

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Occupational Safety Majors and Minors, 2018-2019**

Date: 4/30/2019

Time: 3:30 – 4:30 pm

Place: Hyland Hall 4303

Attended: AVC Greg Cook; Dean John Chenoweth (Business & Economics); Department Chair Alvaro Taveira; faculty and staff in the Occupational Safety program Kwan Ahn, Bob Evangelista, Sang Choi, Todd Loushine, Donna Vosburgh; Audit & Review Team Chair Karla Saeger; Audit & Review team members Yamin Ahmad, Eric Appleton, Ahmad Karim, Joan Littlefield Cook, Catherine Chan

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Karla Saeger summarized strengths of the program including the strong assessment tools already in place in the Occupational Safety program, the social and economic impact of the program in WI and the Midwest, the high degree of success in career placement, and the potential for growth. The review team was impressed by the achievement of ABET-ASAC Accreditation and commended the faculty and staff for their active role in the continuous development of the program.
- 4) Department Chair Alvaro Taveira summarized the program's effort to continually improve program assessments. It was discussed how the ABET-ASAC Accreditation requirements guide how SLOs are aligned with program assessments. Specifically ABET-ASAC SLOs are defined for the overall program, however, there is a lack of SLOs in the emphases due to the structure of accreditation. It was noted that SLOs could easily be added to program emphases aligning with final exams of emphases, which could then be used for program assessment. Career placement of students is strong and salaries continue to increase. There continues to be a high demand for the program. An online version of the program has been approved and is expected to be implemented in fall 2020. There is the potential for tremendous growth with the online program, which is expected to attract non-traditional and out of state students.
- 5) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) *Continue the good work on your assessment efforts. One area to develop further are the SLOs for the emphases within the major. Indicate if there are fundamental differences between the SLO lists for the major and those unique to each emphases.*

Joan Cook highlighted how the program has a good assessment program and uses data, such as SOAS results, to drive changes. Department Chair Taveira explained how the results of group advising questions indicated that more could be done to support student achievement of several SLOs. Group advising (with individual follow-up when needed) has proven to be satisfactory. Vice Provost Greg Cook noted a surprising result of seniors indicating that more math knowledge was needed in the program. The program has begun to address this by adding greater emphasis on relevant math knowledge. Vice Provost Cook commended the program on its good feedback cycle and how it was clearly reflected in the report.

- b) *Develop a strategic plan that includes a timeline for long-term goal setting of the following areas: adequate staffing due to growth of the program, development of online options, and development of risk management and loss control emphasis.*

Development of a risk management and loss control emphasis is a long-term goal of the program. In general, the program struggles to attract qualified faculty to fill positions. There are not any doctoral programs providing candidates and those with the expertise needed to fill faculty positions command salaries that are beyond what the campus can offer. However, Department Chair Taveira indicated some possible solutions such as using part-time faculty, utilizing consultants, or offering classes once per year. The development of the online program is 75% complete with work continuing on how to structure the lab and capstone with field trips requirements.

- c) Please provide an update on the implementation of the OESH laboratory in the Community Engagement Center.

The implementation of the OESH laboratory is going well. A visit to the lab occurred two weeks ago and contact with the Coordinator indicates arrangements are already underway for equipment and donors. The support of the College was noted. There is a lot of work ahead, but the program has a plan for moving equipment to the new space with hopes of minimal lag time between the move and availability for classes. In the new space, shared classrooms will be common and there is faculty office space adjacent to the lab. Additional attention will be given to areas of building safety and travel time to and from the facility.

Dr. Taveira feels the program is doing well overall and shows good potential to become a better and stronger department and program.

Associate Dean Ahmad Karim noted that the program's move to CoBE from CoEPS has gone well, and the program has become well integrated into CoBE. This is the only non-business program in the College, and it makes a good contribution to the College. Dean John Chenoweth also noted that the program is an equal partner in the College and adds value to other programs. Dean Chenoweth is also hopeful that the Community Engagement Center will provide much needed space for faculty offices, since Hyland Hall is at capacity.

