

I. Mission Centrality: *Provide data, evidence, and commentary to address the following:*

I.1 *The program supports the purpose (mission), vision and strategic goals of UW-Eau Claire.*

What does this mean?

The purpose and mission to which this refers is the “lived mission” for our campus. As a byproduct of the HLC self-study, it has become obvious that most individuals on campus cannot quote our existing mission statement, but they *can* articulate a clear description of our shared commitment. This lived mission is at the heart of what we do at UW-Eau Claire and is a powerful, pervasive and guiding force. When asked to articulate our mission, faculty and staff say it is:

- Student learning and success
- Teaching effectiveness
- A distinctive, transformative student experience
- Faculty/student interaction
- A focus on liberal education
- Professional programs that serve our region
- Primarily undergraduate with focused, strong graduate programs
- Experiential, globally-focused learning
- Community engagement
- Facilitative of lifelong learning
- Preparing students to be effective, engaged citizens of a global society
- Undergraduate research opportunities
- Providing excellent quality for exceptional value

This lived mission is the basis for our mission centrality criteria. While individuals may debate the choice of words, the core meaning of the above list is our shared understanding and commitment. This is the purpose and mission which should be used to frame your response.

In addition, the vision and strategic goals to which this question refers are those articulated in the Centennial Plan.

Red → Program demonstrates direct link to (and outcomes that advance) our purpose, vision, and goals.

Blue → Program has little or no link to our purpose, vision, and goals.

I.2 *The program’s learning goals and outcomes align with and support the UW-Eau Claire Liberal Education Learning Goals & Outcomes or graduate program goals*

What does this mean?

Each program is expected to have program (major) specific goals and outcomes. This question asks you to describe the extent to which these program specific goals and outcomes align with, or can be argued to support, the “new” Liberal Education Learning Goals and Outcomes [see <http://www.uwec.edu/assess/goals/goalsBac.htm>], or for graduate programs, the UW-Eau Claire graduate program goals [see <http://www.uwec.edu/graduate/documents/MISSION%20AND%20OUTCOMES.pdf>].

If your department has not aligned its goals and outcomes with the new Liberal Education Learning Goals and Outcomes or outcomes for graduate programs, describe the efforts you have made to date and how many of your faculty members use the goals.

Red → Program has aligned its learning goals with the Liberal Education Learning Goals & Outcomes (or graduate program goals, as appropriate); all faculty are familiar with and using the University’s goals.

Blue → Program has done little to link its learning goals with the Liberal Education Learning Goals & Outcomes (or graduate program goals, as appropriate); faculty are unfamiliar with or do not use the University’s goals.

1.3 The program contributes to other programs (undergraduate, graduate, and student support), across campus – for example, general education, supporting courses, interdisciplinary programs, others.

What does this mean?

Many programs have significant roles to play in support of other programs across campus. This question asks you to describe how extensive this is – in GE, in interdisciplinary programs (please name them), or as support for other majors on campus (please describe how), etc. And one measure of contribution is the extent to which faculty time is invested in this support. If the program has little role in GE or in support of other programs, then an answer like “this program does not support either GE or other programs” would be an honest one.

- Red →** All faculty/staff are involved in contributing to other programs; graduation requirements needed by other programs are offered and supported by tenured or tenure-track faculty; contributions represent a significant part of the program’s activities.
- Blue →** Program serves only its majors; contributions to other programs seem a lower priority, perhaps made only by adjuncts or LTE; contributions to other programs involve minimal faculty time.

1.4 The program’s graduates meet identifiable regional and state needs.

What does this mean?

As departments and majors at a regional, comprehensive university, many of our programs are expected to serve the needs of our region and state. This question asks you to describe the extent to which this is true of your program(s) and their graduates. What is the region? Define this as you see fit, but please describe what “region” you are using, and why you chose it. Also, are your graduates sought, either for their professional specialization or for your program’s contribution to their liberal education? If you have data or evidence that shows you meet regional need, be sure to include that – including a summary of key conclusions drawn from surveys of alumni and employers in the region, or externally generated trend data.

