4 – Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

4. A—Core Component 4 A

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).


Argument

The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay has conducted regular program reviews of academic programs for over 20 years. Since the last time the Higher Learning Commission reviewed the campus (2007), some practices have been modified slightly and the scope of programs subject to review has expanded. In 2008, the cycle for regular program reviews (PROVOST_APRSOAPROCEDURES_2015-16) moved from five years to seven. The modifications made in 2008 also included requiring programs to
review the major’s learning outcomes, assessment plans and recent results from student learning outcomes assessments (PROVOST_PROCEDURESFORACADEMICPROGRAMREVIEWANDSLOASSESSMENT_2015-16). Accredited programs also prepare self-studies in accordance with the guidelines and schedules required by their accrediting bodies.

The process of academic program review begins with members of the academic unit writing a self-study that addresses core issues. All units have access to standard data sets, which are maintained by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment and are updated each February (PROVOST_PROGRAMREVIEW_07282016). The Academic Affairs Committee and the program’s Academic Dean review and reflect upon the self-study. The self-study, reaction from the Academic Affairs Committee and reaction from the program’s Dean are available online at a site maintained by the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff and updated at the start of each year. A newly created Assessment website (PROVOST_ASSESSMENTWEBSITE_2016) within the Provost’s area organizes links to all of these materials onto a single page and should increase campus-wide reflection.

The scope of academic program review has recently expanded to include several new majors and master’s programs. As the array of Master’s programs has grown, establishing regular routines and appropriate information resources becomes more critical. General Education underwent a major review since 2007, and a new program was implemented in 2014. The new General Education program is assessed annually. The Writing Program was reviewed in 2015-16 by a committee of faculty, at the request of the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and several recommendations were put forward. Program reviews are used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs and suggest appropriate modifications.


Argument

The University of Wisconsin – Green Bay (UWGB) follows all transfer policies set forth by the University of Wisconsin System in UW System Administrative Policy 135 (formerly ACIS 6.0) UW System Undergraduate Transfer Policy. In addition, the University of Wisconsin – Green Bay complies with the Universal Credit Transfer Agreement (UCTA) (UWS_UNIVERSALCREDITCHARTERAGREEMENT). This agreement is a UW System/Wisconsin Technical College System agreement to ease transfer of specified courses amongst all campuses within these two systems.

The University of Wisconsin – Green Bay complies with UW System Administrative Policy 135, which regulates the transfer of credit based on institutional and programmatic accreditation standards. UWGB functions under the theory of accommodation and works diligently to award credit for general education courses and use those courses in a students’ general education plan. In determining equivalencies for incoming transfer courses, decisions are made both in the transfer office and in conjunction with the faculty chair or designee of each academic department. All domestic transfer credit must come from an institution accredited by an organization recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), with a few minor exceptions. All undergraduate students are required to meet the university credit residency requirements for both the institution and academic program.
The University of Wisconsin – Green Bay also awards graduate transfer credits. UWGB follows institutional transfer standards when awarding graduate transfer credit. Graduate credits are transferred at the sole discretion of the graduate department and only credits applied directly to the student program are transferred. Generally, no more than 15 graduate transfer credits may be applied to a graduate program (some programs may accept fewer).

The University of Wisconsin – Green Bay allows students to earn credit for experiential learning, called Credit for Prior Learning (PROVOST_CREDITFORPRIORLEARNING_05252016). There are a number of options for students to earn credit for specific UWGB courses such as institutional challenge exams and portfolios. Additionally, national exams (CLEP, Advanced Placement, DSST, International Baccalaureate, etc.) are accepted at UWGB for credit. All credit for prior learning is organized through the Testing Services Office and the faculty of each department have authority over what credit is awarded based on completion of a particular credit for prior learning option. Credit for Prior Learning has specific principles that must be met in order to earn Credit for Prior Learning. UWGB has a military credit policy (PROVOST_MILITARYCREDITPOLICY_05252016) awarding credit to students for basic military experience.

The University of Wisconsin – Green Bay awards credit based on the evaluation of third parties. UWGB reviews American Council on Education (ACE) recommendations as a guide for accepting military credit (beyond basic institutional military credit policy) and will accept credit evaluations from organizations such as Educational Credential Evaluators (ECE) and World Education Services (WES) for foreign credits. Where applicable, foreign credits transferred must come from an institution recognized by the Ministry of Education in that country.

The University of Wisconsin System has the Transfer Information System (TIS), (UWS_TRANSFERINFORMATIONSYSTEM_05252016) through which UWGB complies with the state process for submitting transfer equivalency information. This TIS system is accessible to anyone from any internet access point. TIS allows students in the state educational systems to easily gather transfer equivalency information to and from UWGB.

The University of Wisconsin – Green Bay complies with ACIS 6.2 when creating inter-institution articulation agreements. Those agreements are both reported to the UW System as well as housed at the UWGB campus. Articulation Agreements are arranged and created by the faculty or department chair who then collaborates with the Provost Office and the Registrar Office. In addition to articulation agreements, UWGB has a number of Transfer Guides for the UW Colleges and the Wisconsin Technical College System schools as well as a variety of Memoranda of Understanding and partnerships with various institutions.


Argument

The University of Wisconsin – Green Bay assures the quality of transfer credit by complying with UW System Administrative Policy 135. These policies allow transfer of credit when work is completed at an institution that is accredited by an organization recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). Where applicable, foreign credits transferred must come from an institution recognized by the Ministry of Education in that country. Courses must be of similar nature and level to
that of the University of Wisconsin – Green Bay courses and programs. Individual courses are reviewed by program chairs and faculty expert in the field to ensure course equivalency before credit is awarded.


Argument

Maintains and exercises authority over prerequisites for courses and rigor of courses

Prerequisite for a given course are specified on the initial course approval form which is approved by the appropriate disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary Unit Executive Committee. Changes to pre-requisite requirements require approval of the applicable Executive Committee. Pre-requisite requirements are listed below the course description in the Academic catalog.

