THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution  University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Master's in History

2b. List date(s) of program review: 2006 - 2007

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes X No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes X No _____

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

The increase in enrollment has probably been due in large measure to the establishment of a thesis track, non-thesis track, and Public History track in our program, which provides greater flexibility to meet the needs of a wider range of students.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No X____

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _____ No _____

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

During the spring semester of 2007, the Department of History's Self-Study, prepared in consultation with the Academic Program Review Committee and CSBS Dean Julia Wallace, was sent to Professors Mary Kupiec Cayton, of Miami University of Ohio, and Fritz Fischer, of the University of Northern Colorado, who served as External Reviewers. Professors Cayton and Fischer visited UNI on March 19th and interviewed faculty, staff, and administrators familiar with History's programs. Following their visit, the External Reviewers prepared a generally positive report on the present state of graduate History education at UNI. They did, however, identify several areas in which they believed the Department could build on current strengths.
On September 5, 2007, the faculty of the Department of History met with CSBS Dean Julia Wallace, Interim Graduate Dean Sue Joseph, Associate Provost Beverly Kopper, and Interim Provost James Lubker and discussed some of the issues raised by the Academic Program Review. The departmental faculty met on October 10th to consider each of the recommendations in the Graduate External Review. Based on the faculty's responses to the recommendations, the Department Head, in consultation with the departmental Graduate Studies Committee, prepared a draft of the Program Plan, which was reviewed and approved by the faculty on October 31, 2007. What follows is an abridged and updated portion of that document which contains the External Reviewers' recommendations and the Department's responses to them.

RESPONSES TO REVIEWERS' RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR ADOPTION.

1. Work with the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and with the Graduate College to clarify how the graduate program in History fits with the overall university philosophy of the role of graduate education in fulfilling its mission, and develop a long-term plan for graduate education in History.

Early in the present decade, the Department began reconsidering its approach to graduate education, a process which resulted in the current thesis, non-thesis, and public history tracks in our program. The goal was greater flexibility in order to meet the needs of a wider range of students. These changes have contributed to dramatic growth over the last four years. This growth, coupled with the fact that the Graduate College has recently completed the development of a Strategic Plan for graduate education at UNI, suggests that the time is right for the Department of History to examine its policies and goals with regard to graduate education in view of current and potential resources and in order to have a balanced program consistent with larger University goals. With this in mind, during the 2008-2009 academic year, the Graduate Studies Committee will review the University's Strategic Plan for graduate education to determine its impact on History and make relevant recommendations to the Department regarding the future course of our graduate program.

2. Work strategically to develop niche areas in Public History and content M.A. programs for teachers.

As noted in the response to Recommendation 1, we are planning to review our program in the context of the Graduate College’s Strategic Plan. The results of that review will help to shape what we do over the next several years. We believe that since UNI has the only graduate program in Public History in Iowa, there is great potential for growth and development in that area. We also believe that we have a mission to serve teachers through our own program and through the recently established Social Science Master’s Degree program. Unfortunately, at present, we lack the scheduling flexibility and means of delivery to serve teachers with a Master’s degree in History as extensively as we might like. To do so will require more evening and summer courses and more classes offered through distance education than we presently provide. As we move forward, we must consider the degree to which the Department currently has the resources to expand its graduate offerings to teachers and hopefully devise some means by which our History Master’s Degree program can be made more accessible. Meanwhile, we can serve a substantial number of teachers through our involvement in the recently revived Social Science Master’s Degree program. In addition, we must remain cognizant of and responsive to the fact that our program also serves students who seek graduate education simply for the sake of their intellectual growth or because they are interested in the possibility of subsequent study at the Ph.D. level.
3. Develop modest recruitment efforts in the state and the region to diversify the population of graduate students, increasing the percentage holding undergraduate degrees from institutions other than the University of Northern Iowa.

The Department hopes to strengthen its graduate program by attracting a more diverse graduate student population in the next few years, including drawing more students from outside the UNI community. Recognizing the importance of the internet as a major means of communication with prospective students, we have recently begun working with UNI=s Information Technology Services to develop a more user-friendly and informative website that will provide potential graduate students with detailed information about content and requirements for each of the three tracks within our Master=s degree program, links to sources of financial assistance, and sketches of some of the activities and accomplishments of current and former students. We are continuing to collaborate with the Graduate College and the Office of International Programs in their efforts to recruit minority and international students. We are also trying to allocate some of our limited assistantship funding to provide at least a half assistantship to a few out-of-state students, which will enable them to receive in-state rates at UNI, a fact which should draw at least a few more students from outside Iowa. Furthermore, we have reason to believe that as our graduates in Public History take jobs throughout the state and region, and as other graduates of our program do likewise, these former students will help to publicize what we have to offer in graduate education.

4. Consider, in conjunction with possible applications for Teaching American History grants, building connections with local school districts to help attract teachers to the graduate program of the department.

On two or three occasions the Department has sought to collaborate with schools or educational agencies to secure a Teaching American History grant. For a variety of reasons, these efforts have thus far yielded no positive results. However, we recognize the potential benefits of such grants both to the Department of History and to the educational community in general. We currently have one faculty member with considerable experience working with schools that have received TAH grants and another who has participated in such a program during this academic year. Building on the expertise and experience of these and other faculty members over the next several years, we plan to pursue opportunities to secure a Teaching American History grant. Meanwhile, the Department has recently expanded its connections to local and area school districts through its involvement in the new Social Science Master=s Degree program and, as noted in Response 2, we plan to explore ways in which we may attract more teachers to graduate work in History.

5. Consider developing a B.A./M.A. option for very high ability undergraduate majors.

The Department regards this as potentially a very attractive option for a limited number of our best majors, especially since we have several undergraduates each year who choose to remain at UNI for graduate education. Consequently, the Graduate Studies Committee plans to investigate similar programs at UNI and at other institutions to determine the feasibility and potential design of a fifth-year Master=s degree.
6. Develop a set of goals distinctive to graduate education in the department, as well as assessment measures that specifically address those goals.

The Department currently has a Student Outcomes Assessment Plan for its graduate program, which resembles rather closely that used to measure outcomes for undergraduates. This assessment plan was developed prior to the establishment of our current three-track Master=s degree and needs to be reevaluated and revised to take into account changes that have already occurred in our program and those that may occur as we engage in the activities outlined in Responses 1 and 2. The Graduate Studies Committee has already begun a draft revision of our Graduate Student Outcomes Assessment plan and, in cooperation with relevant offices on campus, will develop and propose to the Department a new plan over the next year.

7. Provide release time to the Graduate Studies Director, and consider allocating additional staff support to the development of the public history internships in a wider geographical area.

With the consent of the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, the current Graduate Coordinator in History has been given a one-course reduction in her teaching load for the current academic year and the coordinator will continue to receive this reduction, as long as the size and quality of the program warrants. Likewise, the Director of the Public History Program has also been given an additional one-course reduction in her classroom teaching load to develop and supervise more internships, seek external funding, and promote collaboration with other departments on campus and institutions off campus.

8. In whatever ways possible, increase the number of assistantships and partial assistantships available to graduate students.

The Department fully supports this recommendation; however, we have little control over the level of support awarded annually by the Graduate College. We recognize that insufficient funding is a problem not unique to History, and we appreciate the special consideration we have received on occasion, with the addition of assistantships for minority and international students and those working on the UNI Museum=s Rural Education Project. However, such special awards are short-term and precarious and provide no sustained support for a growing program. The Department plans to work with the Graduate College in hopes of securing additional permanent assistantship and tuition scholarships in the near future. We are also working with the CSBS Development Officer and the UNI Foundation to secure external sources of funding, an effort which has, during the past year, resulted in our first two donor-funded graduate scholarships. In addition, we hope that efforts to secure funding through such programs as Teaching American History and grants for the support of Public History will yield results that will enable us to provide more support for graduate students.
9. Increase the number of graduate seminar offerings.

The Department recognizes that more 200-level graduate seminars are highly desirable, since they are instrumental in creating a sense of community among graduate students and crucial in providing a distinct educational experience for Master’s degree students. The current deficiency in staffing resulting from resignations, leaves, and lost lines has made the offering of more than two graduate seminars in a semester almost impossible. We have filled two vacant lines during the current academic year and urge the administration to provide funding for the re-establishment of one or more of History’s lost lines as soon as possible. If staffing issues can be resolved, we hope to offer at least one additional graduate seminar annually within the next one to two years.

10. Include significant history content, as well as consultation with history faculty, in planning the new Social Studies M.A. program.

Although housed in the Department of History for administrative purposes, the Social Science Master’s Degree program is designed for social science teachers and is offered by the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and the UNI Department of Economics. It is provided through UNI’s division of Continuing Education. History is one of six departments included in the design and delivery of the program. Two history faculty are instructors in the current curriculum and the Head of the Department of History is the program coordinator. Given the interest in history courses, as documented in a survey administered to teachers across northeast Iowa prior to structuring the current curriculum, it is highly probable that, as the program develops in the foreseeable future, History’s involvement will remain at approximately the same level as at present.
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THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution: University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Business Teaching B.A.

2b. List date(s) of program review: 2006-2007

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes X No

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes No X

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

n/a

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes No X

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes No

n/a

6b. If not, why not?

n/a

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

attached
Business Teaching

Self Study Concerns and Recommendations
The primary issue of concern remains the very small number of majors in the program. Students who graduate from the UNI College of Business Administration with a teaching degree have a strong background in business subjects and are well prepared to teach most courses at the secondary level, but demand for secondary teachers in the state continues to exceed the number of students interested in the profession. The self-study recommendations included a plan to increase awareness of and importance of the Business Teaching major within the College of Business Administration, as well as its indirect influence on the Iowa business environment.

External Review Concerns and Recommendations
The external reviewers echoed these same issues, citing the expertise and enthusiasm of the single faculty member involved in the program as well as its “distance” from the rest of the department and declining enrollments. The recommendation was for a serious consideration of the future of this major and a plan that would provide clarity and direction for the future.

Response and Plan
The concern that the Business Teaching major is disconnected from the rest of the department has been a continuing one, noted in both the 1992 and 1999 program reviews. The department offered no plan in response to those reviews, implicitly agreeing that the preparation of business teachers is not a core activity in the department. Unfortunately, this has left the problems with K-12 teacher preparation unresolved. We are therefore submitting a plan of action for this program that requests action from parties outside the department. While we understand that Program Review is intended to focus only on the internal management of a program, that narrow scope cannot adequately address the needs of an interdisciplinary program such as this.

1. Include Business Teaching in the University’s efforts to enhance Iowa’s teacher preparation in key demand areas. Clearly, declining enrollment in this major is the primary concern. The program is well regarded in terms of quality, but graduates only a few new teachers each year. Meanwhile, the faculty receives 15-18 personal requests for placements, which probably reflects only a fraction of the positions actually available throughout the state. As a demand area (along with math, science, special education, family consumer science, and Spanish), the specialty is eligible for Federal salary bonuses and loan forgiveness, but there currently are no statewide or University efforts to recruit students into the profession.

