Review Team encourages the program to continue the collaboration they have begun to become more closely connected to the College to ensure alignment between the program and the college, ongoing progress in assessment of student learning outcomes, and ensure proper verification of faculty qualifications.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 3 recommended action (see page 13, item 4) related to program continuity across changes in leadership and communication with the college, articulation of instructor qualifications, and assessment.
- 6) **Recommended Result:** Continuation with minor concerns.
 - **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
 - **Progress report on the Recommended Actions due to the college dean by March 1, 2019 and to the A&R committee by March 15, 2019.**
 - Next full self-study will be due to College Dean by October 1, 2021 and to the A&R Committee by November 1, 2021.
- 7) Adjourn.
The meeting was adjourned at 4:31pm

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2017-2018
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 11/27/2017 Short Self Study (SS*) _____

Program Leadership and Military Science Major _____ Minor X

Evaluations submitted by: S.A. Welch, Joan Cook, James Collins, Katy Casey

Review meeting attended by: S.A. Welch, Joan Cook, James Collins, Katy Casey, Nick Guo

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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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	1
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	1
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	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	

Comments

- 3. I'm not clear as to how the information presented addresses/is relevant for UWW's IE goals.
- 4. There's been some recent discussion with CoEPS about integration, but little has been accomplished in the 6 years since the previous review.
- 4. Still working on how to create continuity.

Clear evidence was provided for all areas, including responsiveness to previous feedback.

It is clear that the Leadership program has spent a considerable amount of time addressing the concerns presented in the last self-study. The program should be commended for the thorough review of the program to identify strengths and opportunities.

They mention shared governance but that is not really what they do.

IE is about race/ethnic diversity....so rotating faculty that are still predominantly white does not accomplish IE goals.

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

5. The program, faculty/staff, and/or students have earned recognition or awards.

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

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)	4

Comments

2. The program acknowledges the lack of previously established goals, but actionable goals have since been developed and provided and they appear adequate/reasonable.
3. The process described sounds good. When was it first implemented?
3. SWOT analysis was described; additional information will be gathered at the end of the fall 2017 semester.
4. I especially like the idea of creating an operating procedures handbook, which should help maintain continuity due to the high rate of instructor turnover.
4. Developing a "vision" other than the one the military has for the program might be difficult.
5. The program is to be commended for receiving the Badger Battalion program award
6. The program indicates that this is not applicable, but no evidence was provided for the A&R Committee to help understand this. Does the military have any requirements for accreditation? Are other programs pursuing any form of accreditation?

The goals were clear and measurable. Accreditation is not available for this program.

For what they aim to accomplish, their mission statement is fine

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable)

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

Comments

1. Alternatively, the topics covered are clearly very relevant and useful for students, whether they continue in the military or go into civilian careers.
2. NA because dual-listed courses are unavailable for this program.
3. Curricular changes were made to correct errors, but assessment data did not appear to be used in making curricular changes.
3. Proposed changes were provided, but details related to assessment data used to inform these decisions were not provided.
5. NA because no classes are offered online.

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	2
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	0
No/Limited Evidence	
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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

Comments

1. Have detailed SLOs that are mapped to courses. Specific SLOs are not examined in depth in specific years, but all are assessed regularly using embedded assessments.
3. There is a detailed plan for individual-level assessment using course-embedded assignments, but I don't see a clear indication of how these individual assessments are 'rolled up' to the program level. The self-study implies that this is done, but I don't see a clear description of how the data are summarized to reach program-level conclusions.
5. Again, the implication is that program faculty discuss the data and make program-level decisions but I don't see the process for how this is done clearly articulated. The question that needs to be addressed is "overall, in the program as a whole, how do you know the degree to which students are achieving each of the SLOs?"
6. Data, conclusions are shared within the program and with the military.

The department may wish to consider ways to involve non-military stakeholders due to the far-reaching value of material taught in this program.

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	0
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	0
---------------------	---

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

4. Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students.

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

5. [MAJORS ONLY] Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

- 5. NA because this is a minors program only.
- 7. Supporting evidence is missing from the provided information.

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	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0

No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

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

Comments

2. I assume so, given the relationship of the minor with the military.

3. What objective data are gathered for students who do not enlist in the military? Existing tracking systems only appear to be used for students who enlist (i.e., monitoring promotion rates).