- 6) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists three recommended actions (see page 15) related to SLOs specific to each emphasis, development of a strategic plan, and implementation of the OESH Laboratory.
- 7) **Recommended Result:** Continuation without qualification
- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
 - Because the recommended result of this review is to continue without qualification, the program's next self-study will be a "short" one focused on the recommended actions from the current report. This short self-study is due **October 1, 2023 to the Dean of the College of Business and Economics and November 1, 2023 to the chair of Audit & Review Committee.**
- 8) Adjourn at 4:15 pm.
Submitted by Karla Saeger

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

Date of Evaluation 12/6/2018 Short Self Study (SS*) _____
 Program: Occupational Safety Major Minor

Evaluations submitted by: Karla Saeger, Yamin Ahmad, Eric Appleton, Ahmad Karim, Joan Littlefield Cook
Review meeting attended by: Karla Saeger, Yamin Ahmad, Eric Appleton, Ahmad Karim, 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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. The narrative shows that the program contributes towards the University's Goals.
2. The program offers two General Education courses: Personal and Public Safety along with Alcohol and Other Drugs. These courses appear to be demand. In addition, the program offers classes that contribute towards a number of other programs.

3. The program utilizes high impact practices to engage students; they also make efforts to address the long-term IE goal of recruiting and retaining faculty and staff.
3. The program offers HIPs and integrates LEAP into the curriculum, which is great. However, I do not see the ways in which IE is specifically addressed. Can the program provide a bit more detail on IE specifically?
4. Defined SLO's with outline of data collection plan
4. Analysis of data used to make changes to program
4. Congratulations to the program for being accredited by ABET! The program appears to have been responsive to the previous recommended actions.

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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	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	2
No/Limited Evidence	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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

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

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

Comments

1. It is nice to see that a part of the mission statement "... to serve society with integrity" directly addresses one of UW-Whitewater's values. In addition, I like that the goals of the program are listed directly within the mission statement.
2. Congratulations again on being accredited by ABET, and in the transition from the CoEPS to CoBE. The self-study details how the program undertook two ambitious goals during the review period and succeeded in meeting them. The mission statement from section 1.B.1 lists the specific goals that the program has for its students.
2. Congratulations on the accreditation effort! Great to hear that demand for the program's interns is so high.
3. There does appear to be some evidence of "intentionality" towards goal-setting.
3. It is great that the Program has two advisory boards that meet regularly to offer feedback, and that there is evidence that the feedback is being utilized.
3. While the self-study speaks to the activities and the data it uses to determine long-term goals, the narrative partially addresses the "process" part. Does the program have a specific strategic planning process by which it utilizes these activities and data? What is the timeline for this (although this may be addressed later on in the self-study)?
4. The Program appears to have some clear ideas over what it would like to accomplish over the next five years. Do they have a vision statement that reflects this?
4. Does the Program have any data on potential enrollments for the online program?
4. As the Program begins to offer additional online classes, there may be some impact on the availability of traditional classes given the small number of teaching staff. Are there any thoughts/discussions on how to address this?
4. Three very ambitious and far reaching goals were outlined. Is there a timetable?
4. Has there been discussion with upper administration on the lack of competitive salaries (and this is certainly not the only department to have this problem)? Has there been any response? Knowing this disparity in salaries between Whitewater and the private sector, it would be interesting to hear what aspects of the program/university are positive enough to keep current faculty from seeking more positions that are lucrative.
5. I would say accreditation and QAP status is good recognition. . . Just curious -- are there regional/national awards available for students or academics in the field?