2. Locate the Business Teaching Program within an academic department with curricular or faculty ties to the high school curriculum. If the detachment of the Management faculty from this major is truly a problem, the department respectfully points out that such a connection is beyond its disciplinary scope. The curriculum in the Business Teaching major reflects the Iowa Department of Education requirements for Secondary Teacher Licensure. Beyond the business core, which is required of all majors, there is only one Management course required for the Teaching major, along with one from Finance and one Marketing course. That single course, Business Communication, is an elective that is not required in any other Management major and is taught by faculty with an academic preparation from a non-business discipline. Further, Iowa’s high school level business courses focus primarily on such subjects as accounting, personal finance, economic literacy, consumer behavior, entrepreneurship, and computing technology.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Institution</th>
<th>University of Northern Iowa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed:</td>
<td>Communication Studies/Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. List date(s) of program review:</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators?</td>
<td>Yes X No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years?</td>
<td>Yes X No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval?</td>
<td>Yes X No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents?</td>
<td>Yes X No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. If not, why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments. While the individual programs within the department were reviewed, most of the recommendations for change focused on departmental changes. As a result, the following section will be identical for the four programs reviewed within the Department of Communication Studies. The primary substantive difference in the recommendations addressed issues of staffing. Staffing is a departmental decision. As such, those recommendations are addressed in each of the program reports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum

**Recommendations:**
1. The department was urged to consider a departmental core of 9-15 credit hours.
2. The department was urged to cut back on the number of courses listed in the course catalog.
3. The review suggested that the department consider combining majors.
4. The external review recommended eliminating the two certificate programs in the department.

**Actions:**
1. The Department Head will ask each division to consider what courses should be included in a departmental core. (Fall 2007-Completed) This action is related to Student Outcomes Assessment planning and results.
2. Committees will be formed with the charge of developing courses for a common core for the department. This action is related to Student Outcomes Assessment planning and results. (Fall 2008)
3. The communication division will identify approximately three to five departments that have curriculum models to which they would aspire. The course offerings of those departments will be studied to see how many courses are offered and the nature of those offerings. (Spring 2008 and Fall 2008)

4. The Department Head will ask divisions to examine course offerings within each division and across division lines for possible course consolidations. (Spring 2008 and Fall 2008)

5. The Department Head will report enrollment data in the two certificate programs. The department will decide whether to maintain, modify, or eliminate the certificates. (Fall 2008)

Student Services

Recommendations:
1. The review recommended that the department seek ways to make advising more satisfying to students.
2. The review recommended that the department modify or end its use of wait lists.
3. The external reviewers also suggested that the department consider increasing entrance requirements for majors in the department.

Actions:
1. Changes in advising will be implemented. Specifically, the advising load will be redistributed within the department. In addition, the department will participate in the new advising center for incoming students. (Fall 2008)
2. The Department Head and the Departmental Advisor will explore the possibility of removing wait lists for various courses on an experimental basis. (Fall 2007 and Spring 2008-Completed) In addition, the department offered several additional sections of courses to address wait list needs. Funding for the additional sections was provided by the Dean of the College of Humanities and Fine Arts.
3. The department will consider possible changes to the wait list process for implementation. (Spring 2008-Completed)
4. The department will conduct a survey of students concerning wait lists for the purpose of discovering the unmet demand in various courses. (Spring 2008-in progress)
5. Divisions will use enrollment data in developing a target number for the ideal size of the various majors in the department. (Spring 2009)

Staffing

Recommendations:
1. The external review recommended hiring a Basic Course Director with release time.
2. The external review recommended hiring a faculty position in Public Relations.

Actions:
1. The Department Head will request a hire in Public Relations. (Fall 2008)
2. The Communication Division will examine the model used for oversight of the Basic Course. (Fall 2008)

Budgeting

Recommendations:
1. The external reviewers suggested that more greater support for faculty development be provided.
2. The external reviewers called for an equipment replacement budget.

Actions:
1. The Department Head will make an effort to increase support for faculty travel so that it is more comparable to peer institutions and other departments in CHFA and CSBS. (AY 2008-09)
2. The department will develop a more comprehensive equipment replacement schedule. (Spring 2008)
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution _____University of Northern Iowa, Department of Curriculum and Instruction________________________

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: __Unified Master Degree: Early Childhood Educ.____

2b. List date(s) of program review: ______2006-2007_______________________________________

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ____x__ No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: __2___

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes ______ No ___x___

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes ______ No ____x____

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ______ No ______

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments. Recommendations called for clarification of the program mission/outcomes, increased participation of more early childhood faculty, and linking student outcomes to new NAEYC standards. The faculty concurred with these recommendations and has taken the following steps to initiate response to them.

   a. ECE faculty are participating in the process of curriculum mapping to identify and eliminate gaps and redundancies in the existing curriculum.

   b. Two faculty members attended the National Association for Early Childhood Educators (NAEYC) workshop on assessing program and student outcomes. The association is recommending the use of the Tools identified in the professional development guidelines for
graduate students as the framework for developing student outcomes. In addition NAEYC also recommends using the National Board Certification Standards as an additional framework for developing student outcomes in MAE programs. The ECE faculty will compare existing outcomes and the nationally recommended outcomes to modify/revise/ add student outcomes for the program.

c. The coordinator of the early childhood program and the coordinator of graduate studies for the Department of Curriculum and Instruction have meet and agreed that student advising should be distributed across early childhood graduate faculty. The first step in this process will be in the assignment of first and second readers of the final research papers that will be due Summer 2009. With the beginning of a new cohort in fall 2009 students will be assigned advisors distributed across ECE faculty.

d. The ECE division received approval on a new post BA endorsement program that will be linked to the existing MAE program. This program will enhance the identified purpose of one strand of the MAE ECE program and meet the state need for certified teachers to teach the newly established state sponsored programs for four year olds in Iowa.

e. The faculty will continue to revise the existing curriculum before Cohort#3 begins the program in fall 2009.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution __University of Northern Iowa_______________________________

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: __Department of History B.A. program

2b. List date(s) of program review: 2006 – 2007

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ___X___ No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: __2___

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes ______ No ___X____

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes ______ No ___X____

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ______ No ______

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

During the spring semester of 2007, the Department of History’s Self-Study, prepared in consultation with the Academic Program Review Committee and CSBS Dean Julia Wallace, was sent to Professors Mary Kupiec Cayton, of Miami University of Ohio, and Fritz Fischer, of the University of Northern Colorado, who served as external reviewers. Professors Cayton and Fischer visited UNI on March 19th and interviewed faculty, staff, and administrators familiar with History’s programs. Following their visit, the external reviewers prepared a generally very positive report on the present state of undergraduate History education at UNI. They did, however, identify several areas in which they believed the Department could build on current strengths.
On September 5, 2007, the faculty of the Department of History met with CSBS Dean Julia Wallace, Interim Graduate Dean Sue Joseph; Associate Provost Beverly Kopper; and Interim Provost James Lubker and discussed some of the issues raised by the Academic Program Review. The departmental faculty met on October 3rd and October 10th to consider each of the recommendations in the undergraduate External Review, which are found on pages 3-5 of that document. Based on the faculty’s responses to the recommendations, the Department Head, in consultation with the departmental Policies and Planning Committee, prepared a draft of the Program Plan, which was reviewed and approved by the faculty on October 31, 2007. What follows is an abridged and updated portion of that document which contains the external reviewers’ recommendations and the Department’s responses to them.

I. RESPONSES TO REVIEWERS’ RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR ADOPTION.

1. Retain and enhance strengths in breadth of curriculum offerings.

The Department of History recognizes the importance of the breadth and strengths of its current curricular offerings both to the University’s Liberal Arts Core and to History’s Teaching and Liberal Arts majors. Although we are deeply concerned about the curricular impact of shrinking resources on our Department since the last Academic Program Review, we are committed to the maintenance of a strong and diverse curriculum in order to educate students to function in an increasingly interconnected and complex world. For further comments, please see the response to Recommendation 2.

2. Retain small class sizes in order to guarantee the continued impressive educational experiences for students at UNI.

The Department appreciates the benefits of small class size as a stimulus to student participation and as a catalyst for the use of essay tests and written assignments. It is our goal to continue to provide small classes for our majors and, in so far as possible, for students in our Liberal Arts Core classes as well. However, as in the case of our desire to maintain the breadth and quality of our course offerings noted in Response 1, we are deeply concerned by the loss of two faculty lines since the Academic Program Review in 1999-2000 which has made it increasingly difficult to sustain a relatively small class policy, especially in our Liberal Arts Core offerings. The loss of two lines has both reduced the flexibility of our offerings to our majors and necessitated the use of adjunct faculty to teach more and larger sections of Humanities and Non-Western Cultures. While we recognize that resources remain limited and the demand for these resources is highly competitive, we believe that if we are to provide optimum educational opportunities for our students that the most recently lost position in Humanities/European History should be restored as soon as possible. Furthermore, we also hope that the line lost several years ago can be restored as soon as is financially feasible.

3. Enhance the strong department focus on Secondary Ed majors.

The faculty of the Department of History appreciates the fact that ordinarily more than sixty percent of our majors are History Teaching majors, and we are committed to providing them with a solid educational foundation on which they can build their own careers as middle and secondary teachers. There are admittedly differences of opinion among colleagues as to how we may best accomplish this goal. We recognize that faculty have varied strengths and teaching styles and that not all will approach their instructional responsibilities in the same way. In the coming months, we will consider individually and as a Department things we currently do and additional things we may do across the curriculum to strengthen the training of future teachers.
4. Improve advising for Liberal Arts majors.

The Department acknowledges that its current procedures for the advising of its Liberal Arts majors lack focus and consistency. We have given considerable thought to how deficiencies in our current system of advising might most effectively be addressed. Ideally, we would like to be able to hire another Professional and Scientific staff member comparable to Chad Christopher, who advises History Teaching and Social Science majors, to advise Liberal Arts majors and undertake additional tasks in the Department and College. We have, however, been informed by the CSBS Dean’s office that this is not economically feasible. Consequently, we are looking into other means by which to strengthen Liberal Arts major advising.

5. Enhance the Public History program for undergraduate students.

The Department is already considering ways in which we can provide more Public History options for both undergraduate and graduate students. “Applying History: The Public Alternative” (960:106g) is presently scheduled each fall, and we are trying to determine ways in which a “public history skills” course may be offered each spring. This may be a new course provided within the Department or may be a relevant one offered elsewhere in the UNI curriculum. The director of the Public History Program, Professor Joanne Goldman, will begin this summer an aggressive effort to seek outside sources of funding and to identify more internship opportunities for students. Plans to develop a new departmental webpage and to enhance our Public History website should make material about the Department’s certificate in Public History, information regarding career options in that field, and items about the activities and accomplishments of current and former students readily accessible. In January 2007, we launched a monthly e-newsletter through which we serve Iowa’s Public History community by facilitating communication. We include announcements, programs, requests, and news updates. In September 2007, we partnered with Silos and Smokestacks to offer a workshop, “Teaching with Historic Places.” We hope to offer other workshops, perhaps two a year, to provide greater educational opportunities both for Public History professionals and our students and to publicize our Public History Program.

6. Enhance professional development opportunities for faculty, including annual travel to conferences.

The Department appreciates the importance of providing support for professional development, including the intellectual stimulation and networking opportunities that result from attendance at, or participation in, conferences. We currently have in place a policy providing varying levels of support for conference travel based on degrees of participation, ranging from attendance to presentation of a paper. Resources for this support are drawn from the departmental supplies and services budget, which has remained more or less constant for the past several years. In addition, the CSBS Dean’s Office has annually set aside some support for travel. Unfortunately, budget cuts have resulted in the loss of former Graduate College travel funding, which when combined with increased costs have meant a net loss in support for travel. Budget permitting, in the 2008-2009 academic year the Department Head intends to increase the Department’s current level of support and to work with the office of the CSBS Dean and the Graduate College to encourage increased funding for conference attendance and participation. Beyond the matter of travel to conferences, faculty plan to continue History’s successful tradition of regularly taking advantage of University support for scholarly activities by applying for Professional Development Assignments, Summer Fellowships, and CSBS Research Grants.