UWGB has a Curriculum Planning and Procedures Guide (PROVOST_CURRICULUMPLANNINGGUIDE) which describes the process for curriculum approval procedures from modification of existing courses to the establishment of new degrees. Course modifications and curriculum planning processes involve faculty, and respective Unit Executive Committee, under the leadership of the Unit Chairperson. Faculty are highly qualified in their disciplines and place priority on the quality and rigor of courses and programs. Prior to Executive Committee approval, some units have formal curriculum committees (e.g., Natural and Applied Science, Nursing); other units have informal work groups or individual faculty that address curriculum planning. Examples of policies and practices to assure rigor include the university credit hour definition (PROVOST_CREDITHOURDEFINITION) and rating of course difficulty level on the Course Comments Questionnaire (CCQ) given to students at the end of each semester.

All new course proposals must contain student learning outcomes, course description, credit hours, required and/or recommended pre-requisites, resource/facilities requirements, and supporting documents. Courses vetted by the respective Program executive Committees, Deans, the General Education Council (GEC), and the Academic Affairs Council (AAC) or the Graduate Academic Affairs Council (GAAC) as appropriate. Final approval of courses occurs at the Provost level.

All new degrees go through extensive approval process involving approval and/or recommendation from numerous university committees including Faculty Senate as well as UW System. This process also includes review of the degree proposal (including the curriculum) by two outside consultants who have experience with a degree program similar to the one being proposed. These functions are described in the Faculty Handbook (PROVOST_FACULTYHANDBOOK_2015) as well as the Curriculum Planning and Procedures Guide.

Course numbers assigned by the Registrar according to level of instruction: 100-200 numbers indicate lower level support courses, 300-400 numbers indicate upper level undergraduate courses, 500-700 numbers indicate master’s level courses, and 800-900 numbers are reserved for doctoral level courses.

Maintains and exercises authority over expectations for student learning
The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs has administrative leadership for programs and services that impact student learning and instruction, such as curriculum development processes and academic program review. Within his purview is the authority and assurance of expectations for student learning. Equally important is faculty governance over the curriculum (e.g., AAC, GEC). For example, the GEC was instrumental in development and adoption of a new General Education (PROVOST_GENERALEDUCATION_2014) policy implemented in fall 2014 (fall 2016 for transfer students).

Dedicated efforts and resources have been directed at improving the development and quality of student learning outcomes by academic programs since the last HLC accreditation review. To assist in this effort, a position of Special Assistant to the Provost for Institutional Assessment was created to assist in developing a repository of student learning outcomes for each program and enhance departmental efforts in development or refinement of program outcomes. This position has had three different faculty members in the position over the period of August 2012 – August 2015 which has slowed the pace of progress to some degree. Due to resource limitations, this position has been suspended, and the Associate Provost currently oversees assessment. The university has a solid commitment to improvement in this area and efforts have been substantial and sustained.

All undergraduate courses have learning outcomes and these are listed on course approval forms and in course syllabi. Program outcomes for undergraduate majors are available on the Assessment website (PROVOST_ASSESSMENTWEBSITE_2016). Additionally, each program has an assessment plan and assessment reporting. All graduate courses have learning outcomes and these are listed on course approval form and in course syllabi. A similar repository is available for graduate courses.

Maintains and exercises authority over access to learning resources.

UWGB has an extensive array of learning resources. The Provost oversees all academic areas including areas that provide access to or house learning resources. Each division or area is administered by its appropriate dean or director.

Access to learning resources requires a university identification number and/or username and password which is given by the Admissions Office with enrollment (student) or hire (faculty/staff) at the university. The Dean of Enrollment Services and the Director of Admissions have administer this process.

Faculty, staff, and enrolled students have access to the Cofrin Library which is managed by the Library Director. A Chief Information Officer has authority over academic technology services (e.g., online D2L courses, classroom technology), user support services (e.g., help desk, computer repair), management information systems, and information security.

Numerous science labs are taught each semester. The respective Dean and department chair are responsible for their respective science labs. A University Safety Manager has oversight of safety related to science labs with assistance from two chemical hygiene officers and two laboratory managers. Examples areas covered by the Safety manager include annual review of lab safety practices, maintenance of chemical spill kits, and required laboratory safety training (SAFETY_SAFETYPOLICIES) for persons using campus labs.
Maintains and exercises authority over faculty qualifications

The Chancellor is the hiring authority for all positions at UWGB, and has delegated authority to area leaders (ie., Provost, Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance, Vice Chancellor for University Advancement, and Associate Chancellor for External Affairs, and Chief of Staff). Area leaders are responsible to oversee the hiring process and approve the recommended hire and conditions of appointment.

Recruitment for all positions is authorized by the Position and Compensation Review Committee. Recruitment Committees, which is comprised of Area Leader representation and a Liaison from Human Resources. Recruitment Committees are used for recruitment of faculty and instructional academic staff, and participate in all aspects of the recruitment process. Unit Executive Committees define the qualifications of the positions (subject to approval by the Dean and Provost).

Faculty appointments have the following titles: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor. The Office of Human Resources website contains policies and procedures to guide recruitment processes and facilitate hiring of highly qualified employees (HR_POLICIESANDPROCEDURES). The university complies with the Higher Learning Commission Faculty Qualifications requirements to ensure quality instruction. As an Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity Employer, the university is committed to achieving a diverse workforce and to maintaining a community which welcomes and values a climate supporting equal opportunity and difference among its members. The universities hiring practices also aim to provide diversity in applicant pool and ensure equal consideration for all applicants.

The performance of each faculty member is reviewed on a regular basis. Merit review procedures and timelines are specified in the Faculty Handbook. Similarly, procedures for review for promotion and renewal are described in the Faculty handbook. The Provost and respective Dean have oversight over merit reviews, promotion, and renewal. The Provost, on the recommendation of the appropriate Dean and graduate program executive committee, appoints qualified faculty graduate faculty status.

**Dual Credit Courses**

Dual credit, or College Credit in High School (CCIHS) courses, are offered through UWGB for those courses that follow all policies and approvals, and are cataloged UWGB courses. In 2016-17, approximately 62 dual credit courses were offered. The Director of Education Outreach, in the Division of Outreach and Extension, has oversight over dual credit courses. UWGB has membership in the National Alliance for Concurrent Enrollment Programs (NACEP) and processes at UWGB are aligned well with NACEP standards. Such processes and procedures ensure the rigor and equivalency of all dual credit courses. The CCIHS website (OUTREACH_COLLEGECREDITINHIGHSCHOOL) offers more information about the program.