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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

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

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

Comments

1. I liked the breakdown of course contents -- science and statistics, written communication, fieldwork etc. Helped clarify the overall balance of the program and where various SLOS might fit in.
2. In the dual-listed course syllabi included, I cannot tell what degree to which degree the graduation requirements are above and beyond the UG.
2. Although the Program has a large number of dual-listed courses in the course catalogue, which is marginally lower from the time of the last self-study (when it was 15). In practice, about three are offered currently online, with the intention to reduce that down to two. The syllabi provided for the courses clearly differentiate the different expectations between undergraduates taking the course and graduate students. However, I would continue to urge the Program to work towards lowering the number further, understanding the resource constraints faced by the Program.
3. Were assessment data used to inform the curricular revisions? What data were used (e.g. enrollment data, feedback from advisory boards, or strategic planning process etc.)?
3. A number of substantial curriculum revisions were noted, all of which appear thoughtful and relevant. There was not mention of what assessment data brought about these changes (beyond "long term concerns of the faculty" and "reviewing course options.").
4. The OS program provides ample opportunity for learning experiences beyond the classroom.
4. Did the SSO win the chapter of the year award for 2017-18, or just apply for it?

4. The national scholarships are impressive -- is this something to be listed in the section for awards and recognition? I would think that students receiving scholarships from prestigious organizations would qualify to be noted in that regard.
4. Impressive documentation of student activities! Well done. - I might have missed this, but is there any additional details on the faculty driven undergraduate research projects undertaken? Do the students present at undergraduate research day and/or professional conferences? - Congratulations to the students on getting the national scholarships. - The capstone experience seems to be significant and allows for a smooth transition to begin their post-UWW career.
5. Have all the online courses gone through Quality Matters?

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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

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

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

5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. If possible within the ABET structure, I encourage the program to move away from the "students will demonstrate the ability to" wording, and move toward "students will demonstrate..." (more like the list of specific criteria). We cannot really know if students have the ability to do something or not; we can only assess if they demonstrate the skill and to what extent. However, I recognize that ABET may require both lists, and the specific wording.
1. Do all SLOs receive equal attention every year? Would there be benefit to doing more detailed assessment of one or two each year, to allow a more in-depth understanding of them (especially any that seem to have persistently lower achievement levels)?
1. SLOS are connected to courses, but it would also be good to have a map that showed in which courses particular SLOs are introduced, developed, and then mastery demonstrated. Page 1 and 2 of the appendix does have SLOs broken up into categories (1 through 12 stated 'demonstration' or 'apply' and courses, in which that demonstration occurs -- in which courses, for example, are the fundamental aspects of safety (#3) introduced?
1. Overall, well done! It is clear that the Program has a good approach to assessment given the large number of SLOs. I do have a few comments.
 - The Program does have clearly defined SLOs for the major and courses are mapped to the SLOs and there is data to indicate outcomes for each SLO. However, there is no/limited evidence of how the SLOs for the emphases within the major differ from the SLOs for the major itself. Also, are there SLOs for the two minors?
 - What is not clear from the course mapping is when SLO's are being introduced and/or developed in some of the classes. - The majority of the assessment tools used in the classes are direct/embedded instruments. Are any indirect measures used in the classes themselves?
 - Given the emphases within the major, how are these emphases assessed? How is the minor assessed?
2. Good alignment with LEAP ELOs
3. The Program has a good assessment plan that incorporates both direct and indirect data, as well as data from stakeholders and alumni. I like that there are criteria for corrective action on quantitative analyses. The only thing I would recommend would be to determine how to differentiate the SLOs for the emphases, from the major itself.
4. The details provided here indicate that the Program is collecting a variety of appropriate data (direct/indirect as well as internal/external) that are relevant and should help to inform the program. Well done! However, little information is provided about whether any data is being collected for assessment on the emphases themselves.
4. Based on the SOAS, there are a few areas with somewhat lower ratings (not low, but relatively lower), including advising, using numerical data, and knowledge of/participating in social issues. Are these areas in which the program would like students to gain more knowledge and skill?
4. Use of data and subsequent changes (and results) were clearly described. Nice to see the variety of embedded tools used for assessment purposes (exams, quizzes, projects, etc.)
4. Just curious -- is it known what percentage of alumni responded to the alumni survey?
5. Several good examples are provided of faculty reviewing the data, making a change in instruction, and re-assessing to evaluate the impact of the change--very good!
5. From the evidence provided for Section II.B.4, there is direct evidence that the Program is utilizing the data to evaluate the SLO's. From the evidence given, it seems like they are drawing conclusions from the data and closing the loop. Well done! Also, it seems like they are doing a great job in advising given the feedback from the Senior Exit survey. Well done there as well!

