UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MILWAUKEE ACADEMIC

PROGRAM AND CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

AUDIT AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Audit and Review of Undergraduate Programs

The audit and review of undergraduate programs at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee was established by action of the Faculty Senate on April 17, 1975 (Fac. Doc. No. 907A; amended by Senate Executive Committee May 30, 1975). The authority for audit and review was vested in the Academic Program and Curriculum Committee (APCC), which is to perform its duties relevant to audit and review in cooperation with the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Section I. Guidelines

A. Schedule for Review

Undergraduate programs shall be reviewed in accordance with the Program Review and Accreditation Schedule that can be found at http://www4.uwm.edu/acad_aff/academic/. Program chairs shall be notified by the chair of the APCC of the imminent review no later than January preceding the academic year of the review. Program chairs shall oversee the information-gathering and program assessment in order to meet the October 1 deadline for the Self-Evaluation report. Official data from the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research will be updated annually by September 1 and available online. The reports needed for this self-evaluation are Department profiles located at http://www4.uwm.edu/oair/Department_Toolkit/department-profiles.cfm.

B. Self-Evaluation Report

The chairs of the programs under review shall oversee the compilation of the Self-Evaluation Report (see Section II) and its submission to the APCC by October 1 of the review year. The ultimate responsibility for the report shall rest with the program chair as its executive officer. The program report shall be sent to the dean or director of the program under review, who may attach additional information or interpretative comments prior to forwarding the program's report to the APCC. Even with the addition of the dean or director to the routing process of the report, the deadline remains October 1.

C. Formation of the Audit and Review Subcommittee

The Vice Chancellor shall appoint members of the audit and review subcommittee upon recommendation from the chair of the APCC. Each subcommittee shall consist of a chair selected from current members of the APCC and two (2) persons selected from related departments or academic areas at UWM. Programs shall indicate three (3) related programs or academic areas from which faculty members are to be chosen to review their undergraduate programs.

D. <u>Functions of the Audit and Review Subcommittee</u>

The Audit and Review Subcommittee shall review the program's Self-Evaluation Report and the official data from the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research (see Section II). The subcommittee shall be expected to meet with the program faculty, staff, and students, to assess students' evaluations, to consult with the dean or director of the unit under review, and to make contact with alumnae/i. The subcommittee shall have the responsibility of preparing a report to the APCC. The report shall be forwarded to the APCC, with copies directed to the chair of the program being reviewed and to the appropriate dean or director.

E. <u>Formation of the Final Report</u>

In hearings before the APCC, the program under review and the appropriate dean or director shall have an opportunity to respond, orally or in writing, to the report and recommendations of the subcommittee and to propose amendments and modifications. Drawing upon the work of the audit and review subcommittee and the responses from the program and the dean or directors, the APCC shall prepare or certify a final report with appropriate recommendations to be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor, with a copy to the dean or director, and, if faculty action is required, to the UWM Faculty Senate.

F. <u>Follow-up Reviews</u>

Two years after closure of the full-scale review, the APCC Vice-Chair will contact the Department Chair or equivalent (Program Chair for interdisciplinary programs not housed in a single department) to obtain a progress report on implementation of the recommendations adopted by the APCC. Satisfactory progress in implementation of those recommendations is reported to the Committee. If the APCC finds that the progress toward implementation is not satisfactory, it shall consider appropriate recommendations and call for subsequent follow-up reports.

The APCC will also request a mid-cycle status report five years after the full-scale review. Programs that are professionally accredited could opt to synchronize the submission of the report with the re-accreditation report.

Follow-up reviews will be done as reviews of documents submitted by the program.

Section II. Undergraduate Program Review Guide

Area	Standards adopted by APCC 9/02	Evidence presented by the Unit in the self-evaluation report. Recommended length of narrative: 10 pages.	Focus of the audit team. Recommended length of audit report: four pages.
Introduction General Data		1. Name and describe the program and its place within the unit and the mission of the University. Include any special contributions. 2. Describe the organization of the unit as it relates to the undergraduate program. Note the relationship with related units/programs. 3. Describe the mechanisms for governance of the program, and student involvement, including committee membership and participation in curricular policy making. 4. Address the currency and relevance of courses and programs and the need for the program.	Consult with dean or director of unit under review. Meet with group responsible for program governance. Include student representatives if at all possible. Review exhibits, documents, and materials that support and augment the unit's report.
Accreditation & Review		1. List the appropriate accrediting body(ies) for the program and the dates of the latest and next accreditation reviews. Supply copies of latest accreditation report, or appropriate abstract if school or college was reviewed as one unit (exhibit). 2. Discuss the steps that were taken to implement the recommendations of the latest APCC review. Provide copies of that review (exhibit). 3. Provide copies of assessments, if any, of the program and its graduates (whenever appropriate).	
Faculty	A. Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff are qualified and in sufficient numbers to provide relevant quality learning experiences.	1. Identify requirements for and responsibilities of faculty and instructional academic staff. 2. List current members of the faculty by name, rank, teaching, and research specialization. 3. Describe changes in program faculty, including additions, non-retentions, retirements, resignations, etc., that have occurred over the past 7 years. 4. List current members of the instructional academic staff by name, rank, teaching specialization, and percentage. 5. Clearly articulate role of part-time faculty. 6. List the number of publications over the last 7 years by monographs, chapters, articles, creative expressions, and presentations. 7. Describe contributions to professional and community service activities.	Meet with program faculty/staff. Review curriculum vitae of faculty and instructional academic staff, particularly of those involved with the undergraduate program. Review exhibits of faculty work.