UWGB ensures that equivalent pre-requisites are used in dual credit courses. For example, students enrolling in campus Spanish 202, German 202, or French 202 courses must have completed three years of high school courses in that language. CCIHS students are also required to have completed at least three years of high school language classes in order to enroll in a 202-level language offering. Requirements for syllabi of all CCIHS courses are specified, and learning outcomes must match UWGB student learning outcomes, and be listed in the syllabi. Syllabi are collected and reviewed by
respectively UWGB department faculty. Credential documents are required of all dual credit instructors, and are reviewed by the Director of Education Outreach to ensure adequate qualifications of each dual credit instructor. Additionally, instructor CVs need to be approved by the UWGB department chair or chair’s designee.

UWGB recently received an extended deadline to help its CCIHS instructors meet the HLC faculty Qualification requirements as outlined in Assumed Practice B.2. As outlined in the university’s Application for Extension, CCIHS instructors will prepare a portfolio of work that will be reviewed by UWGB graduate faculty in the field of instruction to determine the level of prior knowledge. A variety of materials and methods will be used to make this determination, including the evaluation of transcripts, review of published materials, consideration of academic presentations, professional experience in the field of instruction and so on. If an individual has published a book in the field he or she teaches, for example, we will recognize that person’s accomplishment by counting it toward their faculty qualifications. We do not anticipate many instructors meeting their full faculty qualifications requirements in this way, however, and imagine perhaps 3 to 6 credits worth of qualifications being met in this manner. In fields were appropriate, such as Modern Languages, UWGB will employ a graduate field test to determine if any of our current instructors have the required knowledge and skills to teach their field. We plan to complete these goals by the September 1, 2022 deadline stated in our extension.

Each high school instructor is assigned a UWGB faculty liaison, who works closely with the instructor and assures sufficient rigor of the dual credit course. Liaisons meet with new instructors for discipline specific training, observation of the instructor in the classroom, consultation with the instructor to complete annual discipline specific professional development, review of instructor final course assessments, and review of course evaluations at the end of each CCIHS course.

The CCIHS staff are involved in student registration and ensure that students enrolled in dual credit courses receive a university identification number, username and password which allow access to learning resources, such as the Cofrin Library, Student Information System (SIS), and department resources.


Argument

The following programs at UWGB are accredited and/or approved by specialized agencies:

- **Arts & Design** – The Bachelor of Art and Bachelor of Art in Design Art are accredited by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD). This voluntary accreditation is a measure of program quality. These programs were last accredited in 2013.
- **Education** – The department has been approved from the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) to offer 31 different teacher licenses. This approval was renewed in 2015 for a five year period. A new requirement for teacher licensure in Wisconsin is the Educator Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) and the department has implementing processes for students to be successful with this mandate.
- **Human Biology** – the Bachelor of Science in Human Biology emphasis in Nutritional Sciences and Dietetic Internship Program are accredited by the Accreditation Council for Education in

Comment [C7]: Need document

Comment [C6]: Need document
Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND). This accreditation is necessary for eligibility for a dietetic internship and to become a Registered Dietitian Nutritionist (RDN). The dietetic internship has a 94% first time pass rate for the RDN exam. Accreditation was last received in 2011.

- **Music** – The Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Music in Performance, and in Music Education have accreditation from the National Association of Schools of Music (NASAM). This voluntary accreditation provides a way to demonstrate program quality. Accreditation must be reviewed every ten years and was last received in 2012.

- **Nursing** – The Bachelor of Science in Nursing and Master of Science in Nursing Leadership & Management in Health Systems are accredited by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE), and approved by the State Board of Nursing. Accreditation was received in 2015 (reaffirmation of BSN program and initial accreditation of MSN program). The Health Information Management and Technology program is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Health Informatics and Information Management (CAHIIM).

- **Social Work** – The Bachelor of Social Work and Master of Social Work are accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). This accreditation is required for licensure as a social worker. The BSW program was granted reaffirmation of accreditation in 2014. The MSW program is anticipating initial accreditation in June 2016; Prior accreditation was as a collaborative MSW program with UW Oshkosh.

- **Chemistry** – the Bachelor of Science in Chemistry program is approved by the American Chemical Society. Students graduating from this program are award a degree certified by the American Chemical Society. This approval was last renewed in 2011.

The Austin E. Cofrin School of Business plans to plans to pursue accreditation from the Association for the Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business (AASCB) for its Bachelor of Business Administration, Bachelor of Accounting, and Master of Management. The College of Science and Technology plans to pursue accreditation from the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) for its Bachelor of Science in Engineering Technology.


**Argument**

The University of Wisconsin – Green Bay has documented and evaluated the success of its graduates for over 20 years. Three different offices on campus collect and analyze employment and graduate-school outcomes. Since the last time the Higher Learning Commission reviewed UW-Bay, these three offices have worked together to clarify their roles and avoid duplication of effort.

The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment surveys graduates beginning just prior to their graduation, and again after three years. Although these surveys do collect employment and graduate school data, their central purpose lies in collecting self-reported assessment data and satisfaction measures. For example, the Alumni Survey asks respondents to evaluate their educational experiences from the perspective of having been out of college for several years. Academic majors reflect on these results as part of the regular academic program review process; each program writing a self-study receives a packet of survey results from its majors from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.

Career Services conducts a “first destination” survey of students to record their placement during the first year after graduation. Campus-wide and major-specific reports are available online.
(STUDENTAFFAIRS_FIRSTDESTINATIONSURVEY_2007-15) for the most recent year and for each cohort extending back to 2007. In 2013, UWGB was selected to participate in an audit of placement rate data by the University of Wisconsin-System. The audit findings were supportive of the campus practices. The audit did suggest changing the collection of salary data from an open-ended item to a question that provided set ranges. The Career Center made that change for two years (2014, 2015) but will return to the open item for the class of 2016 in order to follow guidelines that have been established by the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE). UWGB’s first-destination data reflect positive outcomes for over 95% of recent graduates (STUDENTAFFAIRS_CAREERSERVICESOUTCOMESBROCHURE_2014). This heightened scrutiny has caused the Office to conduct a review of possible response rate biases. That review was first done in 2011 and was replicated in 2013 and 2016. Although responses do not perfectly mirror the population of graduates in terms of race, sex, income and grades, the biases are too small to have a meaningful impact on any of the measures of interest (Career Services_ Review of Response Rates 2016, 2016-Jan-1). For several years the University of Wisconsin System has highlighted UWGB’s placement data in its Annual Accountability Report (for example, the UW System Legislated Accountability Report (UWSLEGISLATEDACCOUNTABILITYREPORT_2014). In 2016, UWGB embarked on a project to enable students and other constituents to access recent outcomes data from the Career Services survey through flexible online queries. This should provide greater access to some of UWGB’s best news.

