



Board of Trustees

Committee on Academic and Student Affairs

Wednesday, September 20, 2023

3:30 - 5:00 PM

Marian H. Rochelle Gateway Center

Salon C

Table of Contents:

- Agenda.....Page 2
- Annual Schedule of TopicsPage 3
- New Degree and Certificate Proposal ProcessPage 5
- Report on Low-Producing Programs.....Page 10
- Native American Enrollment/Retention.....Page 33
- Update on Saddle Up.....Page 34
- Update on Next Gen General Education.....Page 35

**Board of Trustees
Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
September 20, 2023
3:30 - 5:00 PM
Marian H. Rochelle Gateway Center
Salon C**

AGENDA

1. Closed Session

Public Session Agenda

1. Information and Discussion: Academic and Student Affairs Committee: Annual Schedule of Topics (*Carman*)
2. Information and Discussion: New Degree and Certificate Proposal Process (*Barrett/Ahern/Gifford*)
3. Information and Discussion: Report on Low-Producing Programs (*Carman*)
4. Information and Discussion: Native American Enrollment/Retention (*Carman/Moore*)
5. Information and Discussion: Update on Saddle Up (*Carman/Courtney*)
6. Information and Discussion: Update on Next Gen General Education (USP) (*Carman*)
7. Information and Discussion: Discussion with Haub School of Environment and Natural Resources

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Academic and Student Affairs Committee: Annual Schedule of Topics, Carman

- PUBLIC SESSION
- EXECUTIVE SESSION

PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED BY COMMITTEE:

- Yes
- No

FOR FULL BOARD CONSIDERATION:

- Yes

[Note: If yes, materials will also be included in the full UW Board of Trustee report.]

- No

- Attachments/materials are provided in advance of the meeting.*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Academic and Student Affairs is proposing an annual schedule of topics for the Board of Trustees Committee on Academic and Student Affairs to assist with organization and preparation.

WHY THIS ITEM IS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE:

Information item only.

ACTION REQUIRED AT THIS COMMITTEE MEETING:

PROPOSED MOTION:



Board of Trustees Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
Annual Schedule of Topics

March

Annual Reports/Presentations

- Annual Student Success Data Metrics

Consideration and Action

- Recommendation of the 3-year academic calendar from University Administration and Trustees Academic and Student Affairs Committee [Note: the Board reviews and approves a 3-year academic school year calendar (anniversary date of 2016)]
- UW Regulation 2-13 (Academic Program Reorganization, Consolidation, Reduction and Discontinuance)

May

Annual Reports/Presentations

- New degree program progress report
- Review of Trustees' Award of Merit and Honorary Degree Process and Timeline

Consideration and Action

- 3-year academic calendar
- Master list of academic programs
- Request for Authorization: New degree or certificate proposals

September

Annual Reports/Presentations

- Study Abroad/Research Presentations

November

Annual Reports/Presentations

- Student Recruitment and Retention
- Review of Trustees' Award of Merit and Honorary Degree Nominations

Consideration and Action

- Recommendations for UW Regulation 2-13 (Academic Program Reorganization, Consolidation, Reduction and Discontinuance)
- Notice of Intent: New degree or certificate proposal

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: New Degree and Certificate Proposal Process, Barrett/Ahern/Gifford

- PUBLIC SESSION
- EXECUTIVE SESSION

PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED BY COMMITTEE:

- Yes
- No

FOR FULL BOARD CONSIDERATION:

- Yes
[Note: If yes, materials will also be included in the full UW Board of Trustee report.]
- No

Attachments/materials are provided in advance of the meeting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Office of Academic Affairs is proposing changes to the process for New Degrees and Certificates that include a more robust review process and suggested timeline for submission.

WHY THIS ITEM IS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE:

Information item only.

ACTION REQUIRED AT THIS COMMITTEE MEETING:

PROPOSED MOTION:

New Degree and Certificate Proposal Process Overview

Draft Timeline:

A Notice of Intent for a new degree or certificate will be reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees in September. They will recommend the proposal for an up or down vote to the full board.

A Request for Authorization for a new degree or certificate will be reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees in May. They will recommend the proposal for an up or down vote to the full board.

To meet these key dates, the following timeline is required:

Spring semester: Prepare the notice of intent following the guidelines provided in paragraph 1) below.