I am not sure how to answer #2 for this minor.

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

Comments

Previous comments indicated that recruitment to UWW was difficult due to competing programs as UW-Madison and Marquette. However, some of the initiatives recently put into practice appear to be improving recruitment efforts.

They report some interesting information: 1. they say they subscribe to the University's IE agenda, but they then they say that they do not have a diverse student population in their program.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty Characteristics

1-2. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.)

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

3-4. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.

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

Comments

1-2. Still an issue with clarifying the faculty qualifications. The college needs to work with the program to clarify how the specific additional training of some of the instructors constitutes qualifications for the specific courses they are teaching.

I commend their report where they acknowledge the issues they face with staff and faculty. They seem to be quite aware of not only the problem but the impact and possible solutions.

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

1-2. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.

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

Comments

1-2. These are difficult to accurately answer due to the transient nature of instructors in this department. However, considering the rotations required by the military, I think that sufficient information was provided and I expect that the foundation training that instructors receive is continually evolving and being improved-upon.

They report many different activities that the faculty participate in for enhancing their teaching skills.

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

1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.

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

Comments

I'm not completely sure how to answer this one. All faculty at the university should have scholarly activity expectations, but the program is so unique that I'm not sure how to address this.

Due to the unique nature of this program, this question is not directly applicable; although, the provided response did highlight creative ongoing and advanced training accomplishments that (in my opinion) meets necessary evidence requirements.

Instructors in this program are not required to participate in scholarly activities.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding

1-2. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.

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

Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	4
------------------------------------------------	---

Comments

The faculty are not involved in pursuing grants.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service

1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.

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

Comments

The faculty are quite involved in military activities beyond the classroom

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

Comments

As mentioned previously in the report, the department is aware of the issues surrounding maintaining adequate faculty.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings

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

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

Comments

The facilities associated with this program seem to be adequate for their purposes.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Program strengths are discussed.

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

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

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

Yes	2
No	2

Comments

This is the primary strength that department reported: The biggest strength of the program is the diversity in experience that the instructors have. Collectively, the instructors has 11 combat deployments to either Afghanistan or Iraq. (my concern is that this is not a strength of an academic minor)

While they do have a report on improvements this is what they reported: "The most difficult part of updating continuity folders is taking the time to do so. Often times instructors get focused on instructing, practical exercises, labs, military requirements, field training exercises, summer camps, counseling and physical fitness training that we forget to routinely update continuity folders."

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

Offers a unique opportunity to students. Course topics are relevant and very practically useful, both in the military and in civilian society.

The value of this program to all students (even those with a non-military path) is clear.

The Leadership Program has made significant improvements in a relatively short period of time and outlined a strategic plan that if continued will improve the quality of the program. The self-study was well written and clearly described the program. The candid manner in which the personnel continuity issue was discussed is appreciated.

The department is being quite proactive in addressing obtaining diverse faculty.

The Audit and Review team is impressed with both the willingness of the department to engage with the Audit and Review process and the good progress that the department has made since the last review.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

1. Integration with CoEPS and the university
2. Program-level assessment
3. Ongoing improvement of procedures to ensure continuity for students and instructors will be incredibly helpful and I think that this is where a lot of the work needs to be accomplished.
4. The assessment plan is described in detail, and includes many necessary components, but the distinction between the minor program SLOs and Army assessment plan is not clear in the documents submitted. If these are one in the same, the SLOs should be the army competencies. In addition, the issue regarding personnel continuity- while addressed well in the written documents- is still a concern in that there is not much history to suggest the program will continue with the changes outlined in this report when the instructional staff changes.

3. Other comments/questions

I'd suggest a progress report in a year (2 years at the most) to check progress toward building continuity and integration with CoEPS.

4. Recommended Actions

1. Continue to develop processes that allow program continuity across changes in leadership and good communication with the college.
 - a. Consider including representatives from the program on both the College Curriculum and Assessment Committees.
 - b. Consider appointing a college coordinator to work with the program leadership to ensure smooth transitions across leadership changes and establish program processes that align with college policies and practices
2. Work with the college to clearly articulate how instructors' qualifications for this program (including both academic credentials and continuing education certifications from the military) are at levels that meet academic accreditation requirements.
3. Assessment:
 - a. Articulate how the individual- and course-level assessments being done are summarized and used to evaluate program-level achievement of SLOs.
 - b. Share program-level assessment data with CoEPS and UWW.