The Alumni Office, under the direction of University Advancement, maintains records of graduates’ employment. Academic units can access contact information for alumni to conduct focused assessments, although most units have found that the routinely-prepared survey results provide plenty of information for evaluation and decision-making.

The U.S. Department of Education has exerted pressure on universities to improve data collection relating to outcomes, and also has begun to provide additional tools for schools. Most recently, in 2015 the Department implemented the College Scorecard (USDEPTOFED_COLLEGESCORECARD). The scorecard contains two items that measure long-term success. The average salary of students (not graduates) six years after attending shows that students from UW-Green Bay earned $39,600, slightly above the national comparison figure of $34,300; 66% of students who attended UWGB earned more than the average for high school graduates in the same age bracket. The second measure of long-term success is the percent of graduates with student loans who have begun to pay off that debt within three years of graduating. UWGB’s rate of 90% suggests much more positive employment outcomes than the national rate of 66%.

Evidence List

i. PROVOST_APRSOAPROCEDURES_2015-16
ii. PROVOST_PROCEDURESFORACADEMICPROGRAMREVIEWANDSLOASSESSMENT_2015-16
iii. PROVOST_PROGRAMREVIEW_07282016
iv. PROVOST_ASSESSMENTWEBSITE_2016
4. B—Core Component 4 B

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution’s processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

4. B. 1. Argument

Over the past several years, UWGB has made a concerted effort to strengthen the assessment (PROVOST_ASSESSMENTWEBSITE_2016) of student learning and achievement of student learning goals. Resources were committed to this process including creating a position, Special Assistant to the Provost, dedicated to assessment of student learning outcomes. One of the major results was strengthening the connection between institutional student learning outcomes and programmatic learning outcomes. In 2014, an expert in programmatic assessment, Barbara Walvord, conducted a faculty development workshop for the entire campus and worked with individual programs to further enhance their
assessment plans. This commitment substantive improvements in both process and public distribution of program assessment data.

Institutional Student Learning Outcomes:
In keeping with the mission, UWGB established five mission level learning outcomes (MLLO) to provide students with:

- To provide students with an interdisciplinary, problem-focused education;
- To expose students to diversity;
- To encourage environmental sustainability;
- To promote engaged citizenship; and
- To promote critical thinking.

The University Plan for the Continuous Assessment of Student Learning (PROVOST_CONTINUOUSASSESSMENTOFSTUDENTLEARNING_2013) describes the process by which these learning outcomes are assessed. Using a four prong approach, achievement of student learning is assessed in the academic programs, general education, co-curricular programs and resources, and via innovations in teaching and learning.

In 2014, UWGB embarked on a revision of the general education program. Prior to 2014, UWGB evaluated achievement of general education knowledge and skills via the College Basic Academic Subjects Examination (BASE). In 2014, UWGB launched a plan to assess general education in a more meaningful way. University-wide general education goals were established along with a plan for assessment. The General Education assessment goals were to make assessment meaningful and useful, be as streamlined as possible, and engage faculty in the process to support a culture of assessment across the campus. A staggered, rotating schedule was planned with each outcome assessed for two consecutive years for the first five years of the plan. The plan engaged faculty in the development of tools for the assessment of skills such as quantitative literacy and sustainability (link to examples) and the establishment of benchmarks for each. The Assessment of the UWGB General Education Program (PROVOST_GENEDASSESSMENTPROGRAM_2015) describes the process and timeframe.

New ILO’s once approved:

4. B. 2.

Argument

UWGB has a campus-wide, program assessment program to measure the impact of the UWGB student learning experience, both within and outside of the classroom. Gathering evidence about student learning helps to inform curricular, co-curricular and programmatic decision-making, as the collective campus works together to honor our commitment to academic excellence.

Curricular Program Assessment

All academic programs at UWGB are asked to assess and report SLO for their specific programs. Each year, academic programs develop an annual assessment plan.
In addition, programs within the College of Health, Education, and Social Welfare have a history of successfully meeting the rigorous accreditation/licensing standards including those specific to assessment of student learning outcomes. The Social Work Professional Programs received reaffirmation of accreditation in 2013 (BSW) and 2016 (MSW). The Professional Program in Nursing received reaccreditation in 2015 (BSN & MSN). Ongoing accreditation efforts inform the UWGB programmatic assessment for these professional programs. For example, the Social Work Professional Programs incorporates the Council on Social Work Education Competencies into their university program assessment plan. (PROVOST_BSWPROGRAMMATICASSESSMENT).

Furthermore, the revised general education program includes an assessment plan to ensure students are meeting benchmarks for the new SLO. Assessment tools for each of the general education outcomes are being developed and implemented on a staggered, rotating schedule. (PROVOST_GENEDASSESSMENTPROGRAM_2015)

Co-curricular Program Assessment

The intersection of curricular and co-curricular programs is an integral part of student learning. As such, the Division of Student Affairs collects data on a broad range of co-curricular programming via national and institutional assessment tools. In 2015, the Counseling and Health Center conducted the National College Health Assessment (NCHA_MENTALHEALTHSNAPSHOT_2015), a tool that measures nineteen mental health topics. This data identified gaps and opportunities for the Counseling and Health Center to inform student programming.

UWGB has demonstrated a strong commitment to inclusive excellence. To that end, the American Intercultural Center (PROVOST_AICASSESSMENT_2015) assesses the learning outcomes of its multi-cultural students in three areas: transition into UWGB, cultural development, and academic success. The data revealed significant improvements related to student learning outcomes including increased confidence and assertiveness, effective problem solving and communication, increased grade point average, and improved retention of minority students.

The Office of International Education surveys students who participate in both short-term and semester-long study abroad programs. In 2016, the International Education committee analyzed data related to student learning outcomes achieved by students participating in study abroad programs (PROVOST_STUDYABROADOUTCOMES_2015). These data were used to strengthen existing pre-departure activities for students participating in study abroad programs.