7. Create an Executive Advisory Committee to assist the Head in decision making and to increase overall faculty involvement in the future of the department.

The History faculty supports the principle of inclusion and involvement of all colleagues in the discussion of major issues affecting the future of the Department but does not believe there is a need to create another
standing committee since the existing Policies and Planning Committee can perform the function suggested by the External Reviewers.

8. **Review factors contributing to extended time in rank for associate professors and develop ways for more effectively supporting promotion through the ranks.**

The departmental Professional Assessment Committee plans to investigate ways in which other departments may have addressed this issue and, in conjunction with the Department Head, will consider creative ways within the limits of contractual and University policy guidelines to facilitate the efforts of faculty seeking to advance in rank.

9. **Revamp the department web page.**

Recognizing the importance of the internet as a major means of communication with students and the public, during the fall of 2007, we began working with UNI’s Information Technology Services to develop a more user-friendly and informative website, which will provide potential students with detailed information about History’s programs, faculty, student organizations, and activities, and other items of interest. The design and basic structure of the new site went online in April 2008, but much work remains to be done regarding updating the content.

10. **Aggressively pursue external funding, especially in applying for a Teaching American History grant.**

On two or three occasions, the Department has sought to collaborate with schools or educational agencies to secure a Teaching American History grant. For a variety of reasons, these efforts have thus far yielded no positive results. However, we recognize the potential benefits of such grants both to the Department of History and to the educational community in general. We currently have one faculty member, with considerable experience working with schools which have received TAH grants and another who participated in such a program in another state during this academic year. Building on the expertise and experience of these and other faculty members over the next several years, we hope to pursue opportunities to secure a Teaching American History grant. Meanwhile, we are working closely with the CSBS development officer and the UNI Foundation to secure more private funding for scholarships and other departmental needs, an effort that during the past year has already resulted in the establishment of one new scholarship which will benefit undergraduate students.

As noted above, the Department has already begun working toward the implementation of some of its responses to the program review, such as redesign of its website and the search for additional sources of external funding. It will, however, probably take several semesters to implement fully our program plan since we are unable to project a possible timeline for the implementation of some proposals, such as replacement of lost lines over which we have no control.

II. **OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT AND DEPARTMENTAL GOALS.**

The Department acknowledges the increasing emphasis on student outcomes measurements in assessing the success of academic programs. We believe that if we effectively implement the instructional, recruitment, advising, and developmental goals enumerated above that fact will be reflected positively in our annual undergraduate Student Outcomes Assessment results. If it proves necessary to further refine the current Student Outcomes Assessment procedures, revised in the spring of 2006, in order to more accurately measure the progress of students and the effectiveness of the undergraduate History program, we are prepared to do so.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution: ____________ University of Northern Iowa _________________

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: ____________________________

2b. List date(s) of program review: ________________________________

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ___ x ___ No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: ______ 2 ______

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes _____ No ___ x ____

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

   n/a

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No ___ x ____

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _____ No _____

   n/a

6b. If not, why not?

   n/a

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

   attached
Management

Self Study Concerns and Recommendations
The department, covering three majors as well as the largest proportion of the College of Business Administration’s core curriculum, prides itself on its diversity and scope. The faculty values its ability to apply sound management principles across applications in a wide variety of careers and business functions. The program has identified several core strengths, which it will continue to emphasize as areas where we can offer a distinctive advantage.

- Continued emphasis on experiential learning and professional development opportunities serve our students well, although there are areas where improvements could be made. The Management major’s emphasis in Business Administration, in particular, would be enhanced by insuring students of a clearly defined core of professional skills that allow effective application of management principles in organizational settings.

- Both enrollment and employer demand are strong in all areas, but students could be usefully directed toward the more focused degree programs, particularly the MIS major and the Supply Chain and Operations Management emphasis, where employer demand is particularly strong and starting salaries are higher.

- The overall research profile of the department is strong, and continued improvements in research productivity are one of the College’s strategic goals. The management department has shown consistent success in this regard, with several nationally and internationally known scholars on the faculty.

Budgetary issues over the past several years have created difficulties in filling faculty positions, which have had an impact on academic outcomes. Both teaching and research suffer from the need to teach multiple preps and course overloads and to remediate issues that arise from the use of adjuncts for instruction in foundational courses. As resources become more available, the department will be able to remedy these issues.

External Review Concerns and Recommendations
The reviewers were "very favorably impressed” with a number of aspects of the department, commenting specifically on the positive comments made by current undergraduates, the cohesiveness of the faculty and the overall quality of their interactions, and the positive relationship between senior and junior faculty. Beyond a general concern about the number of unfilled faculty positions, the reviewers concerns ranged rather widely toward various areas where improvements could be made.

Tenure/Tenure Track Positions
Although the resource issues associated with tenure track positions lies outside the scope of program review, several comments seem to have been based on incomplete information and require some clarification.

- Administrative positions in the College are pulled from faculty ranks without replacement. The reviewers apparently understood that there was a university policy that a dean and associate dean of a college necessarily come from internal ranks. This would only be tangentially related to the department’s programs in any case, but is also not true of the College of Business Administration. A national search was conducted for the current dean, although an internal candidate was ultimately selected.

- Supervision of adjunct instructors. The reviewers expressed concern that a growing use of adjuncts in the department raises issues with consistency and quality of the classroom experience. They were “unclear” how the adjuncts are being supervised or socialized or how their performance is being observed and evaluated. The topic was not specifically addressed in the self-study, nor was it discussed during the campus visit, and no information was requested by the reviewers as to departmental procedures. Currently,
adjuncts are hired on an as-needed basis by the department head. To the extent possible, the pool of applicants is reviewed with the regular faculty who teach a target course, and in some areas, the adjuncts are trained and supervised by the regular faculty as well. The head attempts to observe each adjunct faculty at least once each semester, providing written as well as oral feedback. Adjuncts are included in the department's regular performance reports, learning assurance programs, and communication.

Program Elements

The external reviewers identified several areas that had not been addressed in the self study. These are university-wide issues, however, and problems are not unique to the department.

- **Transfer Students**: The reviewers recommended that transfer and 2 + 2 agreements with community colleges and international schools be revisited to yield “new productive approaches that are cost efficient, afford positive revenue enhancements, and enrich the students’ experience.” The reviewers reported that in discussions with transfer students, “initial selection of courses” was found to be a problem area. While the preparation of transfer students and their ability to move seamlessly into the College is a concern, the department has no direct impact on University policies or articulation agreements.

- **Student Retention**: Student retention was named as an area of concern because the topic does not appear in either the UNI or CBA strategic plan, nor is there anyone in the department specifically charged with responsibility for retention initiatives. Unfortunately, student retention information is unavailable at the department level.

- **Internships**: The reviewers expressed concern that students are pursuing internships without academic credit and concluded that this was because academic credit was no longer being offered. There have been no changes to the internship courses, and internship enrollment is declining across the University. It is the opinion of the College’s career advisors that the trend is a result of economic pressures. Students continue to do internships, but elect not to pay for the academic units.

Faculty Governance

The reviewers touched on faculty governance issues in several areas. There was some concern that the senior faculty had been insufficiently involved in the development of the self-study. They were “unclear” as to whether advisory boards are being utilized and recommended that some thought be given to development of program-specific boards. They were concerned that because the department is currently headed by an interim, that “continuity in departmental leadership has been a challenge.” None of these areas had been a concern in the department's self-study, and in fact, the department finds its decentralized management structures to be well suited to a large and diverse faculty group.

Distance Education

The reviewers noted a “culture that was highly resistant to distance education and other such approaches to creatively delivering education and extending the reach of the College.” In fact, several of the management faculty have taught in the College’s Hong Kong MBA program. Others have been involved in developing and delivering courses through the Iowa Communications Network (ICN) system, as well as continuing education through the College’s Executive Development Center and the University's Division of Continuing Education. While the College does not encourage the substitution of computer-based platforms for interactive learning environments, we have been especially proactive in using technology to create innovative instructional environments, including international linkages for both students and faculty.

Research Recognition

Although the department had reported one of its significant strengths to be its research productivity, the reviewers expressed some concern that there were “no clear rewards or recognition given for research” by the College as well as a dearth of collaborative efforts in research, which had been a goal of the 1999 Program Review. The reviewers apparently made
their comments after reading the College’s 2006-07 Strategic Initiatives, which reflected a single-year effort by the College to enhance its “teaching edge.” Further, several faculty in the department are engaged in collaborative research projects, and the junior faculty, in particular, regularly engage in discussions of their ongoing work.

Management Major Emphasis Areas

- **Business Administration Emphasis** The reviewers found this area to be extremely broad without a faculty champion or core teaching faculty; they recommend “a strategic realignment of the curriculum.” They suggested the use of certificate programs to allow non-traditional students to be part of the classroom and program experience, raise funds for the Department and the College, enrich the classroom experience, and further develop the image of the department with external constituencies.

- **Human Resource Management Emphasis** The reviewers found this to be a “coherent and relevant major” but the small size of the faculty was a concern. They suggested the area “could benefit from the use of clinical faculty who are practitioners in the field.” While the major is not designed to require clinical faculty, four individuals among the department’s adjuncts have professional qualifications in human resources or training and one holds a terminal degree in Organizational Behavior. We feel our professional depth in this area is particularly strong.

- **Supply Chain and Operations Management Emphasis** The reviewers noted the loss of two faculty members despite a consistent number of majors in the area, with the result that the area is “drifting without a clear mandate.” Since the visit, the provost has authorized a faculty position to address the tenure-track coverage issues in the department, and a search is underway. The specific strengths of the top candidates will determine, to some extent, the future of this emphasis area, but the demand for supply chain majors continues to grow, and the department enjoys strong relationships with a growing number of regional employers. While we might have missed a chance to be on the “cutting edge” of the field, we do not feel the delay has compromised the department’s ability to create an outstanding program over the long term.

**Response and Plan**

While we appreciate the reviewers’ attention to all areas that affect the department’s success, we will limit our plan elements to those items that lie within the department’s capacity to act.

1. **Establish a core faculty for the Business Administration emphasis and charge that faculty with creating a strategic realignment of the program.** Any revision of this program should build on the department’s strengths in experiential learning and professional development opportunities.

2. **Actively recruit students into the Supply Chain and Operations Management emphasis.** Employer demand is particularly strong and new resources will allow a strategic growth.

3. **Expand the use of certificates and certifications.** In keeping with the department’s strength in professional development, the reviewer’s suggestion to expand their use appears to be good advice.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution: University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Management Information Systems B.A.

2b. List date(s) of program review: 2006-2007

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes X No

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes No X

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

n/a

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes No X

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes No

n/a

6b. If not, why not?

n/a

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

attached
Management Information Systems

Self Study Concerns and Recommendations
The department’s self-study found the MIS program to offer an excellent preparation to students, with a faculty that does a good job of maintaining up-to-date curriculum within its resource limitations. Enrollment has declined, reflecting national trends, but efforts should continue to update the curriculum in response to technology changes and business uses of technology.