5. Recommended Result*

Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	0
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the Audit & Review Committee.	5*
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
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
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

Non-continuation of the program.	0
Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0

***Progress report on the Recommended Actions due to the college dean by March 1, 2019 and to the A & R committee by March 15, 2019. Next full self-study will be due to the college dean by October 1, 2021 and to the A&R Committee by November 1, 2021.**

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Progress Report
Undergraduate Programs, 2018-2019
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors

Program Name: Leadership and Military Science

Date of Review Team Meeting: April 5, 2019

Date of Follow-Up Meeting: Thursday, May 9, 2019 Time: 1:00-2:00pm Location: Winther Hall 1013

Evaluations submitted by: S.A. Welch, Bill Miller, Hephzibah Kumpaty, Katy Casey, Andrea Ednie (review team chair).

Review meeting attended by: S.A. Welch, Hephzibah Kumpaty, Katy Casey, Andrea Ednie (review team chair).

Recommendations listed below are from the program's most recent Self-Study review (2017).

Recommendation #1

Recommended Action 1: Continue to develop processes that allow program continuity across changes in leadership and good communication with the college.

- a) Consider including representatives from the program on both the College Curriculum and Assessment Committees.
- b) Consider appointing a college coordinator to work with the program leadership to ensure smooth transitions across leadership changes and establish program processes that align with college policies and practices.

Recommendation #1 Overall Evaluation

Good Progress	4
Making Progress	1
Little/No Progress	0

Comments Related to Recommendation #1

- The program has demonstrated significant efforts and changes in response to this recommendation.
- This program's faculty and staff are involved in College committees and participate regularly in administrative meetings. The Assistant Dean will serve in an advisory capacity to support the program through frequent changes in leadership.
- I actually think they now may be too involved. I say this in regards to recommendation #3 (which I will address there). However, from where they were earlier, I think they have done a wonderful job at getting involved across campus.
- The program has been responsive to recommendations 1a and 1b; as noted in the progress report, the program is now well represented both at the university and college level by ensuring department representatives are involved in the curriculum and assessment issues. The program is also working closely with Dr. Katy Casey who is assisting in areas for which the program needs direction.

Recommendation #2

Recommended Action 2: Work with the college to articulate how instructors' qualifications for this program (including both academic credentials and continuing education certifications from the military) are at levels that meet academic accreditation requirements.

Recommendation #2 Overall Evaluation

Good Progress	4
Making Progress	1
Little/No Progress	0

Comments Related to Recommendation #2

- The progress report appears to fully respond to the recommendation and it seems instructors are well qualified for teaching the particular coursework.
- Documents as to faculty and staff teaching credentials have been collected, and will be maintained to fulfill accreditation requirements.
- From the description provided here, in the progress report, it is now clear what the qualifications are and how they are relevant to the program.
- Perhaps a digital format might help with updating and documenting instructors' qualifications

Recommendation #3

- A. Articulate how the individual- and course-level assessments are used to evaluate program level achievement of SLOs.
- B. Share program-level assessment data with COEPS and UWW

Recommendation #3 Overall Evaluation

Good Progress	0
Making Progress	5
Little/No Progress	0

Comments Related to Recommendation #3

- The report described formative and summative measures and the process of assessment data collection. The report mentions that instructors use the data to customize and make changes to instruction, but does not provide an example of how this is done. The report does not address recommendation 3B about sharing data with COEPS and UWW.
- This department has come a long way in this area and should be commended for its hard work over the past few years. SLOs have been identified and data is collected frequently on students' performance towards meeting these outcomes. Work still needs to be done on how the program uses the data to inform teaching methods. The program understands this need to "close the loop" and will work with the Assistant Dean to complete the department's assessment plan.
- Informing the students of the 4 SLO's is quite helpful. The description in this report about how students are evaluated on these is very helpful. However, I don't see a "closing of the loop" for how this data is used to help the program "to evaluate program-level achievement of SLOs." I also did not see how this data was being conveyed to COEPS and UWW overall. Perhaps this is done with the meetings with Katy Casey, but that was unclear. I mentioned for recommendation

#1 that perhaps they were doing too much particularly in light of what I see as some gaps in addressing recommendation #3.