Consistent with the university’s mission to improve student learning, the Writing Center provides tutoring to all students seeking assistance with writing. A strength of this program is the use of faculty and academic staff of the English Composition program along with trained students highly
proficient in writing, who serve as tutors. The Writing Center provides competency-based assistance founded upon the University’s Writing Competencies (PROVOST_WRITINGCENTERASSESSMENTREPORT_2016). The ultimate assessment of student writing is conducted by course instructors. Students have an opportunity to evaluate the services provided by the Writing Center services (CLAS_WRITINGCENTEREVALFORM). Data is shared with tutors with the goal of process improvement.

4. B. 3.

Argument

UWGB has made significant progress toward capturing how assessment data informs program improvement directly related to student learning. As part of the university program assessment plan, all academic programs provide an annual report summarizing the outcome data for their program-specific assessment plan. Part of the annual assessment report includes a discussion of how the program intends to use the assessment data to improve student learning in their specific program. For an example of the report, see: Assessment Plan Questionnaire 2015-2016 (PROVOST_ASSESSMENTPLANQUESTIONNAIRE_2015-16)

In 2015, UWGB improved the assessment process by requiring programs to identify how data informs future programmatic improvements (PROVOST_ASSESSMENTPLANQUESTIONNAIRE_2015-16) or planning.

One example of a completed report that demonstrates program improvement based on SLO data is that of Nursing which focused on student professionalism (PROFSTUD_NURSINGASSESSMENTREPORT_2014-15).

Another example of how assessment data was used to inform programmatic changes can be found in the Political Science curriculum. Faculty determined that the program lacked an integrative learning experience to assist political science students in their post-college transition. As a result, they developed a capstone course that requires advanced research, a service-learning project, and a transitional plan to enhance student learning post-graduation.

Assessment of student learning outcomes in the Office of Outreach and Adult Access resulted in a rigorous process which led to a major revision of learning outcomes and a change in the name of the major. Originally called Interdisciplinary Studies, Integrative Leadership Studies (CLAS_INTEGRATIVESTUDIESASSESSMENTREPORT_2014-15) now focuses on students’ ability to apply their knowledge to problem-solving situations, especially as related to civic engagement.


Argument

Faculty and staff are critical to the success of the University Plan for the Continuous Assessment of Student Learning. The University Accreditation and Assessment Council (PROVOST_ACCREDITATIONASSESSMENTCOUNCILCHARGE_2015) includes faculty and staff from across
the campus. They are charged with developing and monitoring the implementation of the University Assessment Plan and promoting and supporting the institution-wide assessment activities related to assessment of student learning and the seven year academic program review cycle. The Academic Program Assessment Subcommittee reviews the annual assessment updated submitted by the academic programs and provides feedback and recommendations as appropriate.

Evidence List

i. PROVOST_ASSESSMENTWEBSITE_2016
ii. PROVOST_CONTINUOUSASSESSMENTOFSTUDENTLEARNING_2013
iii. PROVOST_GENEDASSESSMENTPROGRAM_2015
iv. PROVOST_ASSESSMENTPLANQUESTIONNAIRE_2015-16
v. PROVOST_ASSESSMENTOFPROGRAMS_2016
vi. PROVOST_ASSESSMENTOFPSYCHPROGRAM_2015
vii. PROVOST_BSWPROGRAMMATICASSESSMENT
viii. PROVOST_GENEDASSESSMENTPROGRAM_2015
ix. NCHA_MENTALHEALTHSNAPSHOT_2015
x. PROVOST_AICASSESSMENT_2015
xi. PROVOST_STUDYABROADOUTCOMES_2015
xii. PROVOST_STUDYABROADORIENTATION_2016
xiii. PROVOST_ASSESSMENTPLANQUESTIONNAIRE_2015-16
xiv. PROVOST_ASSESSMENTPLANQUESTIONNAIRE_2015-16
xv. PROFSTUD_NURSINGASSESSMENTREPORT_2014-15
xvi. CLAS_INTEGRATIVESTUDIESASSESSMENTREPORT_2014-15
xvii. PROVOST_ACCREDITATIONASSESSMENTCOUNCILCHARGE_2015

4. C—Core Component 4 C

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
4. The institution’s processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

4. C. 1.
In 2009 the University of Wisconsin System Administration initiated an enrollment management strategy, called the "Growth Agenda for Wisconsin", which aspired to increase educational attainment in the state. Over the next several years, System administrators worked with each campus to establish reasonable goals for graduates, codified in a "More Graduates Plan", and to identify the specific improvements in retention and graduation rates required to achieve those goals. Appendix 1 contains the final "More Graduates" planning targets established by UWGB as part of the “Growth Agenda” and communicated officially to the UW-System in 2010.

Since 1993, UWGB has collaborated with the UW-System to produce annual accountability reports. The first accountability report to expressly document achievement toward the “Growth Agenda” retention and graduation rate targets was published in winter 2012 and represented experiences from the 2010-11 year. (The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment houses UWGB’s “Growth Agenda” accountability reports online through their website . Table 1 shows the retention and graduation rate values, both actual and targeted, published in the four “Growth Agenda” accountability reports.

### Table 1. Selected Enrollment Management Targets and Actuals from UWGB’s “Growth Agenda”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Retention of new entering full-time fall freshmen into their second fall</th>
<th>Graduation of new entering full-time fall freshmen within six years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>See below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UWGB Accountability Reports, available online at Reports (PROVOST_OFFICEOFINSTITUTIONALRESEARCHANDASSESSMENTREPORTS_2016) and Accountability (UWS_ACCOUNTABILITYDASHBOARD_2016).

In 2014-15, the UW-System Administration unfolded a new process for reporting campus and system-wide achievements. The “Accountability Dashboard” (UWS_ACCOUNTABILITYDASHBOARD_2016) replaces the long history of printed publications with interactive, online tables and graphs. Because the “More Graduates” initiative within the “Growth Agenda” reflected an assumption of additional state resources, the $15 million budget reductions to the University of Wisconsin System implemented in 2011-13 effectively concluded the “Growth Agenda” and invalidated numeric goals established as part of the “More Graduates” (UWS_GROWTHAGENDA_2011-13) initiative and tracked in the accountability reports. Near the end of
2015, the UW-System Administration began working with campus chancellors to establish new targets for retention and graduation rates.

