## UW-Eau Claire Academic Master Plan

### EFFECTIVE STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>METRICS</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>WHO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of Student Learning and Academic Programs</strong></td>
<td>Require all academic departments to participate in assessment activities in the Liberal Education Core and academic programs.</td>
<td>Expect all faculty and instructional academic staff to participate in assessment activities in the Liberal Education Core and academic programs.</td>
<td>Develop language for DEP’s</td>
<td>1-Jun-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add participation in assessment activities to the Strategic Accountability Matrix (SAM) categories.</td>
<td>Integrate language into DEP’s</td>
<td>Assessment metric added to SAM</td>
<td>Begin January: complete May 15, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide additional professional development regarding the role of assessment in building and maintaining excellence in curriculum and instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Integrate into other professional development?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine the program review process to focus on program-level planning to address priorities identified in this Academic Master Plan.</td>
<td>Revise self-study template to include plans for addressing priorities identified in this Academic Master Plan for the review cycle beginning spring semester 2017.</td>
<td>Revised self-study template</td>
<td>End of spring semester</td>
<td>Mary Hoffman in consultation with APC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revise review report template to review program plans for addressing priorities identified in this Academic Master Plan for the review cycle beginning spring semester 2017.</td>
<td>Revised report template</td>
<td>End of spring semester</td>
<td>Mary Hoffman in consultation with APC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
<td>METRICS</td>
<td>WHEN</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Workload and Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a flexible faculty workload plan to attract and retain faculty and to support academic excellence.</td>
<td>As outlined in the Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures (FASRP), affirm (at the semester level) 12 credit hours of teaching as the base for faculty workload and 15 credit hours of teaching as the base for instructional academic staff workload.</td>
<td>This item will be folded into the model and the guideline.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Mike Carney, Faculty Personnel Committee, AMP Implementation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish alternative workload models for the 15-credit load among teaching, research, and service. Alternative models must continue to meet University needs for overall student credit hours.</td>
<td>Implementation of the alternative model</td>
<td>End of plan period</td>
<td>Provost and Deans with faculty work groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish universal guidelines, criteria, and processes for workload considerations such as the use of contact hours versus credit hours, jumbo sections, student-faculty ratios, class sizes, reassignment time, and overload policy.</td>
<td>Guidelines established</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Mike Carney, Stéphanie Jamelske, Andy Nelson, Rapid Action Task Force Report, EAB research, Faculty Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop universal process for yearly documentation of faculty and instructional academic staff workload.</td>
<td>1. Process established 2. 100% of departments using new guidelines (above) and submitting workload documentation annually (semesterly?) to deans</td>
<td>1. December 2017 2. December 2018</td>
<td>Tim Vaughan, Andy Nelson, Robin Beeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide professional development for using a variety of instructional methods to meet the needs of all students.</td>
<td>Topics are identified for teaching methods workshops and strategies to increase participation.</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Linda Young, Deans and CETL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide time and professional development to faculty and staff for innovative efforts that align with “Creating our Future: UW-Eau Claire Strategic Plan 2016-2020” and this Academic Master Plan.</td>
<td>1. Catalog professional development needs relevant to AMP 2. Work with CETL to develop programming for launch in Spring 2018.</td>
<td>May 2017 Spring 2018</td>
<td>Linda Young, Deans and CETL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require professional development in equity, diversity, and inclusivity for all faculty and staff to increase competence regarding cultural diversity, sexual identity and global awareness.</td>
<td>100% of Academic Affairs personnel have completed Tier 1 EDI professional development</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>EDI Fellows, EDO, and Implementation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a Council on Scholarly Activity to support faculty development in a range of scholarly activities.</td>
<td>Council will have been formed and met</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>Mary Hoffman, Karen Havholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revise faculty and instructional academic staff review processes.</td>
<td>Revise department evaluation plans and department personnel committee processes in order to create more efficiencies.</td>
<td>Materials revised and approved</td>
<td>December 2017 Mike Carney, Faculty Personnel Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revise faculty and staff evaluations to include recognition, reward, and expectation of contributions to equity, diversity, and inclusivity.</td>
<td>100% of departments have EDI language in plans</td>
<td>June 2018 Deans, Shared Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a sustainable, institutional compensation fund to address faculty and staff pay equity and compression, and to provide for merit increases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Undergraduate Program Array

**Evaluate and revise the undergraduate program array in a manner that enhances the reputation of UW-Eau Claire and meets the changing needs of society.**