- Could SLOs be stated in a way that identifies more clearly how they are measured? The primary 'categories' for learning objectives are listed but not specific language that describes the outcomes being evaluated.
- The process for considering individual and program level assessment data looks fine. The program is conducting both formative and summative assessments to measure SLO progress. A variety of techniques are employed, such as weekly journal entries, student leadership assessment cards, month-long practicum tests, exit surveys and annual course assignments by the instructors.
- The program faculty should continue their involvement within the college and their coordinated efforts regarding assessment. I would recommend expanding on the SLOs prior to their 2021 self-study due date. I would also recommend documenting the processes the instructors and coordinator undergo to discuss and consider the collected assessment data, and to compile specific examples of how assessment results are being used to make changes to instructional materials and/or the curriculum.

Recommendations for next review. Additional progress reports required?

Yes, Please List Due Dates (e.g. in 1 year, 2 years)?	4
No	1

Yes, Please List Due Dates (e.g. in 1 year, 2 years)?

- Fall 2020

Next report should specifically address the following:

1. Continue to develop processes that allow program continuity across changes in leadership and good communication with the college.
2. Continue to work on assessment. Now that themes are identified and data are being collected, continue to work on articulating SLOs and documenting how assessment data are being tracked and used to guide program decisions. Please include a couple of examples of how data are used to inform instructional methods.

Additional comments

- We are requiring a progress report to support program continuity knowing the full instructional team are rotating this year. We want the program to continue the positive commitment they have made to be involved in COEPS and to continue assessment work in effort to “close the loop” with existing measures.
- This program has a number of external demands and all faculty and staff are new to higher education- and turnover frequently. Considering these unique circumstances, they have made great strides in understanding higher education accountability structures and demands - great work!
- I am quite pleased with how they have made such a strong effort to work with our first two recommendations.

**** Next Progress Report is due to the Dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies by October 1, 2020 and to the A&R Committee by November 1, 2020. Next full Self-Study is due to the Dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies by October 1, 2021 and to the A&R Committee by November 1, 2021.**

Audit and Review
Discussion of the Progress Report Submitted March 7, 2019 by
Leadership and Military Science

May 9, 2019
1:00-2:00pm
Winther Hall 1013

Attendance: Ken Van Horn (Department Chair); Kristoffer Bates; Chris Mueller; Andrea Ednie (Review Team Chair); Review team members Katy Casey (Assistant Dean), S.A. Welch.

We discussed the review team's observations related to the progress report submitted March 7, 2019 by the Leadership and Military Science program. The program team have demonstrated a high level of commitment to integrate with, and contribute to the COEPS. The Leadership & Military Science minor provides a unique opportunity for students by shortening the coursework path for ROTC programs, and allowing instructors significantly more contact with students.

The program team have developed standards binders to document the professional development and unique qualifications of instructors, as well as to support information sharing through the regular intervals of instructional staff team terms.

With respect to assessment, we discussed the progress Kris B made, and next steps moving forward. We considered the idea of adding specific questions to course evaluation, and adding program-specific questions to the SOAS. We also discussed the possibility of moving the program's Blue cards (part of student final assessment) to an electronic forum in order to facilitate data tracking. Katy volunteered to help the new program team integrate any/all of these ideas. We also encouraged the team to consult with the assessment office.

Kris B mentioned the opportunity for the program team to discuss his lessons learned, the assessments, course syllabi, and make adjustments as needed. We discussed how teaching methods within courses can be modified so long as LOs are being followed.

The current program team were highly involved in committees, and we discussed their observations with respect to the most pertinent committees for the program. Continued involvement with the COEPS Curriculum Committee and Strategic Planning and Budget Committee were suggested. Other initiatives to increase the integration of the program on campus and to support recruiting efforts were discussed, such as inviting department chairs for a meeting in the program's building, participating in events such as SOARs, premier days, etc., teaching a course at UWW-Rock County, and becoming involved with the Williams Center planning committee.

The review team emphasized, throughout our discussion, that a further progress report is solely required in order to support the continuity of the program through the staff transition, and the continuation of the progress the current team have made with respect to assessment.

The next progress report is due to the Dean of the COEPS by October 1, 2020 and to the A&R Committee by November 1, 2020. The program's next full self-study is due October 1, 2021 to the Dean of the COEPS for feedback and by November 1, 2021 to the A&R Committee.