UWGB has formed a variety of working groups to address issues of enrollment and retention. From 2011-2013, the university completed the Equity Scorecard process created by the Center for Urban Education at the University of Southern California. The goals of this work were to develop holistic and comprehensive strategies for addressing access and achievement gaps on our campus by gathering diverse data to identify the problems and then working across campus with faculty, staff and administrators to share these data and develop workable solutions. A set of recommendations, 4C1. Equity Scorecard Final Report – Retention Recommendations for increasing access (ENROLLMENTSERVICES_EQUITYSCORECAREDACCESSPERSPECTIVE_2012) and retention (PROVOST_EQUITYSCORECAREDRETENTIONRECOMMENDATIONS_2013) were presented to campus administration, faculty and staff at the close of the process in spring 2013.

In fall 2013 the Dean of Enrollment Services created a Strategic Enrollment Planning Group, comprised of four groups tasked to develop a comprehensive and collaborative set of strategies to maximize enrollment and retention (ENROLLMENTSERVICES_STRATEGICPLANNINGGROUP_2014-15) at UWGB. In the Retention Work Group, for example, member examined the impact of their work on retention rates. One finding of this work was that student employment on campus exerted a significant positive impact on retention, an area that had previously been overlooked in retention efforts.

In 2014-15 the Chancellor created an Enrollment Working group as part of his Invent the Future initiative, which was intended to “to reflect deeply as an institution about the strategy, operation, creative potential and organization of the University for the purpose of developing and embracing a narrative and vision of a growing institution with a state-wide and national innovation leader in a time of great change in American public higher education” (Gary Miller, Chancellor). The goal of the Enrollment group was to critique our current enrollment strategy and recommend enrollment strategies that will best meet our current and future challenges. A team of faculty, staff and students worked together to gather and examine data from across campus, and then used it to identify the area of gaps currently facing UWGB in the areas of recruitment and retention, and to generate a list of evidence-based recommendations for each. The final report (CHANCELLOR_ENROLLMENTWORKINGGROUPINVENTTHEFUTURE_2014-15) was submitted to the Chancellor in February 2015, to be shared with the University Planning and Innovation Committee.

Our retention rates (PROVOST_OFFICEOFINSTITUTIONALRESEARCHANDASSESSMENTREPORTS_2016) into the second year for new students have been largely consistent over the last decade, at an average of 74.4% from 2011-2013. These retention rates are on par with or slightly lower than those of peer institutions in the UW System (PROVOST_EQUITYScoreCARDRETENTIONRECOMMENDATIONS_2013) (e.g., 74.9% for 2014 cohort as compared to 77.7% for UW Oshkosh, 77.6% for UW Stevens’s Point, 80.1% for UW Eau Claire, and 84.6% for UW La Crosse). UWGB also performs on par with or slightly lower than our peer institutions for low income students (e.g., 76.3% year 2 retention for 2013 cohort Pell grant recipients as compared to 74.5% for UW, 75.0% for UWSP, 80.2% for UWEC, and 81.0% for UWLC). Year 2 retention of underrepresented minority students is on par with peer institutions (UWS_ACCOUNTABILITYDASHBOARD_2016) (75.6% for 2013 cohort as compared to 67.0% for UW, 67.4% for UWSP, 77.1% for UWEC and 82.2% for UWLC).
UWGB’s 6 year graduation rates achievement gap in graduation rates for URM and low income students (PROVOST_EQUITYSCORECARDDETENTIONRECOMMENDATIONS_2013) from any UW institution are somewhat lower than UW peer institutions (e.g., 56.9% for 2009 cohort as compared to 57.3% for UWO, 71.2% for UWSP and 72.4% for UWEC, 77.5% for UWLC). However, the achievement gap in graduation rates (UWS_ACCOUNTABILITYDASHBOARD_2016) for URM and low income students is lower at UWGB than the average across the UW System (e.g., for the 2008 cohort, a 19.9% gap for URM students and a 13.7% gap for low income students system-wide, as compared to 14.7% gap for URM students and a 6.5% gap for low income students at UWGB, all in 6 year graduation rates).

4. C. 2.

**Argument**

UWGB collects and analyzes student success data at both the university and program levels. The primary source for this data is the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment which disseminates results on the university website across all commonly reported data elements. Our institution is more advanced in collecting and analyzing retention data on the institutional level, with programmatic level of understanding retention somewhat lagging behind.

The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) is the primary data collection warehouse for UWGB (PROVOST_OFFICEOFINSTITUTIONALRESEARCH_2016). The OIRA, part of the Office of the Provost (PROVOST_PROVOSTWEBSITE_2016), is managed by Director of Institutional Research who reports to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (PROVOST_PROVOSTSTAFFWEBSITE_2016). The office provides information and services to support campus planning and data-driven decision-making, program assessment, and the assessment of student learning. University plan for Continuous Assessment of Student Learning, initiated by the OIRA, consistently monitors academic programs via annual program assessments (http://www.uwgb.edu/assessment/programmatic/assessments/year) and regular (7 year cycle) program reviews (PROVOST_PROGRAMREVIEW_2016) as well as general education (PROVOST_ASSESSMENTPROGRAMS_2016) and extra-curricular learning outcomes (http://www.uwgb.edu/student-affairs/). Of particular importance in the category of data collection on student retention is the assessment of programmatic learning outcomes (identifying percentage of students not fulfilling the learning outcomes and thus at risk of dropping out) and program reviews documenting changing enrolments within majors. The OIRA also has clearly presented data on enrolment evolution, broken down by gender, race/ethnicity, place of residence, financial need, veteran status, etc. However, the enrolment fact sheets, while dating all the way to 1995, only give general rate of retention, without providing details for individual social and demographic categories (PROVOST_FACTSHEET_1995-2015). There is data for 2013-2015 incoming freshman classes which is broken by social and demographic categories that suggests a 75% rate of retention across all categories with certain categories (women, bi-racial, international and off-campus living categories) showing somewhat lower retention rates (in the 60% range) (PROVOST_RETENTIONUPDATE_2015). This data is not available on the OIRA website.