- Red →** Surveys (employer/alumni, etc.) indicate regional/state demand and satisfaction either with graduates’ specific preparation or with their general liberal-education background; graduates are consistently offered jobs in their field or in a closely related field; external trend data indicate regional/state demand (through legislative funding, donations or business/civic indicators).
- Blue →** No employer/alumni data available or provided; graduates do not find field-related jobs, or they find jobs outside the region/state; external trend data indicate little demand, or data are not available.

1.5 The program’s outreach, community service, and other external linkages support the cultural, educational, and economic development of the region.

What does this mean?

Many programs serve our region and the state in ways beyond just producing graduates who meet regional and state needs. This question asks you to describe how your program(s) serve the region in these other ways. For example, you might write about supporting culture in the community (including art, music, dance, etc.), or the economic development of the region, or the continuing education needs of the community (classes, workshops, etc.). All of these should be framed from the “outreach” perspective – how does the program serve the region via outreach? As much as possible, provide quantitative data regarding the impact of your program.

- Red →** Program has active formal and/or informal linkages with external communities and produces a measurable impact on its communities through its faculty, staff and/or students.
- Blue →** Program is focused internally, with no active linkages to external communities and no measurable impact on the community.

II. Quality: *Provide data, evidence, and commentary to address the following:*

II.1 *As a characteristic part of its academic offerings, the program provides experiences and a high degree of student/faculty interaction that lead to transformative learning.*

What does this mean?

Transformative learning, whether via an incremental process or an extraordinary moment of discovery, involves students being challenged to critically examine views, to being open to alternative perspectives, and perhaps even to changing the way they see or do things. And for our campus, we expect much of that learning to occur as a direct consequence of intentional faculty and student interactions – both inside and outside the classroom. Some of the elements in our “lived mission” may be good indicators of transformative learning. But there are surely others as well. This question asks you to describe those *intentional* experiences and interactions in your program that lead to transformative learning.

Red → Program provides many transformative learning experiences through a wide range of opportunities involving direct faculty and student interactions both inside and outside the classroom; the majority of its faculty and many of its students are engaged in these activities annually; pedagogy is varied, innovative and supports equity.

Blue → Program provides few opportunities for transformative learning, and faculty and student interactions are limited in number and scope; few faculty and few students are engaged in collaborative activities; pedagogy is traditional, tending to focus on transmission of content rather than engagement with learners.

II.2 *The curriculum is modern and well-developed, and appropriate to the breadth, depth, and level of the discipline as judged by reviews, accreditations, external awards, etc.*

What does this mean?

Maintaining a modern curriculum is important, and being active in assessing and evaluating the curriculum (on a regular basis) by comparing it to available quality benchmarks is one way that can be ensured. This question asks you to describe how you can be sure that your program is a modern and well-developed one, without resorting to a simple “we just know it is” response.

Red → Program is accredited (if relevant); has been recognized by its disciplinary peers; has received awards for its quality and/or been cited by external reviewers; the curriculum is distinguished by rigor and innovation; the program is known within the region or state for its quality.

Blue → Program is not accredited and has received little or no external recognition for quality, rigor, or innovation.

II.3 *The program demonstrates and promotes equity, diversity, and inclusiveness in its hiring, recruitment and retention, curriculum and pedagogy.*

What does this mean?

We are committed to promoting diversity in our staffing – in those we recruit, hire, and retain. Just as important, we are committed to promoting and demonstrating equity and inclusivity in our daily work, our teaching, and our curriculum and pedagogy. And participation is encouraged and success is obtained through the representation and valuing of multiple perspectives, which include race, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, ethnicity, age, and disability, in the people we employ and/or through pedagogies and materials we use. Because a quality program fosters a healthy workplace free from discrimination, and it recognizes the importance of actively moving toward greater equity for all individuals, this question asks you to describe the ways in which you demonstrate and promote E (equity), D (diversity), and I (inclusivity) as both separate and interacting values and practices.

Red → The program’s faculty and staff are diverse and actively recruit diverse candidate pools; diverse students are recruited and retained; the curriculum includes courses specifically focused on diversity, and inclusive, multi-cultural perspectives are infused throughout the courses; pedagogy supports diverse learners; diverse perspectives are regularly included and valued in decision making and implementation of policies and practices.