External Review Concerns and Recommendations
The external reviewers commented on the overall high quality of the program, a high level of satisfaction among the students, and a faculty that functions cohesively and effectively to deliver a program that is technologically relevant and meets employers’ needs. That said, the reviewers did have specific recommendations in three areas:

Maintain (and to the extent possible with current resources) enhance MIS program quality. The reviewers expressed some concern about the ability of the department to manage course and program quality while teaching multiple course preparations and using adjunct instructors heavily. While staffing is beyond the scope of departmental resources, it should be noted that the College provided resources to add a well-qualified, full-time term faculty member in January 2008.

Supplement the current assessment effort with additional course-level and program-level assessment for MIS. No specific difficulties were noted, but the reviewers charged the department with developing an assessment program that was strongly supportive of program quality, focused on meeting the needs of the program, and sustainable within a reasonable use of faculty time and resources.

Reexamine the MIS recruiting process and academic program marketing process, then formulate changes (or a new process), implement, and track the effectiveness of changes. The reviewers commented that even with industry-wide enrollment downturn, demand and viability of the major are high. Strengthening enrollment should be an important priority, with attention to gender balance, relationships with feeder schools, and employer/alumni relationships. Specific recommendations were to take immediate steps to begin to bolster enrollment and retention in the MIS program and to leverage existing relationships to attract additional resources to the MIS program.

Response and Plan

1. Curriculum: The MIS faculty will continue to seek out viable partnerships with other programs. The department has already leveraged partnerships with other programs within the College of Business by recently receiving approval for business students to include MIS as a double major option. This allows students to double major in MIS and other business majors (e.g., Accounting, Finance, Marketing) where this expanded skill set enhances the graduate’s employment prospects. This change appears to be quite popular, with approximately 40% of the current (Spring 2008) MIS majors identified as double majors.

2. Assessment that encompasses all courses: The MIS faculty will develop a consistent set of outcome measures for each MIS course. In addition to data currently collected during the capstone course, additional outcomes measures will be developed to insure that all elements of the program are being effectively assessed.

3. Enrollment: The MIS faculty will undertake the development of a strategic plan for recruitment and academic program marketing. We are currently addressing this concern in a variety of ways both on and off campus. Historically we have recruited prospective business students who have not formally declared a major within the College of Business Administration. To attract and retain potential MIS majors, we have recently received approval for students to double major within the CBA (e.g., Accounting and MIS, Finance and MIS). We have worked closely with accounting faculty to design a 5-year plan of study that enables students to obtain an MIS major, Accounting major, and prepare to sit for the CPA exam. Second, we are reorganizing and refocusing course
content in the Introduction to Information Systems course and the two lead-in programming
courses to encourage and ease the transition of interested students into the MIS major. Off
campus we plan to work more closely with the UNI Admissions Office to develop the recruiting
materials and approach to make sure the MIS major at UNI receives consideration by high school
students investigating computer-oriented professional careers.

Another method to attract and retain students in the major is to increase awareness of job
opportunities in the field. We are completing an MIS Job Resources Portal through which current
and former students can access up-to-date employment opportunities. Any student enrolled in an
MIS course will have access to these listings.

• Gender balance

As has always been the case, we will continue to do our best to encourage young women to
enroll in our major. The gender balance has fluctuated by class. For example, our current (Spring
2008) senior class is 47% female. We are fortunate to have three female faculty members who
are excellent role models for young women considering professional MIS careers.

• Relationships with feeder schools

This will be addressed by the recruitment and marketing strategies identified in the first
paragraph. We participate in a variety of university and college recruiting activities, including
campus visits by prospective students and their parents. We are also developing more attractive
and informative traditional recruiting materials, and are in the process of expanding our MIS
Portal to provide more online information and resources for prospective students as well as high
school and community college instructors.

• Employer/alumni relationships

We have always had strong relationships with local and regional employers. We regularly invite
employers on campus to talk to MIS classes and MISA (our MIS student organization) and
faculty. We work closely with the UNI Career Center and supplement its efforts by working with
employers to immediately and directly publicize internships, part-time, and full-time employment
opportunities, and also assist in identifying students who are prepared to be successful in those
positions.

At present, the graduates of our program are in many ways an untapped resource. We have an
alumni web site that maintains updated contact information, but no systematic way to involve our
alumni with our students. We intend to investigate ways that we can fruitfully engage our alumni
in our program to assist us in keeping our curriculum up-to-date and promote our students’
development of professional skills.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Literacy Education MAE Program

2b. List date(s) of program review: 2006-07

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes X No

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes X No

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes X No

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes No

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

See attached.
Division faculty have decided to take advantage of the opportunities presented by the Board of Regents APR process to extend the scope of program analysis, as the division considers APR a stimulus for extensive program review and possible revision rather than a culminating event. Consequently, the various APR recommendations represent a portion of the data contributing to a more thorough program analysis.

Essentially the literacy faculty has begun to implement recommendations from the external review reports. Those recommendations have been subsumed within the context of a broader program assessment. Recommendations for action will be driven by:

1. an evolving academic knowledge base concerning literacy learning;
2. best practices in teacher preparation and professional development;
3. the need for a substantial increase in program specific student feedback while students are enrolled and at predetermined post-graduate intervals;
4. preparation for meeting accreditation expectations for gathering meaningful student outcomes assessment data;
5. market demands and state endorsement requirements, and faculty resource capacity; and,
6. the need to maintain a productive and supportive work environment in which faculty efforts in teaching, research and service are acknowledged and rewarded.

Various changes have already been identified and implemented, others will go into effect during the 2007-2008 academic year. Those components of the review more systemic in nature and/or involving changes potentially impacting other units in the university will be implemented through traditional change processes and take more time. These could include, for example, curricular changes or program sequence changes that require processing through the university curricular change procedures.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution    University of Northern Iowa
2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: M.A., Computer Science Education
2b. List date(s) of program review:    Fall 2006-Spring 2007
3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators?    Yes X    No ___
3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators:    two (2)
4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years?    Yes _____  No X
4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

There are currently no students enrolled. The last graduate of the program finished in 2002.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval?    Yes______  No__X__
6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents?    Yes______  No ______
6b. If not, why not?
Not applicable.

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

See next page.
Recommendations from the Self-Study of Graduate Programs

• consider dropping the MA degree in Computer Science Education

Recommendations from the External Review of Graduate Programs

The external review team suggested that we consider their recommendations for the undergraduate programs when improving the graduate program, given the closeness with which our graduate students take courses and work with undergraduates. It also made a few specific recommendations:

• offer more financial assistantship support to more students
• market the program more heavily to local professionals and area industries
• ensure that graduate students do extra work as prescribed for credit in 1xx(g) courses, work worthy of grad credit
• create a system in which faculty "bank" overload grad course and research credits, trading them (r for 1) for course reduction
• When looking to hire new faculty, do not automatically view the department's list of necessary specialty areas to be equivalent to the list of capabilities of the current faculty.
• create social events exclusively for graduate students
• hold a "town hall meeting" once or twice a year to disseminate information and to solicit suggestions for improvement

Summary Recommendations of the Faculty

The last graduate of the program finished in 2002. There are currently no students enrolled in this program and there is insufficient interest from potential students to continue the program. In recent years, students have chosen to enroll in the Master of Science in Computer Science program.

• eliminate the MA degree program in Computer Science Education

Program Improvements from the Academic Program Review

• Dropped the MA degree program in Computer Science Education and all courses taught solely to support it.

Program Plans Still Under Activate Consideration

• not applicable
DATE: February 8, 2008

TO: Board of Regents, State of Iowa

FROM: Office of the Provost
       University of Northern Iowa

SUBJECT: Suspension of admissions and termination of the graduate major
          Master of Arts in Computer Science Education at the University of Northern Iowa

As directed by Board policy (Procedural Guide 6.06-D, Policy on “Academic Program
Reduced Admissions and Termination”), this memorandum is to request permission to
suspend admissions to and terminate the Master of Arts in Computer Science Education
graduate major at the University of Northern Iowa.

The last graduate of the program finished in 2002. There are currently no students enrolled in
this program and there is insufficient interest from potential students to continue the program. In
recent years, students have chosen to enroll in the Master of Science in Computer Science
program.

This decision has been reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate of the College of
Natural Sciences, the Graduate College Curriculum Committee, the Graduate Council, the
University Faculty Senate and the UNI administration.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality, and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution ________Early Childhood Division, Department of Curriculum & Instruction________________

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: __Early Childhood Education—Undergraduate___
2b. List date(s) of program review: __________April 2007_____________

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes __X__ No _____
3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: __2___

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes ______ No ___X___
4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes ______ No ___X___

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ______ No ______
6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

- **Develop a shared vision and clearly defined program:** Course-mapping has laid the groundwork for developing a shared vision and program definition. The division will do strategic planning beginning in Fall 08 to determine what the undergraduate program should look like and do for students in the future, including offering the program through distance education. In addition, the work to develop a graduate-level distance education endorsement program to meet the state’s growing need for early childhood teachers has brought the faculty together in terms of establishing a vision for the division overall. Although the new program is a graduate program, it clearly demonstrates a strong horizontal and vertical articulation for students’ learning that will provide a framework for defining the undergraduate program as well.
• **Identify learning theory that will give the program focus and consistency:** This will be an outcome of the strategic planning.

• **Identify the knowledge, skills and dispositions that program graduates will demonstrate:** Course-mapping began this process, which will continue as the division analyzes the overlapping or missing components. The division recognizes the lack of attention toward dispositions to date in courses and will work to support students’ development of dispositions that reflect high quality teaching. The program has already begun to strengthen its integration of diversity and multicultural education into courses; this will continue as an emphasis in the coming years.

• **Develop field experiences that allow students to demonstrate effective teaching practices and dispositions:** Faculty has sustained a strong field experience component with substantial work in placing and supervising students in the field. They have begun consulting with student teaching coordinators about ways to strengthen the supervision of students in the field. In addition, Dr. Linda Fitzgerald has been actively involved in the development and research component of the professional development school pilot program as an alternative to field placement during early childhood undergraduate coursework. Finally, faculty has established a pilot program of alternative distance supervision of undergraduates’ field experiences, beginning with the 2+2 program. This pilot will provide information about how to effectively and efficiently supervise field experiences for the students enrolled in the new graduate early childhood endorsement program. Faculty will continue to explore this process within the strategic planning in Fall 08.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution: University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Special Education graduate

2b. List date(s) of program review: 2007

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ___X___ No_____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: __2__

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes _____ No ___X___

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No ___X___

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _____ No ______

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
2007 Program Review of Graduate Programs in Special Education at the University of Northern Iowa

This review primarily focused on the Masters Level Programs because the Educational Doctorate in Special Education is to be evaluated separately during Spring Semester, 2008. Some commentary was provided on the doctorate.

[a] Faculty Strengths & Issues of Concern:

[a.1]Scholarship: The reviewers described the faculty as “distinguished” in relation to published scholarship and conference presentations. It was noted that the faculty are highly diverse in theoretical orientation. Further, faculty were said to generate both pragmatic and theoretical knowledge.

[a.2]Grant Awards: The reviewers expressed that, “The effective grant-writing skills and enterprise of the Special Education Department was noted by all of the administrators with whom we met.” The department has had extensive success in securing grant monies.

