

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Teaching English as a Second Language Minors, 2015-2016**

Date: [Friday, October 14](#), 2016

Time: 3:00-4:00

Place: LT 4012

Invited: Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean David Travis; Associate Dean Frank Goza; Assistant Dean Lana Collet-Klingenberg; Program Coordinator Susan Huss-Lederman; Chair of Curriculum & Instruction Matt Vick; faculty and staff in the Teaching English as a Second Language program; Audit & Review Team Chair Angela Harlan; Audit & Review team members Kathryn Casey, Joan Littlefield Cook, Corey Davis, and Dennis Kopf

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) **Facilities.** The program is in need of classroom equipment, specifically updated technology (including Smart Boards) that is consistent across all classrooms.
 - b) **Program Direction.** The program has a group of faculty that meets regularly and communicates well. What is the vision for the future of the program? What process do you use for setting goals for the program?
 - c) **Assessment.** There are several instruments the program uses to gather different types of information, including the newly developed survey of supervising teachers. How is the program using the data to inform decisions about changes to the program? Is the program using this data to assess student SLOs each year? If so, what is the process for determining which SLOs will be focused on in more depth in a given year?
- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 3 recommended actions (see pages 11 – 12, point 4) related to program goals and assessment.
- 6) **Recommended Result:** *(Tentative) Continuation with minor concerns*
 - Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
 - Submit a progress report describing progress toward the Recommended Actions. Due dates are November 1, 2018 to the Dean of College of Education and Professional Studies and December 1, 2018 to the Chair of the Audit & Review Committee.
 - Next full self-study will be due in October 2020.
- 7) Adjourn.

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies

Undergraduate Programs, 2015-2016
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors

Date of Evaluation March 3, 2016 Short Self Study (SS*)

Program Teaching English as a Second Language Major Minor X

Evaluations submitted by: Angela Harlan, Corey Davis, Katy Casey, Joan Cook

Review meeting attended by: Angela Harlan, Corey Davis, Katy Casey, Joan 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	4
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	4
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	4
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	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

The program uses four assessments. Data is provided from 2011-2014 for most measures, and there is a detailed description of how assessment information is shared and how it is used to make program adjustments.

4. This area should contain a list of recommended actions and the responses to those actions in a concise form.

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	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
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	1
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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	3

Comments

2. "Develop an assessment instrument to evaluate competencies for teachers licensed to teach ESL or ESL and Bilingual Education" was listed as a goal, but not discussed further. Did the program develop such an instrument? If so, has it been used, or how do you plan to use it?
2. What was the assessment instrument that was developed?
3. The faculty in this program meet regularly to discuss goals and program logistics (e.g., field study, advising). However, there is not enough information provided to determine how the program

goals are set and reviewed.

4. Future goals related to creating an exit survey and policy regarding edTPA were identified. It is unclear what the program sees as the "next level," what is the vision (e.g., to prepare teacher candidates to work in increasingly diverse educational settings, to elevate knowledge and skills related to ESL methods in teacher candidate preparation)?
4. I don't see evidence of a longer-term 'vision' for the program. To what extent is this dictated by DPI, by the embedding of this program within other programs at UWW?
5. These are not program-level awards, but they are impressive!
5. The Project SWEETT-NPD grant is very impressive and has had a very positive influence on UWW and the region.
5. Faculty have applied for and have received multiple grants to further program development and outreach.
6. The report indicated that accreditation was NA.
6. Accreditation is available for ESL programs.

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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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	1
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

2. How often are courses in the minor taken for graduate credit? When they are taken for graduate credit, is it toward a degree program, for exam preparation, or other reasons?
2. There was not a description of the different expectations for undergraduates and graduates in the dual listed courses in the self-study. The expectations for graduate students were described in the attached syllabi. However, in instances where the graduate students were held to higher evaluation standards (e.g., 655, 310), the tools and methods used to evaluate were not provided. In other instances, the differential expectations were not clear.
3. Curricular decisions seemed to be based on data, but these data were not described- just noted as "faculty observations." It seems that the feedback from supervising teachers (in field studies and student teaching) is a valuable form of assessment and is being used as such but is not being labeled as such. Is such feedback sought/collected systematically? If not, could it be collected more formally and systematically?
3. Comments from supervising teachers, and faculty field supervisor observations are absolutely valuable sources of data, but it is difficult to tell if these comments and observations were structured, gathered systematically, or more sporadic. The new observation rubric should help a great deal by providing supervisors a systematic way to offer feedback, using a consistent format.
4. Students seem to have many opportunities to participate in activities beyond the classroom, but data on participation rates were not provided.
5. The report indicated this item was NA. Are there no online offerings for courses in this minor?