Blue → The program's faculty and staff are not diverse and recent hiring has not involved diverse candidate pools; no demonstrated effort is made to recruit or retain diverse students; diverse curriculum is limited to few if any courses; pedagogy is traditional; decisions are made without careful and thoughtful inclusion of diverse worldviews.

II.4 *The program assessment process is well developed, adequately documented with measurable student learning outcomes, and used to improve the program and student learning.*

What does this mean?

A sound assessment process is one that is regular, formalized (and documented), uses data to inform an evaluation of the learning outcomes, and then uses the resulting evaluation to take actions for improvement. A program with measurable student learning outcomes and a formal process for assessing the extent to which those outcomes are met is one that is likely to ensure quality, and this question asks you to describe your efforts toward effective assessment. You are encouraged to provide examples of specific assessment outcomes and changes that have resulted from your assessment processes.

Red → The program has a formal assessment process in place, and the process is used on a regular basis; all faculty are involved in ongoing assessment; the outcomes are measurable and have been evaluated using data; the program can demonstrate it has been responsive (e.g. changed) due to assessment efforts.

Blue → The program does not have an assessment process in place, or what is in place is not regularly used; faculty participation in assessment is minimal; the outcomes are not easily measured and data are seldom used in the evaluation; the program cannot demonstrate that improvements have been made as a result of assessment efforts.

II.5 *The program demonstrates that its instructional personnel remain current in their disciplines and use current knowledge and approaches to inform their teaching.*

What does this mean?

This question is not about scholarly activity per se (see the next question); it is about having our instructional activities well informed by current knowledge and pedagogical practice. Currency in the discipline and in effective approaches to teaching can be demonstrated in many ways, and there are many forms of professional development that can result in currency. Whether or not a faculty member is an active scholar or creative artist, it is of paramount importance that instructional activities be informed by both current knowledge in the discipline and also effective approaches to instruction and pedagogy. This expectation pertains to all instructional personnel – both faculty and instructional academic staff – and this question asks you to describe the extent to which all instructors in the program meet this expectation.

Red → All faculty and instructional staff are current in the discipline; all faculty and staff use effective approaches in their teaching and pedagogy; evidence is available to demonstrate currency.

Blue → Many faculty and instructional staff are not current in the discipline, nor do they attempt to remain current in the discipline or to use effective teaching strategies.

II.6 *The program demonstrates that its faculty members are also productive scholars, researchers, or creative artists in ways that support UW-Eau Claire's mission as a comprehensive university.*

What does this mean?

This question is about scholarly and creative activity. UW-Eau Claire is a regional comprehensive university. We are not a "Research I" university. And although scholarly and creative activities are not more desirable than a record of excellent teaching that leads to effective student learning, they do remain important. We value research, scholarly and creative works – especially those that are peer-reviewed. And we value faculty members who demonstrate a commitment to remaining active and productive scholars over all the years of their employment. This expectation really only pertains to faculty members – not to instructional academic staff – and this question asks you to describe the extent to which all faculty in the program meet this expectation. Use data and evidence, to the extent that you can, to support your conclusions.

Red → All faculty members are active and productive scholars, researchers, or creative artists and have remained so over many years; faculty members engage students, when appropriate, in their scholarly and creative projects; evidence is available to document the activities.

Blue → The majority of faculty members are not active and productive scholars or creative artists.

II.7 The faculty demonstrates teaching excellence, including excellence in advising.

What does this mean?

Teaching excellence and the more important consequence – effective student learning – is at the heart of what we do. It is our #1 priority. And thoughtful advising about educational opportunities, career options, etc., is also part of supporting effective student learning. Both aspects are important elements of quality. But excellence in advising is not about “knowing the rules” in the catalogue. It’s about mentoring students toward the best possible educational experience we can provide for them; it’s also about mentoring students beyond academics, supporting them as they develop into educated members of communities once they graduate. This question asks you to describe the extent to which your faculty and instructional staff demonstrate teaching excellence in both areas. If you have data or evidence that supports your conclusions, be sure to include that – perhaps a targeted survey would be of some help in collecting evidence.

Red → All faculty members are committed to and can demonstrate teaching that leads to effective student learning; data are available that supports quality; faculty members are respectful of students and their viewpoints; pedagogy is varied, innovative and supports equity and inclusivity; effective advising and mentoring is highly valued.