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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

1-2. Five year enrollment trends indicate that the program is vibrant and growing. It is interesting that the number of degrees awarded in recent years appears to be cyclical to some extent. It may be worth investigating further

over the next few years to see whether this is a trend phenomenon or simply cyclical variation. If it is the former, then the Program may need to investigate the potential drivers leading to this pattern.

- 1-2. Positive growth for the reporting period and the online option for the OS program anticipated enrollment growth along with recruitment efforts to attract first-year and undeclared students.
3. The Program continues to have students graduating with large number of credits above the 120 minimum, ranging between 140.8 - 157. This effectively translates into an additional semester to two semesters (assuming 15 credits per semester). It's good that the Program has investigated this, and to some extent found that students are coming later into the major. Does the Program have some idea of what portion of the students graduating are doing so because of difficulties navigating the major vs coming late into the major?
4. The Program has some strategies to recruit students into the major. The strategies in place appear to be designed to just increase the total number of students, but there does not appear to be specific strategies targeting the diversity of students in the Program. Also, what portion of the students in the minor are male/female/URM?
- 3-4. Sounds like most recruitment is internal to the university (once students arrive). What is the university recruitment and admissions office doing to help attract students who might be interested in the major?
5. Given that the gender disparity is similar to what is in the field, is this going to be a strategic priority for the Department going forward?
7. Necessary support is emphasized as essential growth. Does the program have any specifics on what they would need to maintain quality in the face of growth? E.g., if the on-line option does double the enrollment, are more instructors required? How many instructors?

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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

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

Comments

1. Impressive rate of 96.3% graduate employment.
3. Well done on tracking alumni and being able to engage them to get feedback for the program.
3. How does the program keep track of graduates in order to administer the survey? Are/how they working with the university alumni office on tracking?
3. Alumni survey results are being used for accreditation and program assessment.

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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

1. Just curious -- what is the closest university also offering a BA in OS? If UW - Whitewater offers the only degree of this kind in Wisconsin, how well nationally distributed are similar programs?
1. This is the only program of its kind in WI, with great placement for graduates. The alumni of the program will no doubt yield dividends in promoting the program here at UW-Whitewater and in doing so enhance the reputation of UW-Whitewater going forward.

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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

Comments

- 1-2. The Program has a good array of experts that reflect the nature of the professional degree. However, are there some prior factors that determine whether the current composition of faculty and staff are optimal? For example, are there areas/fields of expertise that need additional coverage to meet the needs of current student interests?
- 3-4. Has the program already begun conversations with the dean/university regarding additional instructors?

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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

1. The faculty and staff appear to be taking advantage of learning opportunities on campus. I am just curious, but it does not appear that anyone took a faculty sabbatical during the period of review. At least it was not listed amongst the activities, although there was a mention of it in the narrative. Was this because the sabbatical has just been awarded in the current/upcoming year (i.e. outside of the period of review)?
2. Program expectations for engaging in activities to enhance teaching and/or advising are not listed here.

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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

1. The faculty are active in their scholarly work. The tenure-track and tenured faculty continue to publish and generate intellectual contributions.
2. The expectations for research and/or scholarly/creative activities are not listed here, although they would be adherent to the CoBE promotion and tenure standards

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding**1-2. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.**

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

Comments

1. The amount of grants obtained by the faculty and staff are impressive, particularly given the size of the Department.
2. The expectations for obtaining grants are not listed. However, a noted strength of the OS program is having grants exceeding \$600,000.