**Conduct a review of the undergraduate program array.**  
- Academic Affairs will identify the initial scope of screening by considering each of the following. The intent is to cast a relatively broad net to identify programs for further screening.  
  - Majors (by emphasis) that fall into the lower quartile in number of **admitted freshmen and transfer students**  
  - Majors (by emphasis) that fall into the lower quartile:  
    - enrolled new freshmen and transfer students  
    - all enrolled majors  
  - Majors (by emphasis) that fall into the lower quartile in number of graduates per year  
  - Majors, minors or certificates that offer a course array in which more than 25% of class sections have a class size of 10 or fewer.  
  - Departments and academic programs with majors, emphases, minors, or certificates being reviewed will be invited to respond to the review.  
  - Academic Affairs will make one of the following recommendations concerning each identified program or emphasis, using shared governance processes where appropriate:  
    - Continue the program as is, subject to usual program review procedures and timelines.  
    - Streamline course offerings in relation to student demand.  
    - Develop or contribute to cross-disciplinary majors in order to boost enrollment and class sizes within the area.  
    - Redirect program resources to develop new programs in the discipline that will be more attractive to students or better address needs.  
    - Modify the role of the program in the array to suspend or eliminate majors, minors, emphases, or certificates.

**Apply the following criteria in the review.**  
- Academic Footprint: How many students does the program code in question serve through declared majors, minors, or certificates? How many students graduate from the program each year? What other roles does the program play in the curriculum?  
- Attractiveness to Students: How many new students declare a major in the program? Are students initially attracted to the major retained to graduation at UW-Eau Claire?  
- Low Enrollment Courses: How many and what low enrollment courses are currently needed to meet requirements in the program? Is there a pedagogical or strategic need for low enrollment in these courses?  
- Ability to Address Existing or Future Needs: Does the program meet identifiable needs that signal continuing demand?  
- Program Reputation: Does the program enhance the University’s reputation in a manner that attracts students to campus? Does it support campus priorities such as EDI initiatives and HIPs? Is the program crucial to the mission and vision of the University?  
- Student Success: Do students complete the program in a timely manner? Do students of color complete the program at rates similar to majority students? Do students achieve post-graduation success in licensure, employment, or graduate or professional school admission?

**Utilize the program review process to identify opportunities for continuous improvement and program modernization.** Program design should be attentive to student demand and societal needs, while maintaining the core value of instilling liberal education principles throughout all programs.

**PRIORITY** | **ACTIONS** | **METRICS** | **WHEN** | **WHO**
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
**Undergraduate Program Array** | Conduct a review of the undergraduate program array.  
- Academic Affairs will identify the initial scope of screening by considering each of the following. The intent is to cast a relatively broad net to identify programs for further screening.  
  - Majors (by emphasis) that fall into the lower quartile in number of **admitted freshmen and transfer students**  
  - Majors (by emphasis) that fall into the lower quartile:  
    - enrolled new freshmen and transfer students  
    - all enrolled majors  
  - Majors (by emphasis) that fall into the lower quartile in number of graduates per year  
  - Majors, minors or certificates that offer a course array in which more than 25% of class sections have a class size of 10 or fewer.  
  - Departments and academic programs with majors, emphases, minors, or certificates being reviewed will be invited to respond to the review.  
  - Academic Affairs will make one of the following recommendations concerning each identified program or emphasis, using shared governance processes where appropriate:  
    - Continue the program as is, subject to usual program review procedures and timelines.  
    - Streamline course offerings in relation to student demand.  
    - Develop or contribute to cross-disciplinary majors in order to boost enrollment and class sizes within the area.  
    - Redirect program resources to develop new programs in the discipline that will be more attractive to students or better address needs.  
    - Modify the role of the program in the array to suspend or eliminate majors, minors, emphases, or certificates. | 1. Scope finalized  
2. Data compiled and delivered to Academic Affairs/Deans  
3. Initial screen to identify programs for further review  
4. Conduct review based on established criteria  
5. Initial recommendation  
6. Program response to review  
7. Final recommendation | 1. Feb 2017  
2. Feb 2017  
3. Mar 2017  
4. Aug 2017  
5. Aug 2017  
6. Oct 2017  
7. Dec 2017 | Provost, Deans, AMP Implementation Team