Blue → Teaching effectiveness and student learning cannot be demonstrated; no data are available, or data indicate a lack of quality; pedagogy is traditional; advising is routine and often limited to course selection.

II.8 The program contributes in a unique or unusual way (through its students, faculty, and innovative curriculum) that enhances the university's identity and distinctiveness.

What does this mean?

The question asks you to describe whether your program has any unique or distinctive features that make it different from a more traditional program in that discipline, or that make it special in our region. Perhaps the program is the only one in the state; or perhaps the program is the only one with a particular requirement or experience (and one that adds significant value to the education) that all students will satisfy; or perhaps the program has access to facilities or equipment that are unique in our region.

Red → Program is unique in our region/state; program offers experiences that other similar competing programs do not offer; program satisfies an important “niche” for UW-Eau Claire.

Blue → Program is offered at numerous universities in the region/state; program has no special features that distinguish it from others of its type.

II.9 The program is not vulnerable to personnel changes, and there is sufficient staffing to provide program continuity and stability.

What does this mean?

A program that depends too heavily on the effort or expertise of one particular person is a program that cannot be easily sustained should that person become unavailable (or leave). Stronger programs have several “interchangeable parts” that provide continuity and stability in circumstances where personnel are unavailable. As appropriate, comment on any plans the unit may have to address retirements and leadership development in the future.

Red → Changes in individual personnel (retirements, resignations, leaves of absence, sabbaticals, illness, etc.) do not affect the continuity or stability of the program; the program continues with high quality regardless of personnel changes; the program has a formal plan for succession and change.

Blue → The entire program, or a significant portion of the program, depends exclusively on a particular person, the absence of whom would cause the program to lack sufficient support to continue; the program has no plans in place for staffing change.

III. Cost: *Provide data, evidence, and commentary to address the following:*

How do I do this?

For questions III.1a through III.1e below, you are asked to compare data for your department relative to that gathered from our university peers through the Delaware national benchmarks using the materials provided to you on the PEEQ website. This comparison is useful primarily as a means for academic departments to identify those areas where they differ significantly from their peers so that they can determine what merits further study or analysis. Reference the Delaware data in each question. If you feel that there are comparative data more relevant to your program (perhaps from a disciplinary association or national organization of peer institutions) you may cite it as well – but be sure to use the Delaware data also. Please provide details on any other sources you reference.

III.1 *The program is cost effective, relative to the Delaware national benchmarks (available on the PEEQ website). Specifically comment on program cost effectiveness relative to:*

a. *Student credit hours (SCH) per full-time equivalent (FTE) staff;*

What does this mean?

You are asked to analyze how many FTE your program requires to deliver the total number of student credit hours (SCH) you produce. FTE includes all instructional personnel, whether tenured/tenure-track faculty or instructional academic staff. Discuss how the program compares to the national benchmark, providing a rationale for any significant variance. (You will have an opportunity to discuss the ratio of faculty to instructional academic staff and its relevance to the benchmark in III.1d below). Use Table 3, Tab F, Column (6) for this.

Red → Program produces significantly more student credit hours per FTE instructor than the national benchmark.
Blue → Program produces significantly fewer student credit hours per FTE instructor than the national benchmark; no compelling rationale for the variance is provided.

b. *Student credit hours per graduate/undergraduate program levels;*

What does this mean?

This analysis separates your SCH production by level – undergraduate versus graduate. The result refines the analysis in III.1a above to account for differences between undergraduate and graduate levels. Because UW-Eau Claire has significantly fewer graduate-level programs than the majority of our peers, you may need to comment on differences with the peer data – why there are differences and whether there are opportunities for UW-Eau Claire to expand at either the graduate or undergraduate levels. Use Table 3, Tab F, Columns (2) and (4) for this.

Red → Program is comparable to the national benchmark for SCH produced at the graduate and undergraduate levels; program varies from the national benchmark, but a compelling rationale is provided; program has identified or is actively working on opportunities identified by the benchmark data.
Blue → Program varies significantly from the national benchmark without a compelling rationale.

c. *Student credit hours per upper division/lower division course levels;*

What does this mean?