October 15: Share the Notice of Intent with Academic Affairs for review by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (undergraduate degrees or certificates) or Vice Provost of Graduate Education (graduate degrees and certificates).

November: A Notice of Intent for a new degree or certificate will be reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. They will recommend the proposal for an up or down vote to the full board.

Fall semester: Prepare Feasibility Study and Pro Forma Budget following the guidance provided in paragraph 2) below. Prepare a Request for Authorization following the guidance provided in paragraph 3) below.

December 15: Share the feasibility study and pro forma budget and Request for Authorization with Academic Affairs for review by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Vice Provost of Graduate Education, Vice Provost for Personnel, and Executive Director of Budget and Finance.

January 15 – April 1: Academic Affairs will coordinate the campus review process described in paragraph 4) below. Upon successful completion of the campus review process, Academic Affairs will secure a Letter of Commitment from the Provost's Office as described in paragraph 5) below.

May 1: Academic Affairs will provide documentation required for approved new degree programs and certificates for consideration by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees in May. They will recommend the proposal for an up or down vote to the full board.

1) Prepare a Notice of Intent for the Board of Trustees Academic and Student Affairs Committee

What's in a Notice of Intent (NOI)? The NOI will provide the Board notice that you are exploring a new certificate or degree offering. Basic information to be included are anticipated learning outcomes, student and post-graduation demand for the program, basic information of expected expenditures, and how it aligns with UW's mission.

From UW Regulation 2-119

- **Notice of Intent.** A Notice of Intent is a preliminary, conceptual proposal requesting authorization to plan a new Academic Program. The NOI should normally be no longer than three (3) pages in length and shall include the following information:
 1. The name of the proposed Academic Program and the mode of delivery;
 2. A description of the new Academic Program that includes an outline of the anticipated curriculum and learning outcomes;
 3. Information about content and how the Academic Program may relate to other offerings;
 4. A plan for obtaining a market analysis of anticipated student demand and enrollment, and a plan for evaluation and analysis of post-graduation employment market demand
 5. A preliminary budget, including potential funding sources, projected expenses and revenues, and potential faculty, academic professionals, lecturers, professors of practice, and staff;
 6. Proposed timeline for staged implementation over five years, including campus and Board review;
 7. Information on other required approvals, such as accreditation bodies and the Higher Learning Commission;
 8. Evidence of how the new Academic Program aligns with the University's mission, strategic plan, and existing academic degree program array; and
 9. A rationale that clearly defines the need for the new Academic Program. The rationale should include evidence that the Academic Program will not produce unnecessary duplication of existing programs.
- Additional requirements/information:
 1. Notices of Intent will only be accepted for the September meeting of the Board of Trustees.
 2. Materials for the NOI should be submitted for review to the Provost's Office at least three weeks prior to the Board's meeting. The Provost and President must review all materials prior to submission.
 3. The Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board is the designated committee for this step of review. They will recommend the proposal for an up or down vote to the full board.
 4. If the new degree or certificate utilizes courses outside of the department, a letter of support must be obtained from those department heads and deans.
 5. If the new degree/certificate requires any new courses, involve the Faculty Senate Curriculum Review Committee for curriculum review.
 6. The new degree proposal must contain the department head and dean's approval. Please use this signature sheet that will accompany the NOI proposal.
 7. Once the NOI is approved, provide written notice to Faculty Senate that you are moving forward with the Request for Authorization.

2) Prepare **Feasibility Study** and **Pro Forma Budget**

- Once completed, share the feasibility study and pro forma budget with Academic Affairs for review by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Vice Provost of Graduate Education, Vice Provost for Personnel, and Executive Director of Budget and Finance.
- For a proposed new certificate, please complete the [Title IV \(Federal Student Aid\) Program Eligibility Determination Form](#). (Form issues? Email steveb@uwyo.edu)

3) Prepare a Request for Authorization

From UW Regulation 2-119

Request for Authorization: Around 10 pages: "After review and approval of the Notice of Intent, and upon completion of a full feasibility study and campus review, the President shall submit a Request for Authorization to implement the Academic Program, including the purpose and need for the proposed Academic Program; the proposed curriculum; a plan to assess the Academic Program; anticipated enrollment, existing or new resources required to deliver the Academic Program, and timeline for implementation; a plan for accreditation, if applicable; the benefits of the Academic Program to the University; the ability of the University to carry out the Academic Program; and the likely value to, and impact on, students and the residents of Wyoming.