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

Comments

1. There is no indication that any SLO received attention during the review period.
1. The learning outcomes listed aren't really "learning outcomes" in the way we usually encourage programs to state outcomes, but I rated this as 'sufficient evidence' because the program must work within the constraints of the DPI standards. The sub-points within each standard are phrased in assess-able language (so I'm considering these as the actual program SLOs). There are more of these than we normally see but, again, I believe this is because of the need to work within DPI standards.
1. "Demonstrates working knowledge"--how is this defined? Do the assessment rubrics clarify what level is considered 'working knowledge'?
1. Good mapping of standard/outcome to courses to evidence/measures.
2. I'm not clear about how some of the standards are mapped to LEAP ELOs. For example, how is "demonstrates knowledge of the educational background of ELLs" related to information literacy? And how is "demonstrates deep understanding of the cultures of the students taught..." related to written communication? I understand that the assessment measure for this outcome is a paper, but the outcome itself doesn't seem to relate to written communication. Please clarify the relationship between the program SLO and the LEAP ELOs.
3. Each competency has a means of assessment associated, but what is the overall assessment plan?
3. Are all SLOs assessed every year? It would be helpful to the program to map out a year-by-year plan of which SLOs are assessed in which years OR (if all have to be assessed every year, and for every student--and given licensure requirements, this may be the case) which SLOs the program wants to focus special attention on during which years. There's nothing to keep the program from doing a deeper analysis of a specific SLO in a given year if they think it would be productive to do so (e.g., the oral communication skills that the preliminary data seem to indicate may be problematic for students).
4. The Evaluation rating rubric is clear, well-aligned with SLOs, and seems very useful. Who completes it? Only the supervising teacher, or do faculty do some observations too? I encourage the program to think about whether this rubric, or parts of it, could be used in other settings, on other assignments, earlier in students' training.
4. The direct assessments are good, especially given that this is a minor (good use of processes already in place to gather direct data). Would any sort of indirect data (e.g., surveys of students, of field

placement supervisors) add useful information?

- 4-5. I understand that the low passing rates on the language proficiency exam are not under the program's control, and it's a small N, but has there been any discussion of this issue? The low rates are very striking. If they continue, this issue must be addressed somewhere, perhaps including joint discussions with the other programs involved.
5. No information is provided regarding how the program faculty/staff make use of their data.
6. How are the assessment data shared with internal constituencies? DPI is not the only constituency with which the program should share results.

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

4-5. [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	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	2

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

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

Comments

1-2. There is no discussion of the vitality or sustainability of the program.

- 3. This program is a minor.
- 6. This doesn't seem to be a problem, but there really isn't any evidence given.
- 7. Why is 45 optimal enrollment? Explain how you came to this conclusion.

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)	3

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

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

Comments

- 1. This program is a minor.
- 3. Tracking is a goal. It would be good to provide some ideas for how to do that. How can campus offices (such as Career and Leadership; Alumni Office) help with this?

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

Comments

- 1. Might want to (re)list some of the HIPs that make the program unique (e.g., field study, international study opportunities).
- 1. There was not any information provided on competing programs.

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

Comments**IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement****1. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.**

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

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

Comments

Good scholarly activity

1. A maximum of 4 accomplishments per person should be listed.

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0

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

Comments

Impressive pursuit and receipt of grants from a variety of sources.
Very impressive!

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

Comments

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

Comments

Please give more information here to help support your request.
1. Faculty could use release time for DPI compliance.

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	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Classroom technology needs to be updated, and should be consistent between rooms. Winther classrooms do not have consistent instructional technology resources.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Program strengths are discussed.

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

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

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

Yes	0
No	4

Comments

All items in this category could use some more detail.

2 – 3. The program does not seem to have reflected on areas of improvement or where they would like to head over the next 5 - 10 years.

3. This would be a good place to list the tracking of graduates.

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

Meets a growing need in Wisconsin schools.

Lots of High Impact Practices.

Multicultural emphasis.

Faculty activity (teaching, scholarly activity) is strong.

Good collaboration with other CoEPS programs.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

Clarify alignment of SLOs with LEAP ELOs.

Need more evidence that decisions are made based on assessment material.

Need tracking of graduates.

Assessment work needs to continue. Progress has been made, need to continue to implement, evaluate and use the information.

3. Other comments/questions

How do you use the feedback from supervising teachers in program assessment? Would this be a valuable resource that you could include in the assessment plan?
Accreditation is available for ESL programs. Is it not available for this minor?

4. Recommended Actions

1. Create a clear vision for the future of the program and establish a process for setting goals for the program.
2. Assessment:
 - a. Develop a clear assessment plan, making decisions about which specific SLOs to focus on more closely each year. For example, if using the DPI competencies as SLOs, focus on one or two of these competencies each year.
 - b. Fully implement the assessments.
 - c. Develop and clearly articulate a process for the program to regularly review and discuss data, and make data-based decisions.
 - d. Develop efficient strategies to track how data are used to improve the program.
3. Work with the Dean's office to equip classrooms with consistent, updated technology.

5. Recommended Result*

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
Continuation without qualification	0
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	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

*A progress report describing progress toward the Recommended Actions is due by November 1, 2018 to the Dean of College of Education and Professional Studies, and by December 1, 2018 to the Chair of the Audit & Review Committee. The program's next full self-study is due October 1, 2020.