This analysis separates your SCH production by level yet again – but this time between upper division (3xx -4xx) versus lower division (0xx-2xx) courses. This comparison sketches a picture of where the efforts of the program are focused – primarily on producing upper-level/major credits or on serving lower-level and general education needs. Discuss the rationale for this distribution of effort and how it compares to the national benchmark. [Note that the

upper/lower division course data provided by the Delaware study are split between tenured/tenure-track faculty (Table 2, Tab A, Columns (3) and (4)) and IAS (Table 2, Tab B, Columns (3) and (4)). As you compare your department data to Delaware data, keep the two tables separate, and discuss how your department differs from the national benchmarks, relative to both faculty/IAS.]

- Red → Allocation of tenured/tenure-track faculty to lower/upper division SCH generation closely matches national benchmarks, or rationale for variation is compelling while still serving students and/or the university well.
- Blue → There is significant variance with the national benchmarks and no compelling rationale is provided; variance from benchmarks does not serve students and/or the university well.

d. Student credit hours per tenure and tenure-track faculty/Instructional Academic Staff FTE;

What does this mean?

This question asks you to discuss who delivers the student credit hours and in what proportions. This analysis separates your SCH productivity by faculty versus IAS. Address any variance with the national benchmark and the rationale for the ratio of faculty/staff in the program. Use Table 3, Tabs A and B, Column (6) for this.

- Red → Use of tenured/tenure-track faculty to instructional academic staff compares favorably to the national benchmark; a compelling case that addresses both program mission and quality is presented for any variance.
- Blue → Use of tenured/tenure-track faculty to instructional academic staff varies significantly with the national benchmark with no compelling rationale.

e. Direct instructional expenditures per student credit hour.

What does this mean?

This question looks at the level of financial resources directly invested in producing student credits. Such resources are commonly called “direct instructional expenditures.” The Delaware study direct expenditure data reflect costs incurred for personnel compensation, services, and supplies used to support and conduct instruction. The personnel costs shown in that study are largely faculty and staff salaries and benefits, but they also include clerical, professional, graduate student stipends, student wages, and any other personnel who directly support the teaching function. Also included are items such as travel, supplies and expenses, non-capital equipment purchases, etc., that are typically part of a department or program’s cost of doing business. In short, direct instructional expenditures typically represent the sum of your “personnel” and “services and supplies” budgets. If the ratio for your program differs significantly from the benchmark, provide a rationale for why it is greater or smaller. You may cite comparative data from other programs you feel more closely parallel yours, as relevant. Use Table 4, Column 4 for this.

- Red → Direct instructional expenditures per SCH are aligned with the national benchmark; a compelling rationale is provided for any variance.
- Blue → Direct instructional expenditures per SCH are significantly greater than the national benchmark with no compelling rationale.

III.2 Discuss the importance to the university, in terms of mission centrality, quality, and incremental cost, of any majors, emphases, or certificates graduating fewer than 12 undergraduate or 9 graduate students per year.

What does this mean?

This question asks you to discuss the extent to which it is important or necessary to offer low-enrollment majors, minors, emphases, or certificates. Are there opportunities to modify or eliminate any of these in order to make more efficient use of our resources? If not, then this question is asking you why that is the case, and how retaining the current structure benefits the university.

- Red** → The program offers few majors, minors, emphases or certificates that graduate low numbers of students; those that are offered provide a clear benefit to the university in terms of mission centrality and quality.
- Blue** → A high proportion of the program's majors, minors, emphases or certificates graduate low numbers of students; no compelling rationale is offered; program has no plan for improving efficiencies.

III.3 *Discuss the importance to the university, in terms of mission centrality, quality, and incremental cost, of any classes offered in sections smaller than 12 students at the undergraduate level, or 9 students at the graduate level.*

What does this mean?

Like the previous question, this question asks you to discuss the extent to which it is important or necessary to offer low enrollment sections of courses. While small sections are often desirable, they are not necessarily essential to quality learning for every class or subject. Are there opportunities to modify the program curriculum – retaining high quality – in a way that makes more efficient use of our resources? Explain what efforts have been made to examine alternative course delivery options. If there are no opportunities for modification, then this question is asking you why that is the case, and how retaining the current structure benefits the university.