[a.3]Teaching: The reviewers commented that,

Faculty show a genuine commitment to their teaching responsibilities. As a whole they expressed pride that most undergraduate and graduate teacher preparation courses are taught by tenured or tenure track faculty. All faculty seemed dedicated to preparing teachers to use best practices as they work in inclusive school settings.

Further, the reviewers provided commentary from Area Education Agency (AEA) personnel describing the high quality professionalism found in those hired out of the graduate level preparation programs.

[a.4]Service: The reviewers pointed out that faculty demonstrated a commitment to service at the college and university level, at the local community level, regionally, and nationally.

Departmental Response [a.1-a.4]

Scholarship, teaching, and service are all strengths of the department faculty. Service and scholarship support teaching and each is emphasized and reflected in the Departmental PAC requirements [available on request]. Faculty provide support in these areas to new faculty. The Department would like to see continued and sustained support for faculty scholarship and grant enterprises.

[a.5]Departmental Morale: While the faculty was lauded as strong and collegial, areas of concern were raised particularly in relation to morale. “An issue that surfaced as most glaring in all of our interviews,” stated the report, “was the current lack of administrative stability.”
Further, the report noted that in the past few years, the UNI Department of Special Education has lost 5 faculty members due to retirement and employment elsewhere, and they have only been allowed to hire one replacement. The report stated:

All faculty and administrators echoed the refrain about the need to replace faculty who have retired or resigned and the need to make sure that the current faculty are retained. The former issue will depend upon the improved availability of university funds and/or a new allocation plan of current NIU financial resources so that more comes to the College of Education and, particularly, to the Special Education faculty. The department faculty need to make sure that the excellence of their programs is highly visible to funding sources and that the need for special education personnel is recognized by those who control university purse strings.

Other issues affecting faculty morale described in the report included the lack of transparency in the evaluation process as it related to salary decisions and disparities in teaching assignments and course loads.

**Departmental Response [a.5]**

Stability and a renewed energy in leadership has contributed to a departmental sense of mission and direction. The department is currently conducting two faculty searches.

**[b] External Review Commentary on the Graduate Program Requiring Reflection & Response**

**[b.1]Enrollment Levels:** Throughout the report the reviewers brought out concerns with reduced numbers of students enrolling in the graduate program. For example, it was stated,

No faculty mentioned large class size as a problem. In fact, the concerns revolved around low and declining course enrollments. One administrator was under the impression that the Special Education department limited program admission in order to retain low class size as a quality control measure, however, Special Education faculty denied this was true and said they had always admitted and tried to retain all eligible students.

In attempting to explain the declines the report suggested competing (low-quality) Teacher Preparation Programs. The reviewers noted, “Another phenomena that seems mostly to be out of the control of Special Education faculty is how alternative (mostly on-line) teacher-training are increasingly available.” The reviewers continued, “Many of these are known to be less rigorous than UNI campus-based or distance-delivered courses. These courses/programs may also be cheaper.”

The report brought up a number of ways to counteract declining enrollment. First was to market UNI programs as high-quality and encourage school officials in personnel services to recognize this in hiring and promoting. Second, described as “what may be
the most successful approach,” was using the ICN to deliver distance courses/programs to geographically isolated areas. The reviewers stated, “Certain Special Education faculty are to be lauded for the innovative programs they are currently delivering over ICN to students in remote areas of Iowa. Perhaps other programs can be developed to use this media/format to reach the many teachers with limited licenses currently employed in the state.” Third, the report suggested enrollment might be increased by developing new attractive programs, courses, and degrees (e.g., add-on course sequence that emphasize leadership or inclusive schooling, etc.).

**Departmental Response [b.1]**

Enrollment levels are a concern for all departments at UNI. The department’s enrollment numbers have decreased for a number of reasons. Tuition increases have decreased enrollment numbers. There are numerous smaller institutional special education programs across the state which offer expedient degrees. These program are generally lower quality, make extensive use of adjunct instruction, and are able to recruit students because of cost.

At UNI, the field-based experiences provided by the department are, in part, what lengthens our program and helps make it distinctive. The Department uses alternative methods of course offerings such as the ICN. The Early Childhood Special Education program is offered entirely on the ICN in cohort groups and the secondary program is also offered on the ICN. Also, students from other COE departments have an interest in and are enrolling in our graduate courses, such as the Seminar in Special Education and Special Education Law and Policy courses.

The department will begin a concerted effort to draw committed education students. Materials distributed concerning the department offerings will focus on the quality of the programs offered. Dean Callahan noted that in the past funding has not been appropriated for advertising COE programs. Funding will now be provided for electronic and hard-copy advertisement materials.

[b.2]Course Sequences: The report raised questions about students finding a logical sequence through the Master’s program:

The graduate tracks do not appear to recruit cohort groups, therefore it seems that students can start the program or complete required course work for degrees or certification during any semester. Because many courses are only offered once a year, it may be difficult to ensure that students take courses in a logical sequence in order to have the necessary prerequisites for later, more advanced courses.

**Departmental Response [b.2]**

The department offers certain courses only once a year; however, those courses are offered on a regular rotation so that students can plan their programs appropriately. Teaching in cohort groups is challenging because students entering the program many
times need to begin coursework immediately in order to sustain their teaching positions.

**[b.3]Field Experiences for Graduate Students Securing Teaching Certifications:**
Various issues were brought out concerning field experiences required in certain courses graduate students enrolled in for licensure purposes. Among the concerns raised by the reviewers was the suggestion that there was not a clear link between field experiences and course content. For instance,

> If field experiences are truly linked with campus courses, then it seems that students would have field experience assignments aligned with their core special education courses (and these links should be evident in syllabi). It also seems that when courses and field experiences are to be interrelated, these courses would need to follow a set sequence.

A second concern pointed out was the struggle to find high-quality sites reflective of most-informed practice in which to conduct field experiences. It was noted that the Price Laboratory School offered relatively few options for many experiences because of the few students with moderate to severe disabilities attending the school.

The reviewers described these struggles with finding quality field-based sites as “ubiquitous and universal” and laid out a 3-tiered model of the dilemma:

1. identifying schools and qualified teachers with diverse students within a reasonable distance from the university,
2. making sure that school personnel's philosophy of service delivery and instructional practice are consistent with that of the campus faculty teacher preparation programs,
3. having adequate resources to monitor supervising teachers and students in these placements so that those enrolled in the programs have high quality field-based preparation.

The reviewers suggested that one prominent way of resolving this dilemma was to build closer relationships between the faculty and AEA and LEA personnel. “Perhaps,” the report states, “faculty might consider increasing/enhancing their contacts and collaboration to improve schools and, related, to help create better field sites for preservice teacher preparation.

**Departmental Response [b.3]**

Faculty disagree with the findings of the external reviewers and suggest that field experiences and method courses are closely linked. Materials will be prepared to better reflect these connections.

Particular faculty have or are developing research programs linked to local school districts in order to facilitate excellent field-based sites for practical experiences.

**[b.4]The Master’s in Consultation Program:** This program was effectively ended with the retirement of one faculty member who was then not replaced. After discussions with
the Director of the local AEA, the reviewers pointed out,

The AEA hires consultants for the very large district (51 LEAs), and many schools in these districts are currently seeking to hire qualified consultants. Although the AEA can also hire social work and educational psychology graduates for this position, Dr. Stevens said that she felt the graduates of the Special Education Consultant program had always been the most qualified and competent.

The report suggested that revival of the Consultation Program might hinge on hiring personnel from the AEA to at least initially support the program. The reviewers noted that although Special Education faculty are proud to have tenured and tenure-track faculty teaching in their department, for this particular program it might be necessary to look toward the expertise of the AEA.

**Departmental Response [b.4]**

The Consultation Program has been identified as one of the department’s potentially strongest areas. The faculty member in charge of the program retired and funding to replace him was unavailable. AEA 267 has strongly encouraged the department to offer the program again as there is a high demand for consultants across the state.

Last year faculty worked with AEA 267 personnel to develop a collaborative approach to renovate the program. There is interest among faculty to hire a tenure-track faculty to oversee the program rather than relying wholly or extensively on adjunct instruction. This would be a distinctive program for UNI.

**[b.5]Increased Collaboration with Programs in Departments Outside of Special Education:** The report suggested at the desirability (as well as most effective and informed practice) of increasing collaboration with faculty and programs in other departments. More and improved cooperation around joint programs might be a way to begin to meet the goal of offering courses that improve the disability-related competencies and philosophies of all teachers so that a stand-alone special education minor might no longer be needed. It also might be a way, the report suggested, to increase access to a wider range of funds (NSF, OSERS, Literacy funding) to maintain, improve, or expand programs.

The report brought up merger with another department as a way of finding stable leadership and as a philosophically appropriate path in an era where special education is attempting to shed its isolationistic shroud. The reviewers included commentary from faculty outside the department:

A department merger might also provide the opportunity for better collaboration among faculty in various departments. Dr. Knesting and Dr. Pace expressed concern that Schindler Education Center was not conducive to meeting faculty outside one's own department. Both felt that more collaboration between their
respective departments and the Special Education department would have many benefits, especially in pursuing grant funding, but also in developing effective programs and courses in their respective departments.

The report noted that certain faculty were concerned that “merger” might mean the loss of identity.

*Departmental Response [b.5]*

The department will address collaborative efforts within the COE, outside the COE, and with Price Laboratory School. The department has had collaborative partnerships in the past. Syllabi should better reflect the collaborative efforts that are being used. Co-teaching has been used across departments within the COE as well as university-wide.

*b.6* Content of Courses Offered as Reflected Through Syllabi: The report raised an ironical concern that course content as reflected through reviews of syllabi did not generally reflect a focus on issues of diversity in the classroom. In effect the reviewers were suggesting that links among the experience of children with disabilities and other vulnerable and at-risk populations went unexplored. The reviewers noted that this concern was raised in the previous External Review and appeared to have been ignored.

Additionally, the report reflected a concern that a lot of emphasis in introducing issues of disability to teachers-in preparation (at both the graduate and undergraduate level) fell on the proverbial shoulders of a two-credit class, *Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners* (220:150). The main issue identified was that the course was not sufficient to provide future teachers with the knowledge and skills to meet the needs of academically and behaviorally diverse students. Everyone, according to the report, concurred that the course should be worth at least 3 credit hours:

Most of the administrators and faculty we talked to emphasized that one course could not prepare teachers for inclusive classroom instruction. Some suggested that there be a 9 credit hour block that included a supervised field experience in settings that included children or adolescents with disabilities. A tremendous barrier to this plan is that faculty in other departments are unwilling to give up certain of their course work to accommodate more special education courses. It probably would take administrative decree to transform program requirements so that the 9-hour block could be added.

*Departmental Response [b.6]*

Syllabi will be designed to better reflect the deep and broad focus on diversity in all departmental courses. Expanding the 220:150 course has been an on-going issue and is again in discussion across the COE.

*b.7* Research Paper or Thesis Requirement: It was suggested that the final
requirement for graduation from the Master’s program, either a research paper or a thesis, be expanded to include more pragmatic options reflective of our practitioner-students. The reviewers suggested the Department might consider the requirement of a portfolio.

Departmental Response [b.7]

The external reviewers recommended that a portfolio option be added to the graduate program. Faculty feel that the research paper or thesis requirement needs to be retained. The department is preparing teacher-scholars and leaders in the field. The research paper/thesis option requires data based procedures for special education. This allows students to apply the skills and knowledge gathered from the research courses. A number of our students have the potential to continue onto doctorate work. The research paper can serve as a writing sample when being admitted into the doctorate program. Eight to ten special education students have had their research papers published.