**Evaluate and revise the undergraduate program array in a manner that enhances the reputation of UW-Eau Claire and meets the changing needs of society.**  
- Apply the following criteria in the review.  
  - Academic Footprint: How many students does the program code in question serve through declared majors, minors, or certificates? How many students graduate from the program each year? What other roles does the program play in the curriculum?  
  - Attractiveness to Students: How many new students declare a major in the program? Are students initially attracted to the major retained to graduation at UW-Eau Claire?  
  - Low Enrollment Courses: How many and what low enrollment courses are currently needed to meet requirements in the program? Is there a pedagogical or strategic need for low enrollment in these courses?  
  - Ability to Address Existing or Future Needs: Does the program meet identifiable needs that signal continuing demand?  
  - Program Reputation: Does the program enhance the University’s reputation in a manner that attracts students to campus? Does it support campus priorities such as EDI initiatives and HIPs? Is the program crucial to the mission and vision of the University?  
  - Student Success: Do students complete the program in a timely manner? Do students of color complete the program at rates similar to majority students? Do students achieve post-graduation success in licensure, employment, or graduate or professional school admission?

**Utilize the program review process to identify opportunities for continuous improvement and program modernization.** Program design should be attentive to student demand and societal needs, while maintaining the core value of instilling liberal education principles throughout all programs.

**PRIORITY** | **ACTIONS** | **METRICS** | **WHEN** | **WHO**
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
**Undergraduate Program Array** | Apply the following criteria in the review.  
- Academic Footprint: How many students does the program code in question serve through declared majors, minors, or certificates? How many students graduate from the program each year? What other roles does the program play in the curriculum?  
- Attractiveness to Students: How many new students declare a major in the program? Are students initially attracted to the major retained to graduation at UW-Eau Claire?  
- Low Enrollment Courses: How many and what low enrollment courses are currently needed to meet requirements in the program? Is there a pedagogical or strategic need for low enrollment in these courses?  
- Ability to Address Existing or Future Needs: Does the program meet identifiable needs that signal continuing demand?  
- Program Reputation: Does the program enhance the University’s reputation in a manner that attracts students to campus? Does it support campus priorities such as EDI initiatives and HIPs? Is the program crucial to the mission and vision of the University?  
- Student Success: Do students complete the program in a timely manner? Do students of color complete the program at rates similar to majority students? Do students achieve post-graduation success in licensure, employment, or graduate or professional school admission? |  |  | AVC, Shared Governance

**Year 2**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM ARRAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIORITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize efficiency and effectiveness of the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Program Array</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revamp infrastructure, policies, and procedures to better support graduate programming.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Instructional Resource Allocation | Use centralized position authority to critically evaluate instructional resource needs and allocate these resources guided by the decision-making principles described above. | Implement a transparent process by which Academic Affairs allocates new instructional resources by holistic evaluation of the following information:  
- Position description including the disciplinary area covered by the new hire.  
- Narrative addressing how the proposed position will:  
  * Help the University meet its 100/90/50/20 strategic guideposts.  
  * Sustain core disciplinary and pedagogical principles of the department such as lab experiences, strategic smaller class sizes, and graduate versus undergraduate curriculum, and address emerging trends in pedagogy or the discipline that are not covered by current resources.  
  * Benefit other programs and areas within the college and University, if relevant.  
  * Enhance relationships with external constituencies, including employers.  
  * Help meet accreditation or other external constituency requirements, if relevant.  
- Meet departmental and University needs as reflected by SCH and SCH/FTE data and by SAM metrics associated with the program's underlying drivers and values.  
  - Underlying driver metrics include:  
    * Number of undergraduate majors including second majors.  
    * Number of graduate students, if relevant.  
    * Number of minors and undergraduate certificate students.  
    * Number of yearly degrees conferred.  
    * Number of students enrolled in courses to meet the requirements of other programs or the Liberal Education Core.  
  - Value metrics include:  
    * Number of declared majors for incoming students.  
    * Number of high impact practices per instructional FTE.  
    * Percentage of majors participating in high impact practices.  
    * Student progression metrics in SAM.  
    * Student demographic metrics in SAM.  
    * Post-baccalaureate success metrics. | 1. Develop a standardized format for resource allocation request.  
  a. Data (produced by who)  
  b. Narrative  
  2. Formalize timeline and process for allocating resources.  
  a. Roles of department/chair  
  b. Role of deans  
  c. Role of colleges  
  d. Roles of academic affairs committee  
  3. Review dashboard and criteria for completeness and relevance.  
  4. Review dashboard for ease of use by producer and users. | 1. & 2. Complete by end of March 2017 | 1. & 2. Recommend subcommittee of deans and provost's staff |