- Red** → The program offers few classes with low enrollments; small section sizes are intentional with clear learning outcome benefits that cannot be achieved with larger sections; program assesses opportunities for learning efficiencies that do not diminish quality.
- Blue** → Program offers a high proportion of classes with low enrollments; rationale for small sections not tied to demonstrated learning outcomes; efficiencies have not been explored or implemented.

III.4 *Discuss the program's efficiency in terms of student retention in the major(s), credits to degree and graduation rates.*

What does this mean?

The question asks you to summarize the trends in graduation rates from your program – about how many students graduate per year. If possible, determine what percentage of students entering your program successfully graduate. It also asks you to describe how many credits are required for the degree and to compare that to the actual credits that a typical student takes to complete the degree (if students greatly exceed the number of credits required for the degree, can you account for why?). And it asks you to consider the typical retention rates from year to year for students in your majors. We're not asking you to determine if students stay at UW-Eau Claire or not, but rather how many students drop out of your program in a typical year, and why they do that – if you know. Some of these data are available to you in your annual report materials, and some you will need to analyze locally based on your own tracking of student trends in your program.

- Red** → Program monitors student progress and success; student retention rates are high; credits to degree support timely graduation while emphasizing a strong liberal education foundation; graduation rates are high.
- Blue** → Program does not monitor student progress and success; student retention is low; students require more credits to degree than other programs or take significantly more credits than required; graduation rates are low.

IV. Opportunity Analysis: Strategic Plan Fulfillment

IV.1 *Discuss opportunities within your program to align with and contribute to the goals of the UW-Eau Claire Centennial Plan, if resources (faculty positions, new facilities, administrative support, etc.) could be allocated to these opportunities via:*

a. *purely internal reallocation of program resources – through consolidation, elimination or the novel use of technology;*

What does this mean?

Perhaps the most important aspect of PEEQ is the explicit permission you are given to suggest ways in which you can reassign resources from within your own program(s) to other areas in your own program(s). Can you suggest ways to be more efficient with the resources that you have? If so, describe them here! Feel free to suggest some things that you could stop doing, and then what you would do with the newly available resources – keeping in mind the goals of the Centennial Plan.

Responses are not colorized.

b. *additional resources provided through campus reallocation;*

What does this mean?

The phrase “campus reallocation” means that the resources are on campus right now (typically in 102 type funding streams) and would need to be reassigned to your program from some other program. What you get in “new” funding would have to come from another program’s resource base. This is an opportunity to describe what you would do with such resources, understanding that reallocations of this form are a challenge to implement.

Responses are not colorized.

c. *new external revenue streams generated by the program.*

What does this mean?

New external revenue streams are ones that the program creates outside of the normal “102” funding stream. External grants, financial support from external partners (business or industry), collaborations with other universities, partnerships with Continuing Education, etc., would be just some examples. This is one of the few means we have for finding “new” resources that don’t require a DIN or moving existing bases resources – so thinking broadly and “out of the box” is very important. By the way, writing that you will “seek a System DIN” is not a practical answer to generating new revenue streams, as DINs are driven by System priorities and, within the current economic environment, will likely be difficult to obtain in the near future.

Responses are not colorized.

IV.2 *Discuss opportunities for greater collaboration, partnerships or team approaches to delivering instruction or services.*

What does this mean?

The collaboration referred to here is intended to be interdisciplinary, or with individuals outside of your department or program – including non-academic units. This is a chance to suggest ways in which different departments and units could work more efficiently. If there are policies or procedures that prevent this, please mention them – we may be able to change those if the benefits are sufficiently great.

Responses are not colorized.

Appendix:

- A. Attach a program array table using the template provided on the PEEQ website <http://www.uwec.edu/acadaff/PEEQ/PEEQArchive/PEEQArchive.htm>.

What does this mean?

The purpose of the program array table is to provide a high level overview of the various programs (majors, minors, graduate programs, role in GE, etc.) and associated approximate resource allocations. The data you report should be approximate – this is not exact science – and should represent a typical moment in time. Think of the mythical “average” semester – roughly half of an annual total. The point is to provide some context to the evaluation team so that they may better understand where the majority of resources are deployed in a department. This is the academic counterpart of an organization chart – it indicates what you do, and about how much effort is applied to each such function.