Area	Standard	Self-Evaluation Report	Audit Team
Faculty (Continued)	B. At least 25% of total tenure/tenure track faculty time is committed to the undergraduate program.	Trend faculty numbers and percentage involvement over the past 7 years.	Review Department Profile information including faculty workload, and number and dollar amount of research proposals submitted and awarded over the past 7 years.
Students	There are adequate numbers of qualified students for meaningful cohorts to meet learning objectives.	1. Define qualified students, and identify cohorts of majors and submajors*. 2. Trend number of majors enrolled, student credit hours, and enrollment in upper and lower division courses over the past 7 years. 3. Assess trends in application and enrollment over the past 7 years. 4. Attend to minority, disadvantaged students.	Review Instructional Capacity Analysis data or comparable exhibits that include curricular area code, course number and title, enrollments, semester offered, frequency of course offerings, FTE students conveyed by year compared to courses offered.
Curriculum	A. There is an organized and coherent sequence of course work that prepares students to meet the educational goals of the program, secure appropriate employment, and pursue graduate study.	1. Identify the educational goals/outcomes of the program. 2. Explain the organization of courses, credits, and sequencing within the program. 3. Explain the organization of courses, credits, and sequencing within submajors. 4. Describe how course content and activities help students meet course objectives. 5. Describe the program delivery options available. 6. Attach current undergraduate bulletin copy and copies of printed program information including catalogues, brochures, etc.	Include related discussions as part of the faculty/staff meeting, and the student meeting. Review the Course Offering list of undergraduate and U/G courses offered in the past three academic years.
	B. Learning outcomes reflect expected workforce competencies.	Explain how educational goals/outcomes of the program prepare students for employment.	
Resources	There are sufficient resources to meet program needs: A. For assisting students.	1. Describe and assess advising procedures and placement support. 2. Describe procedures for requesting financial assistance. Give brief history and data on support provided.	Include related discussions as part of student meeting, and faculty/staff meeting. Meet with advisors and financial officers, as appropriate.

*The UWS definition of a "submajor" includes all sub-programs requiring 15 credits or more in a particular field. Includes all of the following terms: minor; area of interest; specialization; area; concentration; emphasis; field; focus; option; sequence; track.

Area	Standard	Self-Evaluation Report	Audit Team
Resources (Continued)	B. To provide for program stability.	1. Describe the program's budget history and fiscal viability over the past 7 years. 2. Comment on patterns of total salaries, capital, and supply expenditures over the past 7 years. Discuss the allotment of those expenditures to undergraduate instruction.	Review budget documents, including planning documents and their updating and the Department Profile. Observations, including a tour, may be appropriate.
	C. For facilities and space within the university.	1. List space and facilities requirements for the program and assess adequacy of current allocation. 2. List research and teaching equipment available for the program and assess adequacy. 3. Describe procedure for recommending additions to the UWM Library holdings. Assess adequacy of library resources for students and faculty.	
	D. For facilities and space outside the university.	1. List space and facilities being used for the undergraduate program off-campus and assess adequacy. 2. List research and teaching equipment being used for the undergraduate program off-campus and assess adequacy.	
Evaluation	A. An evaluation process that involves students, faculty, graduates, and community members, as appropriate, is in place and the data gathered is used to monitor the program and direct its changes.	1. Describe evaluation process and identify the measures used to collect data. 2. Display some of the data received and indicate use in monitoring the program. 3. Provide a summary of findings from the most recent cycle of assessment of student achievement of program learning goals/outcomes. 4. Report how assessment data trends are used to improve or modify program. Data may include but are not limited to: course evaluations by students, evaluation of the program by graduates, the unit's systematic program evaluation data, minutes of curriculum meetings, community members' assessments of graduates. Such information should be available for review by the audit team.	Meeting with faculty/staff to discuss perceptions, strengths, weaknesses, and future of the program. Meeting with students to discuss their perceptions of their program. Other mechanisms for securing student input may be needed. An example might be an e-mail survey. Contact with alumnae/i presents same challenges as do students. Again, an e-mail survey might be appropriate. Review evaluation data, committee minutes, and other exhibits.

Area	Standard	Self-Evaluation Report	Audit Team
Evaluation (Continued)	B. 90% of students complete the program within 5 years.	Report graduation data and degrees awarded trended over past 7 years.	
	C. 75% of graduates have satisfactory employment within 1 year of graduation.	1. Describe the current employment opportunities for graduates of the program. Include trends and projections. 2. Report employment data trended over past 7 years.	
	D. Relevant credential, if any, achieved within 1 year of graduation.	Report credentialing data trended over past 7 years, if appropriate.	
Summary		1. Discuss the major strengths and particular characteristics of the program. (Compare this program with other institutions' programs, if appropriate.) 2. Indicate any weaknesses or deficiencies. 3. Suggest resources that would be needed to eliminate the deficiencies. 4. Comment on faculty workload relevant to program objectives. What needs, if any, exist? What plans are there to meet these needs? 5. Describe plans for the next 5 years.	The report must include specific recommendations to strengthen, maintain, consolidate, reorganize, or phase out the academic program. Evaluation of the standards and the unit's summary should provide the needed support for the recommendation.