- The Request for Authorization shall include a detailed budget for the next four (4) years, including funding sources, projected expenses and revenues, and faculty, academic professionals, lecturers, professors of practice, and staff.
- The Board of Trustees may review and consider taking appropriate action. Until Board of Trustees approval of the Request for Authorization, there shall be no further action on the Academic Program."

Additional information/requirements:

1. Request for Authorizations will only be accepted for the May meeting of the Board of Trustees.
2. Materials for the RFA should be submitted for review to the Provost's Office at least three weeks prior to the Board's meeting. The Provost and President must review all materials prior to submission.
3. The Academic and Student Affairs Committee is the designated committee for approval and will make a recommendation to the full Board.
4. Finally, the RFA must contain the department head and dean's approval. Please use this signature sheet that will accompany the RFA proposal (***include signature sheet**).

4) Campus Review

- The campus review process includes sharing the study with:
 - Faculty Senate (Academic Planning Committee for undergraduate programs, Graduate Council for Graduate Programs),
 - ASUW and Staff Senate,
 - Deans, and
 - Executive Council (President's Cabinet)
- Faculty Senate should be given at least 90 days to review the proposal and should provide feedback. Simultaneously, Staff Senate and ASUW should be given at least 30 days to review the proposal and may provide feedback.

- Please recognize that Faculty Senate's review is substantive. They may iterate with you and ask for revision and resubmittal of your feasibility study. They will accept up to three revisions before deferring their decision to the next academic year.
- After Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, and ASUW have reviewed and provided feedback, Deans and Directors Council and Executive Council should be given the opportunity to review and provide feedback.

5. Letter of Commitment from Provost

- **Letter of Commitment:** Upon successful completion of the campus review process, secure a Letter of Commitment from the Provost's Office, affirming the following:
 - The Academic Program has been designed to meet the University's standards of quality and will make a meaningful contribution to the University's mission, strategic plan, overall academic plan, and academic degree program array;
 - The University community, including but not limited to Executive Team, Deans and Directors, Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, and ASUW, have been provided the opportunity to review and present feedback;
 - The necessary financial and human resources are in place and/or have been committed to implementing and sustaining the Academic Program; and
 - Program evaluations are in place.

7.) If all reviews are successful and proposal is approved:

- For new Programs/Certifications work with HLC Accreditation Liaison Officer, Vice Provost Steven Barrett (steveb@uwyo.edu), to submit [HLC Certificate Program Screening form](#)
- For existing program/certificate changes work with HLC Accreditation Liaison Officer, Vice Provost Steven Barrett (steveb@uwyo.edu), to submit [HLC Screening Form for Changes to Existing Programs](#)
- Send to Curriculum Committee – New [CARF's through Curriculog](#) for new coursework
- Send to Office of the Registrar – [Add to Acalog Catalog](#)
- Send to Admissions - to add to the "Pick List" for majors and programs

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Report on Low-Producing Programs, Carman

- PUBLIC SESSION
- EXECUTIVE SESSION

PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED BY COMMITTEE:

- Yes
- No

FOR FULL BOARD CONSIDERATION:

- Yes
- No

[Note: If yes, materials will also be included in the full UW Board of Trustee report.]

- Attachments/materials are provided in advance of the meeting.*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Per the *Standard Administrative Policy and Procedure: Academic Program Review*, the Provost's Office must annually review degree production for all academic programs:

Those that are low-producing, will be required to conduct an immediate review with a report on the status of the program due back to the Office of the Provost within six months. If in the judgment of the Office of the Provost, a compelling case has not been made for continuation, the program will be recommended for reorganization, consolidation, reduction or discontinuance pursuant to UW Regulation 2-13.

Per UW Regulation 2-13, the Provost will make final recommendations for reorganization, consolidation, reduction of discontinuance to the President:

The President in collaboration with the Faculty Senate will review the recommendations. The President or the Provost shall also discuss the recommendation with and solicit feedback from the Academic Personnel and staff in the department or program, the department chair, and the dean of the school or college.