[b.8] Limited Funding for Graduate Students: The report noted that several faculty expressed the need to have more than the current 2.5 graduate student lines funded from the Office of Graduate Studies.

Departmental Response [b.8]

The department currently receives funding for 2.5 graduate assistants from the Graduate College. The department has been able to supplement these with grant funding. However, the focus of federal grants is no longer on preparing MAE students and funding is not available. Funding for graduate assistants will be an issue as the current grants expire.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Special Education undergraduate

2b. List date(s) of program review: 2007

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ❑ No ❑

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes ❑ No ❑

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes ❑ No ❑

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ❑ No ❑

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
Content of Courses Offered as Reflected Through Syllabi: The report raised an ironical concern that course content as reflected through reviews of syllabi did not generally reflect a focus on issues of linguistic and cultural diversity in the classroom. In effect the reviewers were suggesting that links among the experience of children with disabilities and other vulnerable and at-risk populations went unexplored. The reviewers noted:

Given the high rates of overrepresentation of children from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds in special education programs nationally, increasing the amount of instruction that future teachers receive on how to meet the needs of these students and their families should be a top priority for the faculty. Rather than adding an additional course on cultural and linguistic issues to the curriculum a more effective approach would be to embed this content into all courses in the minors.

The report also suggested that materials did not consistently demonstrate a strong reflection of aptitudes, methods, strategies, and dispositions toward most-effective practices associated with inclusive special education services and supports.

The report noted an expressed interest in exposing undergraduate students to ideas associated with a range of theoretical orientations toward the education of students with disabilities, but suggested that the coverage was in fact inconsistent.

Departmental Response

Syllabi will be designed to better reflect the deep and broad focus on diversity and inclusion in all departmental courses. The department believes this is a strength of the program but it must be made more visible.

Field Experiences: The report noted that clear links were often lacking between course content and student field experiences. The reviewers commented:

It is not clear that there is a direct link between the assignments given to students in their courses and their work in their field experiences. Ideally, students should have an opportunity to apply the knowledge and skills they are learning in their courses immediately with children in schools. This weakness suggests that the faculty and the Professional and Scientific staff need to come to agreement on linkages between the courses and field experiences, and develop a strategy for effectively coordinating students' work in both settings.

Additionally it was pointed out that there was a struggle to find adequate high-quality sites for field experiences. The report suggested a possible response to this dilemma:

One approach that other colleges of education have used is to develop formal partnerships with school districts to identify, train, and support practicing teachers to adopt innovative practices. This approach not only allows the faculty to actively improve the quality of the field experiences available to students but it can also create a significant number of opportunities for collaborative research between school district staff and faculty.

Departmental Response

Faculty disagree with the findings of the external reviewers and suggest that field experiences and method courses are closely linked. Materials will be prepared to better reflect these connections.
Limited Disability Knowledge in General Education Majors that do not Minor in Special Education:
The report pointed out that students majoring in various education programs but not receiving a minor in special education often received insufficient information on disability issues. For many students, the only exposure to disability concerns came in the form of a two-credit course in the professional sequence, *Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners* (220:150). These two-credits might not adequately prepare future teachers for classrooms with populations demonstrating increasingly diverse and complex needs. The reviewers commented:

> The faculty in the Department of Special Education are encouraged to work with the Dean and their colleagues in the college to infuse additional course in special education into the common core of courses taken by students in early childhood, elementary, and secondary education.

One of the recommendations of the reviewers was that the general education majors include more coursework involving special education faculty.

**Departmental Response**

The department concurs with this concern and would like to work with other departments and administration to build collaborative teaching ventures. Faculty tried to increase the hours of the Diverse Learners course from 2 to 3 credits. The proposal was met with resistance during the curriculum review process. The Council for Teacher Education discussed this topic last week so it may be time to revisit the issue. There have been discussions on lengthening the course and attaching a field experience to it.

**Faculty Loads & Commitments:** The report pointed out that the department is accomplishing a lot with reduced resources. The report noted:

> The Department does an admirable job providing comprehensive undergraduate minors given the limited number of faculty. The University is getting a good return on its investment in the Department and it could be strongly argued that the Department is under funded given the diversity of teacher licensure and degree programs that it offers. The Department has lost faculty lines as result of University wide budget cuts. This is unfortunate given the demand for special education teachers and educational consultants in the state. It would appear that the Department has untapped potential for significant enrollment growth. However, this expansion is not possible without additional funding for faculty lines.

A recommendation of the reviewers was that the department receive an increase in faculty lines.

**Departmental Response**

Currently the department is conducting two tenure-track faculty searches. More are needed.

**Enrollment Levels:** The reviewers brought out concerns with reduced numbers of students enrolling in the undergraduate programs. The report noted, “The Department needs to develop a comprehensive student recruitment plan that differentiates its programs from those provided by the competitors. The quality of the faculty, the rigor of the program, and the supervised mentoring in working with students with disabilities are all important features that should be emphasized within the plan.”

**Departmental Response**

Enrollment levels are a concern for all departments at UNI. The department’s enrollment numbers have decreased for a number of reasons. Tuition increases have decreased enrollment numbers. There are numerous smaller institutional special education programs across the state that offer expedient degrees. These programs
are generally lower quality, make extensive use of adjunct instruction, and are able to recruit students because of cost.

At UNI, the field-based experiences provided by the department are, in part, what lengthens our program and helps make it distinctive. The Department uses alternative methods of course offerings such as the ICN. The Early Childhood Special Education program is offered entirely on the ICN in cohort groups and the secondary program is also offered on the ICN. Also, students from other COE departments have an interest in and are enrolling in our graduate courses, such as the Seminar in Special Education and Special Education Law and Policy courses.

The department will begin a concerted effort to draw committed education students. Materials distributed concerning the department offerings will focus on the quality of the programs offered. Dean Callahan noted that in the past funding has not been appropriated for advertising COE programs. Funding will now be provided for electronic and hard-copy advertisement materials.

**Advising:** The report suggested that a gap exists between what the department might offer students and how students are being advised. It was suggested that:

Steps should be taken to ensure that the Department staff are collaborating with the College advisors to make sure that students are getting accurate and up-to-date information about the program of study. In addition, the undergraduate students reported that they do not have faculty advisor. It is recommended that the Department consider developing a faculty advising system for undergraduate students so that they have a consistent point of contact for questions about their program of study.

**Departmental Response**

There was a time when the COE Advising office was orienting students to minors in other areas. Faculty have since had discussions with them and have educated them on the special education area. One of the problems was that the Iowa Department of Education made major changes to special education certification areas. The program is now easier to understand. The department requires that post-BA students be admitted into the graduate program, either as non-degree or MAE. This ensures that they are assigned an advisor at the time of admission. Faculty have so many graduate advisees that they do not feel they would be able to advise undergraduates as well.

**Data Collection:** The report suggested that two areas of data collection be modified. First, it was argued that because the department correctly went from offering majors to minors, it has been penalized in how the university tracks program participation. The report states, “The University data collection system needs to be restructured so that the Department is recognized for the number of students who successfully complete the minor programs.”

Also, it was advised that the department develop a comprehensive Student Outcome Assessment that (a) documents students' knowledge and skills across the broad theoretical foundations that undergird the teacher licensure programs (i.e., applied behavior analysis, constructivism); (b) gather information on the perceptions of graduates about how well their programs prepared them for their professional roles; and (c) gather information on the perceptions of supervisors/principals about how well the programs prepares graduates for their professional roles.

**Departmental Response**

Efforts are underway to better track and maintain data on students who minor in special education programs.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Communication Studies-Electronic Media
2b. List date(s) of program review: 2006-07

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ___x_ No _____
3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: ___3_

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes ______ No __x____
4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes ______ No __x____

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ______ No ______
6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

While the individual programs within the department were reviewed, most of the recommendations for change focused on departmental changes. As a result, the following section will be identical for the four programs reviewed within the Department of Communication Studies. The primary substantive difference in the recommendations addressed issues of staffing. Staffing is a departmental decision. As such, those recommendations are addressed in each of the program reports.

**Curriculum**

**Recommendations:**
1. The department was urged to consider a departmental core of 9-15 credit hours.
2. The department was urged to cut back on the number of courses listed in the course catalog.
3. The review suggested that the department consider combining majors.
4. The external review recommended eliminating the two certificate programs in the department.

**Actions:**
1. The Department Head will ask each division to consider what courses should be included in a departmental core. (Fall 2007-Completed) This action is related to Student Outcomes Assessment planning and results.
2. Committees will be formed with the charge of developing courses for a common core for the department. This action is related to Student Outcomes Assessment planning and results. (Fall 2008)
3. The communication division will identify approximately three to five departments that have curriculum models to which they would aspire. The course offerings of those departments will be studied to see how many courses are offered and the nature of those offerings. (Spring 2008 and Fall 2008)

4. The Department Head will ask divisions to examine course offerings within each division and across division lines for possible course consolidations. (Spring 2008 and Fall 2008)

5. The Department Head will report enrollment data in the two certificate programs. The department will decide whether to maintain, modify, or eliminate the certificates. (Fall 2008)

Student Services

Recommendations:
1. The review recommended that the department seek ways to make advising more satisfying to students.
2. The review recommended that the department modify or end its use of wait lists.
3. The external reviewers also suggested that the department consider increasing entrance requirements for majors in the department.

Actions:
1. Changes in advising will be implemented. Specifically, the advising load will be redistributed within the department. In addition, the department will participate in the new advising center for incoming students. (Fall 2008)
2. The Department Head and the Departmental Advisor will explore the possibility of removing wait lists for various courses on an experimental basis. (Fall 2007 and Spring 2008-Completed) In addition, the department offered several additional sections of courses to address wait list needs. Funding for the additional sections was provided by the Dean of the College of Humanities and Fine Arts.
3. The department will consider possible changes to the wait list process for implementation. (Spring 2008-Completed)
4. The department will conduct a survey of students concerning wait lists for the purpose of discovering the unmet demand in various courses. (Spring 2008-in progress)
5. Divisions will use enrollment data in developing a target number for the ideal size of the various majors in the department. (Spring 2009)

Staffing

Recommendations:
1. The external review recommended hiring a Basic Course Director with release time.
2. The external review recommended hiring a faculty position in Public Relations.

Actions:
1. The Department Head will request a hire in Public Relations. (Fall 2008)
2. The Communication Division will examine the model used for oversight of the Basic Course. (Fall 2008)

Budgeting

Recommendations:
1. The external reviewers suggested that more greater support for faculty development be provided.
2. The external reviewers called for an equipment replacement budget.

Actions:
1. The Department Head will make an effort to increase support for faculty travel so that it is more comparable to peer institutions and other departments in CHFA and CSBS. (AY 2008-09)
2. The department will develop a more comprehensive equipment replacement schedule. (Spring 2008)
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THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW:  Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Communication Studies-Masters program

2b. List date(s) of program review: 2006-07

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ___x___ No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: __3__

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes _____ No ___x__

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No ___x__

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _____ No _____

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

While the individual programs within the department were reviewed, most of the recommendations for change focused on departmental changes. As a result, the following section will be identical for the four programs reviewed within the Department of Communication Studies. The primary substantive difference in the recommendations addressed issues of staffing. Staffing is a departmental decision. As such, those recommendations are addressed in each of the program reports.