In 2009, the University of Wisconsin System Administration initiated an enrollment management strategy, called the “Growth Agenda for Wisconsin,” which aspired to increase educational attainment in the state. Over the next several years, System administrators worked with each campus to establish
reasonable goals for graduates, codified in a “More Graduates Plan,” and to identify the specific improvements in retention and graduation rates required to achieve those goals. The final “More Graduates” planning targets established by UWGB as part of the “Growth Agenda” and communicated officially to the UW-System in 2010 are contained in this document (Appendix 1) (PROVOST_ACCOUNTABILITYANDRETENTION_2015).

Since 1993, UWGB has collaborated with the UW-System to produce annual accountability reports. The first accountability report to expressly document achievement toward the “Growth Agenda” retention and graduation rate targets was published in winter 2012 and represented experiences from the 2010-11 academic year. (The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment houses UWGB’s “Growth Agenda” accountability reports online at UWGB (PROVOST_OFFICEOFINSTITUTIONALRESEARCHANDASSESSMENTREPORTS_2016) and with UW System (UWSACCOUNTABILITYDASHBOARD_2016).

In 2014-15, the UW System Administration unfolded a new process for reporting campus and system-wide achievements. The UW System’s “Accountability Dashboard” replaces the long history of printed publications with interactive, online tables and graphs. Because the “More Graduates” initiative within the “Growth Agenda” reflected an assumption of additional state resources, the $15 million budget reductions to the University of Wisconsin System implemented in 2011-13 effectively concluded the “Growth Agenda” and invalidated numeric goals established as part of the “More Graduates” initiative and tracked in the accountability reports. Near the end of 2015, the UW-System Administration began working with campus chancellors to establish new targets for retention and graduation rates.

By far, the most intentional, targeted, and consistent data collection on all-University retention rates happens through the work of the Center for Students in Transition that collects data on retention, success, and perseverance of many at-risk students. Among the types of data collected at that level are (1) surveys of transfer intentions (ENROLLMENTSERVICESTRANSFERINTENTIONS_2014), (2) equity score card data for diverse students (ENROLLMENTSERVICES_EQUITYSCORECARDACCESSPERSPECTIVE_2012), (3) retention rates for First Year student cohorts, especially for Phoenix GPS students (CLAS_PHOENIXGSPPROGRAMYEARONERESULTS_2013-14). The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment also compiles lists of non-enrolled students by semester and shares this information with the academic deans, in an effort to ensure better retention rates, especially among academically at-risk students.

Another important hub of all-university data collection for student retention and persistence is the Dean of Student Office (STUDENTAFFAIRS_DEANOFSTUDENTSWEBSITE_2016) acting as an umbrella for many other departments on campus, including the Office of Student Life (STUDENTAFFAIRS_STUDENTLIFEWEBSITE_2016) and Admissions Services (STUDENTAFFAIRS_ADMISSIONSWEBSITE_2016). All of the Student Affairs (STUDENTAFFAIRS_STUDENTAFFAIRSWEBSITE_2016) Directors submit annual reports, detailing relevant retention and persistence information (per Brenda, Clif has copies from last year and Tim Sewall is working with the Enrollment Services areas). Academic Advising Office (ENROLLMENTSERVICES_ACADEMICADVISINGWEBSITE_2016) tracks numbers of suspension appeals since 2009 (ENROLLMENTSERVICES_SUSPENSIONAPPEALSSUMMARYREPORT_2015 and other 3 updates), providing a good indicator for the academically at-risk students.
Several academic departments on campus (e.g., Nursing and Dietetics) also have accreditation requirements of reporting graduation rates and maintaining clear retention goals (data available at accreditation self studies for both programs). However, the bulk of our retention data comes from non-academic, so called co-curricular sources, including Office of the Dean of Students, Campus Life, Athletics, and Academic Advising Offices. For example, Residence Life Office reports retention rates of 56–60% for the 2015-2016 and 2014-2015 academic year respectively (ENROLLMENTSERVICES_SUSPENSIONAPPEALSUMMARYREPORT_2015).

UWGB is home to Division I athletic program which necessitates additional data collecting and reporting to be in compliance with the NCAA and Horizon League regulations (KRESS_ATHLITICS.COMPLIANCEARTICLE_2009). As a Division I member of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the University commits to maintaining high academic standards for student-athletes and shares data with the public about athletes’ progress toward a degree. Each year the University updates the Graduation Success Rate report (the most recent GSR report is available with the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (NCAA_GRADUATIONREPORT_2015); Academic Progress Rates can be calculated on demand for each team at the NCAA’s website (https://web1.ncaa.org/maps/aprRelease.jsp). UWGB teams graduate at a significantly higher rate than do students attending UWGB overall, and several teams have some of the highest progress rates in the nation. These strong outcomes stem from the effective implementation of best practices such as employing an Assistant Director for Academics and Student Welfare and requiring student-athletes to participate in supervised study halls.

UWGB collects and reports student progress data in accordance with all common reporting requirements including IPEDS, NCAA, Common Data Set, among others. This data is in turn available to external constituents of the university. Unfortunately, the only analysis of collected data happens by the staff of the Center for Students in Transition and is not widely disseminated to the rest of the university community. There is no Retention Committee or Working Group and our institutional efforts remain highly decentralized, piecemeal and not strategic. One of the challenges for the future is to have a person/office responsible for retention goals, strategies and measurements/reporting.

Student satisfaction and engagement is measured through multiple instruments. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), and Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) are the regularly administered tools at UWGB. UW-Green Bay Bat strives to demonstrate its commitment to student access and success through programming in the first year, including the Phoenix GPS Program, First Year Seminar Program, American Intercultural Office events, Residence Life schedule, Academic Advising, Writing Center, Tutoring Center, Office of Residence Life and the Dean of Students. University has specially dedicated Center for Students in Transition that assists new incoming and transfer students in making successful adjustment to our campus. Other offices, including Veteran Affairs, Office of Adult Degree, Pride Center, Office of Student Life, and Athletics, also provide support in achieving higher retention and persistence rates.

4. C. 3.

Argument
UWGB has utilized data to inform the development, expansion and revision of a variety of programs that both directly and indirectly work to support student retention, persistence and completion. Several illustrative examples are provided below.