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

Due to circumstances surrounding COVID-19, this program did not have a Follow-Up meeting for their 2019-2020 review. The document below is considered the program's follow-up report for the 2019-20 audit and review cycle. Please refer to a document on our website titled "Audit and Review and COVID" for further information.

Program Name: Teaching English as a Second Language Minor

Date of Review Team Meeting: November 21, 2019

Date of Follow-Up Meeting: Cancelled Time Cancelled Location: Cancelled

Evaluations submitted by: Dale Splinter, Denise Roseland, Hephzibah Kumpaty, Catherine Chan, Katy Casey

Review meeting attended by: Dale Splinter, Denise Roseland, Hephzibah Kumpaty, Catherine Chan, Katy Casey

Recommendation #1

Create a clear vision for the future of the program and establish a process for setting goals for the program.

Recommendation #1 Overall Evaluation

Good Progress	1
Making Progress	3
Little/No Progress	1

Comments related to recommendation #1

- I commend the faculty for taking the time to meet and discuss future directions of the program. It seems there would be a vision and process in place at the end of a full-day meeting. The assessment work is critical and should be completed having decided on a vision for the program and goals. I did not feel the response provided sufficiently addressed the recommended action.
- It is great to have begun the process for establishing program goals and objectives, and it is understood that they may need periodic discussion/evaluation for possible revisions. Even though what the program has currently is a draft, please share that with the reviewers to help with evaluation.
- This is an interdisciplinary program and the coordinators, Jenna Cushing-Leubner, Susan Huss-Lederman, Olesya Ostapenko, and Melanie Schneider, had been in periodic meetings to discuss the vision and goal setting process to gather assessment data.
- The coordinators attended the "August 2019 assessment institute" and drafted an assessment plan for TESL/BE licensure program. Their goal is to have it approved by the faculty for implementation in the next audit and review cycle (UW-W Assessment institute team action plans, Aug 2019 document from appendix).
- Participation in the Assessment Institute appears to have been worthwhile.
- I see discussion and evidence of setting clear goals but am unclear from the information provided to this recommendation that a process for setting goals has been established.

Recommendation #2

Assessment: a. Develop assessment plan, making decisions about which specific SLOs to focus on more closely each year. For example, if using the DPI competencies as SLOs, focus on one or two of these competencies each year. b. Fully implement the assessments. c. Develop and clearly articulate a process for the program to regularly review and discuss data, and make data-based decisions. d. Develop efficient strategies to track how data are used to improve the program.

Recommendation #2 Overall Evaluation

Good Progress	2
Making Progress	3
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #2

- Progress is being made in this area. It is clear faculty are committed to creating a plan for measuring student outcomes.
- I commend the program for making great strides in its assessment efforts!
- Making good progress here. The program has a draft assessment plan articulated which was developed through participation in the 2019-20 Assessment Institute. The draft shows action plan outline with goals and timelines, assessment tools and strategies, data collection, analysis and dissemination.
- These programs plan to implement the assessment plan in the coming year and beyond. Two assessments, an ESL Field Study, and a reflective narrative on a professional development activity were conducted but the report doesn't have any data yet.
- Evidence for other SLOs and how to document them are in progress.
- Work in progress...the program is yet to implement the assessment plan fully and collect data on all SLOs.
- Their plan is to set aside two monthly meetings to review and analyze the data going forward.
- Through continued participation in the assessment institute (next meeting in January 2020), the team of instructors in this minor hope to implement the assessment plan fully and collect and discuss the data for program improvement.
- Progress is ongoing. Presentation of data is the next step, I assume.
- Looks like via the Assessment Institute, you are making great progress here!

Recommendation #3

Work with the Dean's office to equip classrooms with consistent, updated technology.

Recommendation #3 Overall Evaluation

Good Progress	4
Making Progress	1
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #3

- Addressed
- Congratulations on getting updated technology and furniture in the classrooms.
- Good Progress
- Do you need additional updated technology?

Recommendations for next review. Additional progress reports required?

Yes, Please List Due Dates (e.g. in 1 year, 2 years)?	0
No	5

Next report should specifically address the following:

1. Continue work on recommendation #1 from the previous report: Create a clear vision for the future of the program and establish a process for setting goals for the program.
2. The program has done a decent job of creating an assessment plan being inclusive of both the college and DPI requirements for licensure in SLO development. The program needs to fully implement the assessment plan and start collecting data on SLOs. b. As you move forward, consider expanding the curriculum map as a way of figuring out whether all SLOs are fully tracked in the curricular and co-curricular activities. Consider supplementing additional embedded assessments and scoring rubrics as needed to track SLO achievement. c. Do these SLOs represent all the emphases in the licensure area? May need to identify specific SLOs for each emphasis (TESL, TESL Bilingual-Bicultural and TESL Adult) within the ESL/BE minor.

Additional comments:

I am hopeful that at the progress report follow-up meeting, the program will be able to better address the first recommendation.

*****Next FULL Self-Study is to the College Deans by October 1, 2020 and to the Office of Academic Assessment by November 1, 2020.***