The President shall make a final recommendation to the Board of Trustees to reorganize, consolidate, reduce or discontinue a program within a maximum period of 120 days from the time the initial request was made. The recommendation shall include a plan for program closure, if applicable, identification of tenured faculty and Fixed Term Academic personnel appointments recommended for termination, and a plan for accommodating students currently enrolled in the program.

In January 2023, Provost Carman requested a review by colleges and schools of programs that were identified as low-producing. The Office of Institutional Analysis (OIA) provided data on all degree

programs. The data identified 26 undergraduate and 34 graduate programs that were low-producing (those that average fewer than 5 graduates per year for undergraduate programs and 3 graduates per year for masters programs, over a 5-year period). In January and February 2023, Provost Carman provided the list of identified programs and the data to the Deans and made public the list of programs on the Academic Affairs website. Reports from the colleges and schools on these programs were due July 31, 2023. They included narratives that address the low-completion rate of each program and proposals to either continue, or recommend for reorganization, consolidation, reduction, or discontinuance pursuant to UW Regulation 2-13. Provost Carman will summarize the process, highlight some initial recommendations, and discuss the next steps involving further discussions with deans and the President to determine how best to address these low-completion programs, as well as a campus discussion period. The Provost's and President's recommendations for low-producing programs that should be reviewed and analyzed pursuant to UW Regulation 2-13 will be shared with the Board at its November 2023 meeting.

Deans recommended the following low-producing programs to be considered for review under UW Regulation 2-13:

College of Agriculture, Life Sciences and Natural Resources

- B.S. in Zoology & Physiology

College of Arts and Sciences

- B.A. in French
- B.A. in German
- M.A. in Philosophy
- M.A. in Sociology
- B.A. in Psychology

College of Education

- Ph.D. in Educational Administration
- Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration
- M.S. in Instructional Technology
- Ph.D. in Instructional Technology
- Ed.D. in Adult & Post-Secondary Education
- Ph.D. in Education-Literacy Education
- Ph.D. in Education-Mathematics Education
- Ph.D. in Education-Science Education

College of Engineering and Physical Sciences

- B.A. in Geology & Earth Sciences
- B.A. in Mathematics
- B.A. in Statistics

WHY THIS ITEM IS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE:
University Policy on Review of Low-Producing Programs

ACTION REQUIRED AT THIS COMMITTEE MEETING:

PROPOSED MOTION:

Standard Administrative Policy and Procedure

Subject: Academic Program Review

Number:

I. PURPOSE

Academic Program Review (APR) provides an opportunity for the institution and faculty to examine the quality of their academic programs as a whole, to affirm ways that the program is working well, and to implement improvements. APR is also a mechanism for demonstrating a commitment to continuous improvement and thus meet accreditation requirements of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). At the University of Wyoming, comprehensive institutional reviews will generally be conducted on a department by department basis, every seven years. Other types of program reviews may occur as described below.

II. DEFINITIONS

Institutional Academic Program Reviews: Each academic department shall undergo a comprehensive review of its academic programs at least once every 7 years. The purpose of conducting the reviews on a departmental basis is to assure that the degree programs are assessed in the context of the faculty's overall workload. Degree programs that are interdisciplinary, or are housed outside an academic department will be reviewed independently. From time to time, institutional reviews may be requested for special circumstances.

Reviews of New Degree Programs: For effective long-range planning and continuous improvement, it is important to monitor the progress of a new degree program soon after implementation. All new academic degrees, options, and certificates shall undergo a first review approximately five years after initiation to assess the health of these programs. The Provost's office will initiate review. The process is [outlined here](#).

Reviews of Low Producing Programs: When an academic program produces relatively few graduates over an extended period of time, it is often a signal that the program is not performing well and that university resources are not being effectively deployed. In general, low-producing programs are defined as those that average fewer than 5 graduates per year for undergraduate programs and 3 graduates per year for masters programs, over a 5 year period. On an annual basis, the Office of the Provost will review degree production for all academic programs. Those that are low-producing, will be required to conduct an immediate review with a report on the status of the program due back to the Office of the Provost within six months. If in the judgement of the Office of the Provost, a compelling case has not been made for continuation,

the program will be recommended for reorganization, consolidation, reduction or discontinuance pursuant to UW Regulation 2-13.