Curriculum

Recommendations:
1. The department was urged to consider a departmental core of 9-15 credit hours.
2. The department was urged to cut back on the number of courses listed in the course catalog.
3. The review suggested that the department consider combining majors.
4. The external review recommended eliminating the two certificate programs in the department.

Actions:
1. The Department Head will ask each division to consider what courses should be included in a departmental core. (Fall 2007-Completed) This action is related to Student Outcomes Assessment planning and results.
2. Committees will be formed with the charge of developing courses for a common core for the department. This action is related to Student Outcomes Assessment planning and results. (Fall 2008)
3. The communication division will identify approximately three to five departments that have curriculum models to which they would aspire. The course offerings of those departments will be studied to see how many courses are offered and the nature of those offerings. (Spring 2008 and Fall 2008)

4. The Department Head will ask divisions to examine course offerings within each division and across division lines for possible course consolidations. (Spring 2008 and Fall 2008)

5. The Department Head will report enrollment data in the two certificate programs. The department will decide whether to maintain, modify, or eliminate the certificates. (Fall 2008)

**Student Services**

**Recommendations:**

1. The review recommended that the department seek ways to make advising more satisfying to students.
2. The review recommended that the department modify or end its use of wait lists.
3. The external reviewers also suggested that the department consider increasing entrance requirements for majors in the department.

**Actions:**

1. Changes in advising will be implemented. Specifically, the advising load will be redistributed within the department. In addition, the department will participate in the new advising center for incoming students. (Fall 2008)
2. The Department Head and the Departmental Advisor will explore the possibility of removing wait lists for various courses on an experimental basis. (Fall 2007 and Spring 2008-Completed) In addition, the department offered several additional sections of courses to address wait list needs. Funding for the additional sections was provided by the Dean of the College of Humanities and Fine Arts.
3. The department will consider possible changes to the wait list process for implementation. (Spring 2008-Completed)
4. The department will conduct a survey of students concerning wait lists for the purpose of discovering the unmet demand in various courses. (Spring 2008-in progress)
5. Divisions will use enrollment data in developing a target number for the ideal size of the various majors in the department. (Spring 2009)

**Staffing**

**Recommendations:**

1. The external review recommended hiring a Basic Course Director with release time.
2. The external review recommended hiring a faculty position in Public Relations.

**Actions:**

1. The Department Head will request a hire in Public Relations. (Fall 2008)
2. The Communication Division will examine the model used for oversight of the Basic Course. (Fall 2008)

**Budgeting**

**Recommendations:**

1. The external reviewers suggested that more greater support for faculty development be provided.
2. The external reviewers called for an equipment replacement budget.

**Actions:**

1. The Department Head will make an effort to increase support for faculty travel so that it is more comparable to peer institutions and other departments in CHFA and CSBS. (AY 2008-09)
2. The department will develop a more comprehensive equipment replacement schedule. (Spring 2008)
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Communication Studies-Communication

2b. List date(s) of program review: 2006-07

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ___x___ No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: ___3___

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes _______ No ___x___

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _______ No ___x___

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _______ No ______

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

While the individual programs within the department were reviewed, most of the recommendations for change focused on departmental changes. As a result, the following section will be identical for the four programs reviewed within the Department of Communication Studies. The primary substantive difference in the recommendations addressed issues of staffing. Staffing is a departmental decision. As such, those recommendations are addressed in each of the program reports.

Curriculum

Recommendations:
1. The department was urged to consider a departmental core of 9-15 credit hours.
2. The department was urged to cut back on the number of courses listed in the course catalog.
3. The review suggested that the department consider combining majors.
4. The external review recommended eliminating the two certificate programs in the department.

Actions:
1. The Department Head will ask each division to consider what courses should be included in a departmental core. (Fall 2007-Completed) This action is related to Student Outcomes Assessment planning and results.
2. Committees will be formed with the charge of developing courses for a common core for the department. This action is related to Student Outcomes Assessment planning and results. (Fall 2008)
3. The communication division will identify approximately three to five departments that have curriculum models to which they would aspire. The course offerings of those departments will be studied to see how many courses are offered and the nature of those offerings. (Spring 2008 and Fall 2008)

4. The Department Head will ask divisions to examine course offerings within each division and across division lines for possible course consolidations. (Spring 2008 and Fall 2008)

5. The Department Head will report enrollment data in the two certificate programs. The department will decide whether to maintain, modify, or eliminate the certificates. (Fall 2008)

Student Services

Recommendations:
1. The review recommended that the department seek ways to make advising more satisfying to students.
2. The review recommended that the department modify or end its use of wait lists.
3. The external reviewers also suggested that the department consider increasing entrance requirements for majors in the department.

Actions:
1. Changes in advising will be implemented. Specifically, the advising load will be redistributed within the department. In addition, the department will participate in the new advising center for incoming students. (Fall 2008)
2. The Department Head and the Departmental Advisor will explore the possibility of removing wait lists for various courses on an experimental basis. (Fall 2007 and Spring 2008-Completed) In addition, the department offered several additional sections of courses to address wait list needs. Funding for the additional sections was provided by the Dean of the College of Humanities and Fine Arts.
3. The department will consider possible changes to the wait list process for implementation. (Spring 2008-Completed)
4. The department will conduct a survey of students concerning wait lists for the purpose of discovering the unmet demand in various courses. (Spring 2008-in progress)
5. Divisions will use enrollment data in developing a target number for the ideal size of the various majors in the department. (Spring 2009)

Staffing

Recommendations:
1. The external review recommended hiring a Basic Course Director with release time.
2. The external review recommended hiring a faculty position in Public Relations.

Actions:
1. The Department Head will request a hire in Public Relations. (Fall 2008)
2. The Communication Division will examine the model used for oversight of the Basic Course. (Fall 2008)

Budgeting

Recommendations:
1. The external reviewers suggested that more greater support for faculty development be provided.
2. The external reviewers called for an equipment replacement budget.

Actions:
1. The Department Head will make an effort to increase support for faculty travel so that it is more comparable to peer institutions and other departments in CHFA and CSBS. (AY 2008-09)
2. The department will develop a more comprehensive equipment replacement schedule. (Spring 2008)
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution  University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed:  B.A., Computer Information Systems

2b. List date(s) of program review:  Fall 2006-Spring 2007

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes__X__ No____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: two (2)

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes__X__ No____

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.  
Computer science enrollments nationwide dropped by a large amount early in this decade. UNI was no exception. In the last three years, we have seen an increase of about 1/3 from our lowest numbers.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval?  
Yes ______ No__X__

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents?  
Yes_______ No____

6b. If not, why not?  
Not applicable.

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.  
See next page.
Recommendations from the Self-Study of Undergraduate Programs

Curriculum
• find one or more ways to attract students to computing
• identify general goals of the department and this degree program
• consider ways to add new material without lengthening the program

Student Outcomes Assessment
• develop clear, workable SOA plans for the program
• develop clear, measurable outcomes for each course
• fold assessments back into curriculum development
• require all department proposals for new courses and programs to list expected outcomes

Faculty
• plan carefully for future retirements

Facilities and Resources
• seek ways for CNS to offer better IT support (better pay and retention)

Budget and Finance
• increase the faculty travel allowance from $515 to at least $1200 per year
• create a department budget line item to support student research presentations and other travel

Recommendations from the External Review of Undergraduate Programs

Facilities and Resources
• localize department into a single space
• create local lab space for students
• buy a printer for student use in ITTC
• provide classroom machines
• consider a new model for labs, e.g., student computer fee for student laptops

Community Building and Public Visibility
• plan additional activities to bring students, faculty, and (when appropriate) families together

Connecting with Alumni and Industry
• form industrial advisory board
• engage recent alumni via on-site meetings, site tours

Faculty Professional Development
• look for ways to provide even more funding for travel

Programs
• consider offering a CS0 course, to improve retention
• compare the requirements of the programs with the national norm, IS 2002

Student Outcome Assessment
• shorten graduating student survey

(continued)
Other Recommendations

• "When looking to hire new faculty, do not automatically view the department's list of necessary specialty areas to be equivalent to the list of capabilities of the current faculty."

Summary Recommendations of the Faculty

• develop and implement a useful Student Outcomes Assessment plan
• develop a plan to recruit more and better students from high schools
• develop an itemized budget that reflects the teaching, research, service, and administrative priorities of the department

Program Improvements from the Academic Program Review

• An outreach effort to promote computer science and UNI CS programs to K-12 students
• Encouraged the college to increase salary on college-level IT support positions.
• An increased faculty travel allowance of $1000 per year
• An experimental department budget line item to support student research and travel
• Student lounge in the ITTC with computers and a printer for student use
• A mobile laboratory of 28 laptops for classroom use
• An industrial advisory board
• A faculty retreat prior to the Spring 2008 semester

Program Plans Still Under Activate Consideration

• Extended, deliberate examination of the general goals of the program
• Consider ways to add new material without lengthening major
• Localize department into a single space
• Consider a new model for computer labs and Student Computer Fee
• Engage recent alumni via on-site meetings, site tours
• Compare the requirements of its degree programs with national norm
• Shorten graduating student survey
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution  **University of Northern Iowa**

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed:  
    **B.A., Computer Science**

2b. List date(s) of program review:  
    **Fall 2006-Spring 2007**

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators?  
    Yes____X___ No_____  
    3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators:  
        two (2)

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years?  
    Yes___X___ No_____  
    4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.  
        **Computer science enrollments nationwide dropped by a large amount early in this decade. UNI was no exception. In the last three years, we have seen an increase of about 1/3 from our lowest numbers.**

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval?  
    Yes________ No__X__

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents?  
    Yes______ No______

6b. If not, why not?  
    **Not applicable.**

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.  
    **See next page.**
Recommendations from the Self-Study of Undergraduate Programs

Curriculum
• find one or more ways to attract students to computing
• identify general goals of the department and this degree program
• consider ideas previously proposed
  • certificate or minor programs designed to attract students and perhaps supply an alternative entry into the major
  • a minor in bioinformatics
  • a course to meet the current LAC quantitative methods requirement
• consider ways to add new material without lengthening majors
  • focus majors on portions of the computing continuum
  • combine some traditional courses in novel ways

Student Outcomes Assessment
• develop clear, workable SOA plans for the program
• develop clear, measurable outcomes for each course
• fold assessments back into curriculum development
• require all department proposals for new courses and programs to list expected outcomes

Students
• investigate a less structured curriculum that encourages domain-specific studies

Faculty
• recognize overload activities via course-load reduction

Facilities and Resources
• seek a line item for departmental equipment in the CNS budget, similar to other departments' laboratory equipment funds
• seek ways for CNS to offer better IT support (better pay and retention)

Budget and Finance
• create a department budget line item with "a small amount of money budgeted within the department to support faculty research and teaching needs"
• increase the faculty travel allowance from $515 to at least $1200 per year

Recommendations from the External Review of Undergraduate Programs

Facilities and Resources
• localize department into a single space
• create local lab space for students
• buy a printer for student use in ITTC
• provide classroom machines
• consider a new model for labs, e.g., student computer fee for student laptops

Community Building and Public Visibility
• plan additional activities to bring students, faculty, and (when appropriate) families together
• display posters featuring student and faculty work and other artifacts
• display on the web page a "much more comprehensive record of activities and accomplishments within the department"

(continued)
Connecting with Alumni and Industry
- form industrial advisory board
- engage recent alumni via on-site meetings, site tours

Faculty Professional Development
- seek change in PDA selection criteria "to value all forms of professional development activities"
- develop pattern of submitting (successful) PDA proposals
- look for ways to provide even more funding for travel

Programs
- move forward with its plans to participate in the Liberal Arts Core curriculum and to engage in further interdisciplinary areas
- consider offering a CS0 course, to improve retention
- compare the requirements of its degree programs with a national norms, LACS 2007

Student Outcome Assessment
- "The department must come to a consensus as to the content of each course, at least as far as major outcomes are concerned." Document decisions in syllabi, and identify methods to measure outcomes. "[A] partial list of outcomes is better than none at all."
- shorten graduating student survey

Other Recommendations
- "When looking to hire new faculty, do not automatically view the department's list of necessary specialty areas to be equivalent to the list of capabilities of the current faculty."