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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

1. Faculty and staff actively engage in service activities beyond the Department level. This includes both public and professional service.
2. Expectations for service within the Department are not listed, although they would be adherent to the promotion and tenure standards in CoBE.

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	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

1. The narrative lists some examples that help to serve its undergraduate students and they indicate that this is currently sufficient to meet the needs of the students. However, the narrative does not detail how/why this is sufficient.
1. Adequate resources available for students.

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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	1

Comments

1. State of the art facilities in multiple campus locations (Hyland Hall, Ambrose Building). Anticipating space in the UWW Community Engagement Center.
1. The narrative provides examples of resources available to the Program and the Department. I may have missed it, but it does not state whether these are adequate, or whether more is needed.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program**1. Program strengths are discussed.**

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

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

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

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

Comments

- Strengths of the OS program include social and economic impact to not only WI, but the Midwest.
- OS program achievement of ABET-ASAC Accreditation.
- Additional details would be helpful, particularly as to whether the Program has considered the impact of the major growing, and the balance between allocating resources between their undergraduate and graduate programs.
- Not sure I saw where earlier it was noted that the lab space had become insufficient. (Especially since in strengths it's noted that the department has state of the art facilities and 'a spacious student laboratory.')
- Is this a corollary to the space to be included in the community center? Will this space fulfill the needs, or is there more space needed in Hyland?
- In need of additional physical space for equipment and a competitive salary structure for faculty.

VI. Reviewer Conclusions**1. Strengths of the Program**

- This is a strong, unique program that is in demand, and has the potential to grow.
- The faculty and staff are actively engaged both within the program and beyond.
- The Program has garnered a number of successes in achieving its long-term goals since the prior Audit and Review, including being accredited by ABET with ABET-ASAC Accreditation Internship opportunities. This is a credit to the quality of the faculty and staff in the Department and the Program.
- The Program has strong assessment tools in place and it is readily apparent that they are engaged in continual development of the major to improve it.
- There appears to be a high degree of success in career placement. Assessment activities appear to be clear, ordered, and responsive to the data. Accreditation is a major accomplishment.
- The program looks to be poised for further growth.
- Positive social and economic impacts in WI and the Midwest with high percentage of employment for graduates.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- Despite the strong assessment practices, I think that there is some work that needs to be done in differentiating the SLOs for the major vs the emphases in the major itself. Are the SLOs for the major a subset of those for the emphases? Is there anything fundamentally different about the learning outcomes there?

- Develop a robust strategic planning process. Although there is a process in place, it is unclear how long-term goal setting is currently being determined.
- The program noted three major goals -- 1) development of online options, 2) implementation of the OESH laboratory in the Community Engagement Center, and 3) development of the risk management and loss control areas. I would note that with growth of the program, the issue of additional faculty should be included in the mix.
- Provide specific examples on what assessment data are being used to drive curricular changes.

3. Other comments/questions

- To what extent are the resources that are currently available to the Department/Program adequate?
- Are there factors that are lacking that would help deliver an even better program?
- An articulation of a vision statement can lead to the refinement of long-term goals that may help determine any needs better.

4. Recommended Actions

1. Continue the good work on assessment, but differentiate the SLOs specific to each emphasis within the major.
2. Develop a robust strategic planning process to address the following related to growth of the program:
 - a. timeline of strategic planning activities
 - b. work with the College to ensure adequate staffing as program grows
 - c. development of online options
 - d. development of risk management and loss control emphasis
3. Continue working with the campus and College to complete the implementation of the OESH laboratory in the Community Engagement Center.

5. Recommended Result

Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	X
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	
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.	
Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	

*Because the recommended result of this review is to continue without qualification, the program's next full self-study will be a "short" one focused on the recommended actions from the current report. This short self-study is due **October 1, 2023 to the Dean of the College of Business and Economics and November 1, 2023 to the chair of Audit & Review Committee.**