Reviews of Programs on Suspended Admissions: Departments may suspend admission into a degree program for up to two years with the approval of the Provost and notification to the Faculty Senate Academic Planning Committee. Within the two-year window, the program faculty must prepare a detailed recommendation on the future of the program for consideration by the Provost. If the decision is made to close the program, the process governed by University Regulations for discontinuance of academic degree programs will be initiated. This type of review is supported separately by the Standard Administrative Policy and Procedure: Policy and Guidelines for Suspending, Restructuring and Discontinuing Academic Degree Programs.

Specialized Accreditation Reviews: Specialized accreditation reviews are conducted by professional organizations and typically require a self-study and an outside evaluation team named by the professional organization. Such reviews are the responsibility of Deans and Program Directors, with the expectation that the Office of the Provost is provided with documentation from the reviews and is kept informed of their status.

For undergraduate and professional programs, the accreditation review may meet the requirement for institutional program review, depending upon the nature of the external organization's review. Because these types of reviews typically do not view a department's work holistically, especially with regard to graduate degree programs, specialized accreditation reviews are usually not sufficient for meeting the criteria of an institutional review.

III. OVERVIEW OF REVIEW PROCESS

The Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (AVPUE) oversees and coordinates program review on behalf of the Provost, except in the case of interdisciplinary graduate programs, in which case oversight and coordination lies with the Associate Vice Provost for Graduate Education. College and School deans, as applicable, hold primary responsibility for working with the Associate Vice Provosts to schedule reviews and for ensuring that a high-quality review is carried out.

The department faculty has responsibility for producing a self-study prior to a visit from an external review team. The Provost will appoint the external review team in consultation with the relevant dean and department head.

It is the responsibility of the Office of the Provost to track program review status by academic department. The AVPUE will maintain a schedule for reviews that is staggered to assure that colleges are not burdened with an inordinate number of reviews in any given year. The AVPUE will provide deans and program directors with at least annual summaries of which departmental reviews are upcoming, due, and/or past due. The Office of the Provost will also serve as the repository for all material related to program review. Summary information regarding program reviews will be reported annually.

The Provost's Office will maintain the following data:

- A list of departmental reviews that were completed in the prior year.
- Copies of the external review team's report, the program's response and the self-study.
- A list of departments and programs that are due for the one-year follow up
- An up-to-date list of reviews of any programs that were identified as low-producing in the prior year.

A list of all department reviews that are at the five-year mark or later in the seven-year cycle, including confirmation that the review has been charged, a status update on the self-study, the review committee's progress, and the expected submission date for the review committee's report to the dean and the timeline for the dean's final summary.

IV. RELATIONSHIP OF INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW TO PROPOSALS FOR NEW PROGRAMS

In general, proposals for new degree programs will only be considered when a recent UW institutional academic program review or external accreditor review is available to provide context for the implementation of the new program. Exceptions to this requirement may be made as the new institutional process is implemented. The proposing unit should also be prepared to provide a rationale for existing degrees in their unit that are low-producing as part of any request for adding degree programs.

V. PROCESS FOR INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Step 1: Annually, the Provost's Office provides a list of departments and programs due for review to Deans and Program Directors

Annually ([see timeline](#)), the Provost's Office will remind the deans and directors of reviews that are scheduled for the upcoming year, and of those which are in the fifth year of the seven-year cycle and due to be charged with program review the following year. The dean or provost may initiate a review at any time if deemed necessary.

Step 2: Dean or Director Initiates the Program Review

Upon notification by the Provost in the Spring term (usually no later than February), the review is initiated by a charge memo from the dean to the lead member of the department's faculty, usually the academic unit director, department chair or head. The Provost's Office will provide a charge memo to directors of independent academic programs. The charge memo will include the following elements:

1. A request that a self-study be developed and a request that a lead study director be appointed. This director may be the department chair or head, or their designee;
2. A description of specific issues to be addressed, such as degrees offered in the department or program, characteristics of students and graduates, faculty activity

- including scholarly and creative activity, extension and experiment station activity, advising, mentoring, service, and teaching;
3. A due date for completion and submission of the self-study, typically in late November of the following Fall term;
 4. Directions for how to obtain assistance with data resources;
 5. For programs that have undergone a previous review, the dean's summary memo from that previous program review is attached for reference.

Step 3: Program Faculty Prepare the Self-study

The program faculty prepare a self-study according to the instructions in the charge memo, the self-study [template](#) and [guidelines](#). The self-study should include institutional data wherever possible. The self-study should reflect on the recent past and present to provide context for the external reviewers, but need not review the entire previous seven years in detail. The self-study will also serve as a reference against which progress can be measured at the next program review.