Summary Recommendations of the Faculty
- revise curriculum to include a greater emphasis on support for general computing education
- develop and implement a useful Student Outcomes Assessment plan
- develop a plan to recruit more and better students from high schools
- work on a plan for the number and type of computer labs that the department should support, both general and area-specific, and work to improve the software, hardware, and network services provided to students
- develop an itemized budget that reflects the teaching, research, service, and administrative priorities of the department

Program Improvements from the Academic Program Review
- An outreach effort to promote computer science and UNI CS programs to K-12 students
- A minor in bioinformatics
- A Liberal Arts Core course in computational modeling and simulation
- Initial draft of an implementable student outcomes assessment plan with meaningful outcomes. This is part of a department-wide SOA initiative.
- Begun to create a system for counting overload undergraduate course and research credits toward future teaching load, with Spring 2009's schedule the target date for its first use.
- Encouraged the college to increase salary on college-level IT support positions.
- An increased faculty travel allowance of $1000 per year
- An experimental department budget line item to support student research and travel
- Student lounge in the ITTC with computers and a printer for student use
- A mobile laboratory of 28 laptops for classroom use
- An industrial advisory board
- A faculty retreat prior to the Spring 2008 semester
Program Plans Still Under Activate Consideration

- Extended, deliberate examination of the general goals of the program
- Consider ways to add new material without lengthening major
- Create a department budget line item with "a small amount of money budgeted within the department to support faculty research and teaching needs"
- Localize department into a single space
- Consider a new model for computer labs and Student Computer Fee
- Display posters featuring student and faculty work and other artifacts
- Improve the department web site, including a more comprehensive record of activities and accomplishments
- Seek change in PDA selection criteria and a pattern of submitting PDA proposals
- Look for ways to provide even more funding for travel
- Compare the requirements of its degree programs with national norm
- Consider offering on-line or distance learning courses
- Shorten graduating student survey
- Engage recent alumni via on-site meetings, site tours
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution  University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed:  
   B.S., Computer Science

2b. List date(s) of program review:  Fall 2006-Spring 2007

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes___X___ No_____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators:  two (2)

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years?  Yes___X___ No_____

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.  
   Computer science enrollments nationwide dropped by a large amount early in this decade. UNI was no exception. In the last three years, we have seen an increase of about 1/3 from our lowest numbers.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval?  
   Yes_______ No___X___

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents?  
   Yes_______ No_____

6b. If not, why not?  
   Not applicable.

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.  
   See next page.
Recommendations from the Self-Study of Undergraduate Programs

Curriculum
• find one or more ways to attract students to computing
• identify general goals of the department and this program, both the current program and possible future programs ("extended, deliberate ... examination")
• consider ideas previously proposed
  • certificate or minor programs that fill a perceived niche in the workplace
  • certificate or minor programs designed to attract students and perhaps supply an alternative entry into the major
  • an interdisciplinary major in computational science/modeling and simulation
  • a course to meet the current LAC quantitative methods requirement
• consider ways to add new material without lengthening majors
  • focus majors on portions of the computing continuum
  • combine some traditional courses in novel ways

Student Outcomes Assessment
• develop clear, workable SOA plans for the program
• develop clear, measurable outcomes for each course
• fold assessments back into curriculum development
• require all department proposals for new courses and programs to list expected outcomes

Students
• investigate a less structured curriculum that encourages domain-specific studies

Faculty
• plan carefully for future retirements
• recognize overload activities via course-load reduction

Facilities and Resources
• seek a line item for departmental equipment in the CNS budget, similar to other departments' laboratory equipment funds
• seek ways for CNS to offer better IT support (better pay and retention)

Budget and Finance
• create a department budget line item with "a small amount of money budgeted within the department to support faculty research and teaching needs"
• create a department budget line item to support student research presentations and other travel

Recommendations from the External Review of Undergraduate Programs

Facilities and Resources
• localize department into a single space
• create local lab space for students
• buy a printer for student use in ITTC
• provide classroom machines
• consider a new model for labs, e.g., use student computer fee for student laptops

(continued)
Community Building and Public Visibility
- plan additional activities to bring students, faculty, and (when appropriate) families together
- display posters featuring student and faculty work and other artifacts
- display on the web page a "much more comprehensive record of activities and accomplishments within the department"

Faculty Responsibilities and Load
- create a system a la Biology in which faculty "bank" undergrad research credits, and trade them (5 for 1) for course reduction

Connecting with Alumni and Industry
- form industrial advisory board
- engage recent alumni via on-site meetings, site tours
- participate in USENIX campus representative program

Faculty Professional Development
- seek change in PDA selection criteria "to value all forms of professional development activities"
- develop pattern of submitting (successful) PDA proposals
- look for ways to provide even more funding for travel

Programs
- move forward with its plans to participate in the Liberal Arts Core curriculum and to engage in further interdisciplinary areas
- consider offering a CS0 course, to improve retention
- compare the requirements of its degree programs with the national norm, CC 2001

Student Outcome Assessment
- "The department must come to a consensus as to the content of each course, at least as far as major outcomes are concerned." Document decisions in syllabi, and identify methods to measure outcomes. "[A] partial list of outcomes is better than none at all."
- shorten graduating student survey

Other Recommendations
- "When looking to hire new faculty, do not automatically view the department's list of necessary specialty areas to be equivalent to the list of capabilities of the current faculty."

Summary Recommendations of the Faculty
- revise curriculum to include a greater emphasis on interdisciplinary programs
- develop and implement a useful Student Outcomes Assessment plan
- develop a plan to recruit more and better students from high schools
- work on a plan for the number and type of computer labs that the department should support, both general and area-specific, and work to improve the software, hardware, and network services provided to students
- develop an itemized budget that reflects the teaching, research, service, and administrative priorities of the department
Program Improvements from the Academic Program Review

• An outreach effort to promote computer science and UNI CS programs to K-12 students
• A certificate in software testing to fill a perceived niche in the workplace
• Initial draft of an implementable student outcomes assessment plan with meaningful outcomes. This is part of a department-wide SOA initiative.
• Begun to create a system for counting overload undergraduate course and research credits toward future teaching load, with Spring 2009's schedule the target date for its first use.
• Encouraged the college to increase salary on college-level IT support positions.
• An increased faculty travel allowance of $1000 per year
• An experimental department budget line item to support student research and travel
• Student lounge in the ITTC with computers and a printer for student use
• A mobile laboratory of 28 laptops for classroom use
• An industrial advisory board
• A faculty retreat prior to the Spring 2008 semester

Program Plans Still Under Activate Consideration

• Extended, deliberate examination of the general goals of the program
• Consider ways to add new material without lengthening major
• Create a department budget line item with "a small amount of money budgeted within the department to support faculty research and teaching needs"
• Localize department into a single space
• Consider a new model for computer labs and Student Computer Fee
• Display posters featuring student and faculty work and other artifacts
• Improve the department web site, including a more comprehensive record of activities and accomplishments
• Seek change in PDA selection criteria and a pattern of submitting PDA proposals
• Look for ways to provide even more funding for travel
• Compare the requirements of its degree programs with national norm
• Consider offering on-line or distance learning courses
• Shorten graduating student survey
• Seek a line item for departmental equipment in the CNS budget, similar to other departments' laboratory equipment funds
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution  **University of Northern Iowa**

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed:  
**M.S., Computer Science**

2b. List date(s) of program review:  **Fall 2006-Spring 2007**

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators?  
Yes__X__  No_____  

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators:  
two (2)

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years?  
Yes__X__  No_____

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.  
**Two years ago, UNI's graduate computer science enrollment dropped by about 1/3 from its long-term steady-state enrollment of 18-20. As UNI's tuition has risen, the availability of graduate assistantships and other financial aid for graduate students, especially international students, has become more important. We have worked to increase the number of research-funded assistantships to meet this need.**

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval?  
Yes______  No__X__

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents?  
Yes______  No_____

6b. If not, why not?  
**Not applicable.**

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.  
**See next page.**
Recommendations from the Self-Study of Graduate Programs

Curriculum
• offer a 200-level, non-core course at least once each year
• consider cross-listing senior-level 100g courses as 200-level courses
• change program requirements to allow students with non-computer science undergraduate degrees to take all their courses in computer science
• change program requirements to allow graduate committee members to consist of all computer science faculty if the advisor believes this is appropriate

Student Outcomes Assessment
• develop a useful plan with meaningful outcomes
• track initial employment of graduates

Students
• develop a method to eliminate underachieving students from the program (The Graduate Committee would be more willing to admit a weak student if we had a degree review in place)
• consider offering on-line or distance learning courses
• encourage graduate faculty to involve students in research projects as early as possible in a student's degree program (to avoid ABD)

Recommendations from the External Review of Graduate Programs

The external review team suggested that we consider their recommendations for the undergraduate programs when improving the graduate program, given the closeness with which our graduate students take courses and work with undergraduates. It also made a few specific recommendations:
• offer more financial assistantship support to more students
• market the program more heavily to local professionals and area industries
• ensure that graduate students do extra work as prescribed for credit in 1xx(g) courses, work worthy of grad credit
• create a system in which faculty "bank" overload grad course and research credits, trading them (? for 1) for course reduction
• When looking to hire new faculty, do not automatically view the department's list of necessary specialty areas to be equivalent to the list of capabilities of the current faculty.
• create social events exclusively for graduate students
• hold a "town hall meeting" once or twice a year to disseminate information and to solicit suggestions for improvement

Summary Recommendations of the Faculty
• seek an increase the number of graduate assistantships in Computer Science by reallocation from the Graduate College or by external funding sources
• increase external funding for support of graduate assistantships, research projects, and equipment
Program Improvements from the Academic Program Review

- Increased external funding for graduate assistantships and research projects, with a continued emphasis on grant writing.
- Begun to create a system for counting overload grad course and research credits toward future teaching load, with Spring 2009’s schedule the target date for its first use.
- Changed program requirements so that students with non-computer science undergraduate degrees can take all their courses in computer science.
- Begun work on an implementable student outcomes assessment plan with meaningful outcomes. This is part of a department-wide SOA initiative.
- A faculty retreat prior to the Spring 2008 semester

Program Plans Still Under Activate Consideration

- Offer a 200-level, non-core course at least once each year
- Cross-list senior-level 100g courses as 200-level courses
- Track initial employment of graduates
- Develop a mid-program review of students to identify students in need of additional academic support
- Consider offering on-line or distance learning courses
- Offer on-line or distance learning courses
- Create social events and "town hall meetings" for graduate students