The First Year Seminar Program:

Started in 2006 as a pilot program, First Year Seminars were initially designed to address the relatively low academic engagement levels of our first year students, as indicated by results from the National Survey of Student Engagement. The courses provide students with a rigorous, engaging academic course and support to develop skills critical to college success in a small class setting. Data from the first four years of the program (PROVOST_FIRSTYEARESEMINAROUTCOMES_2010) found that participation in the courses not only significantly improved academic and co-curricular engagement, but also retention. As a result, when UWGB conducted a revision to the general education curriculum in 2012, First Year Seminars were added as a requirement for all new students. Up until the implementation of the seminar general education requirement in fall 2014, we continued to find a significant retention impact for students who completed a First Year Seminar. In 2008, a Peer Mentor component was added to the First Year Seminars. Approximately 60-75% of the courses include a trained peer who facilitates the development of skills relevant to student success, encourages student engagement with university activities, and acts as a role model for the students in their seminar class. Overall, retention and engagement is higher (PROVOST_IMPACTOFPEERMENTORS_2008-10) in FYS with Peer Mentors than in FYS that do not contain Mentors. The Peer Mentor program also significantly increases retention for underrepresented students (PROVOST_IMPACTOFPEERMENTORS_2008-10) through the fourth year.

The Center for Students in Transition:

In 2011, UWGB created the Center for Students in Transition, whose purpose is to promote success (academic achievement, achievement of liberal arts outcomes, retention, completion) for students in transition by acting as a coordinating institution and development resource for faculty, staff and students seeking to improve the experiences of students in transition, especially historically underserved students. The Center has served as a faculty development resource for instructors teaching First Year Seminars, has conducted institutional assessments to evaluate the impact of current initiatives on retention and student success, and has worked to increase the availability of high impact experiences that are associated with retention and success. For example, the Center Director has worked as a member of a campus team with the Council on Undergraduate Research (CUR) to improve students’ opportunities to participate in undergraduate research activities on campus, has worked with the offices of Admissions and Academic Advising to expand transition services provided to transfer students, and conducted a prospective longitudinal analysis of new students’ intent to leave UWGB in order to provide more information on barriers and critical events to those working with new students.

The GPS Program:

In response to the high proportion of UWGB students who are considered historically underrepresented (e.g., approximately 60% first generation, 35% low income and 10% student of color), in 2013 the GPS Program was created to improve retention, graduation and engagement for underrepresented students on campus. Based in institutional data and a review of the empirical literature on factors that maximize college success, the GPS Program (PROVOST_GATEWAYTOFIRSTYEARSUCCESSWEBSITE_2016) takes a strengths-based,
enrichment focused approach, placing students into small cohorts with mentors who work with them for the entire first year. Central elements of the program include: (1) providing challenging learning experiences and (2) scaffolds to support student success, coupled with (3) strong mentoring relationships and (4) opportunities to make a meaningful impact on their campus and in their communities. The GPS program serves approximately 125 first year students each year, and participation successfully eliminates equity gaps in retention, engagement and academic achievement for UR students. Students who participate (BOR_GPSPROGRAMIMPACTSTATEMENT_2016) in the yearlong GPS program are 16.2% more likely to return to UWGB for their second year than are other UR students, and they are 18.4% more likely to return for year 3. They also earn significantly higher GPAs, complete a larger percentage of their attempted credits, and declare majors significantly earlier than do other UR students.

Advising Initiatives:
As a result of data on students’ perceived quality of their Advising experiences at UWGB, in 2014 the Director of Academic Advising developed several initiatives to improve advising experiences. First, an Advising Task Force was created, a cross campus team of faculty, staff and students working to improve the quality of the undergraduate advising experience. Initiatives thus far have included clarifying faculty advising responsibilities, revising the Advising website to better serve a student audience, and improving campus collaboration on advising initiatives. Second, a Peer Advising Consultant program was created. This program trains undergraduate students to provide basic advising assistance to undeclared students.

The American Intercultural Center:
Over the last few years, the American Intercultural Center (AIC) has engaged in a concerted and effective effort to increase the utilization of their services. They have tracked attendance at the center and at programs, and have found increases in student engagement at the center, which they credit to the development of programs including: Jump Start, an orientation program for first year students of color; the Lawton Grant; the Cross Cultural Leadership Retreat; and the development of their Academic Progress Report Program. The AIC has assessed not only student attendance, but student perceptions of their programs in order to continually revise and develop initiatives to maximize impact on student engagement, retention, and success. For example, the academic progress report program initiated in 2014-15 resulted in a significant increase in GPA for students of color (PROVOST_AICASSESSMENT_2015).

Residence Life:
Our Residence Life program conducts yearly assessments to examine progress in meeting their Programmatic Outcomes. For example, in 2014-15 they examined the ability to attract and retain residential students through data gathered from the Educational Benchmarking Institute assessment module (PROVOST_RESLIFEPROGRAMATICASSESSMENT_2014-15). They examined these results and use the data to inform revision of programs and activities.

4. C. 4

Argument
The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (PROVOST_OFFICEOFINSTITUTIONALRESEARCH_2016) compiles Fact Sheets each fall on enrollment, new students, academics, and student services broken down by various demographics, including gender, race/ethnicity, and age. UWGB also participates in College Portrait and publishes Common Data Sets, IPEDS Data Feedback reports, and UW-System student statistics on the OIRA website. We also post a UWGB fact book on the OIRA website that includes degrees granted, retention rates, and enrollment history.

All institutions within the University of Wisconsin System use IPEDS definitions to calculate official retention and graduation rates. Most retention and graduation rate reporting and analysis relies on warehoused student data which have been heavily vetted by both the institution and the System. Because UWGB serves a large number of transfer students, the IPEDS focus on new entering full-time fall freshmen excludes a majority of the student body. In recent years, over half of the new students came to UWGB as transfer students. Over a third of the transfer students begin in the spring, not the fall, and over 40% of them begin as part-time students. Clearly, programs that serve a high percent of transfer students, such as Nursing and Integrative Leadership Studies, need a more robust approach to tracking retention and graduation. In those cases, the Office of Institutional Research works with program faculty to define an appropriate performance indicator and to regularly update the outcome. These program-specific ad hoc reporting processes are mainly consulted in conjunction with the program’s self-study review or accreditation visits.
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