The study should also reflect on the value the department and programs contribute to the university, innovations made in degree programs and curricular offerings, program productivity (e.g. enrollment and graduates), accomplishments related to private fundraising and grant and contracts, research and creative work, and other departmental/program accomplishments that have been occurred to adapt to changes in the profession and higher education.

When complete, the self-study is submitted to and approved by the dean or the university official who requested that it be prepared, before it is forwarded to the Office of the Provost.

Step 4: The external team is appointed and carries out the review

The external review team is comprised of three or more experts appointed and convened by the Provost. In general, the majority of the team will come from outside of the university, but members may also come from programs or departments within the university as long as they are not affiliated with the programs under review. The program faculty, in consultation with the dean, will provide the Provost with a list of possible reviewers who have familiarity with the discipline and are outstanding leaders in the field and/or higher education. A member of the program faculty should be appointed to serve as a liaison to the external review team.

The Provost's office will provide the external review team with a written charge that outlines the expectations of their work. This charge will specify the chair of the committee and will provide guidelines for the work of the committee and a due date for the report. Their charge will generally be to review the self-study and to collect additional data, feedback, and information that will speak to the quality of the department and programs during a campus visit. A [sample charge letter](#) provides context for the faculty preparing the self-study. A [sample external review team schedule](#) is here.

The department liaison will be responsible for developing a visit schedule, in consultation with their Dean and the Provost's Office, and for scheduling required meetings for the review team.

The chair of the committee is responsible for convening the meetings, setting the meeting agendas, making any specific assignments to review team members, overseeing the process, producing the review report, soliciting feedback from the committee, and submitting the final APR report to the Provost's Office.

Step 5: Completing the Academic Program Review

The external review team report is submitted to the Office of the Provost, which will immediately provide the report, along with a cover memo and timeline for formulating a response, to the relevant Dean, Department Head, or Director. After departmental review, the dean or dean's designee will lead a discussion with the department about the program review documents, the self-study, the APR review committee report, and the program's response, which will include formulation of action items that support UW's strategic plan and the program's mission.

The dean or designee, in consultation with the department head, prepares a final summary of the review. This summary identifies program strengths and recommendations for improvement or any requirements and action items for follow-up. The dean and department head sends the final summary of the review, the external APR review team's report, and the program's response, as outlined below, to the AVP for Undergraduate Education, AVP of Graduate Education, and the Provost.

Step 6: Progress Report on Academic Program Review

One year after the review is completed, the department or program, in consultation with the Dean, will prepare a progress report for the Provost on the status of implementation of action items resulting from the program review. The Provost's Office will meet with members of the program to discuss the progress report.

VI. FIVE YEAR REVIEW FOR NEW MAJORS/DEGREES

The Provost's Office will initiate five-year reviews for new degree/majors. New programs are initiated after a lengthy study of market conditions, faculty strengths, and curricular trends pursuant to UW Regulation 2-119 (Degrees and Diplomas). To ensure that the program's faculty can make appropriate adjustments to the program, it is essential that it circle back to the program's goals and objectives and assess performance after the degree has been launched. Thus, a review of the new degree itself, separate from the department or program that offers it, is critical after data on it can be collected.

The department offering the program will be notified the semester before the review is due that it should prepare to collect, analyze, and share data with the Provost's Office on:

1. The number of students in the major by year, and the number of graduates.
2. Current degree/major requirements, and an analysis of any courses or requirements that are:
 - a. Routinely oversubscribed

Approved: DRAFT 6-5-18

Appendix A: Typical Timeline for Institutional Academic Program Review

Term	Term	Term	Term	Term	Term
<p><u>Spring:</u></p> <p>Review notifications issued to departments / programs that will undergo next AY review (notification to go out by February)</p> <p>Programs begin organizing and starting self-study</p>	<p><u>Fall:</u></p> <p>Programs continue and complete self-studies. Self studies will typically be due by late November.</p> <p>Program and college provide potential names for external review teams.</p> <p>External review teams appointed by Provost</p> <p>Schedule for external review teams established</p>	<p><u>Spring:</u></p> <p>External review team visits</p>	<p><u>Summer:</u></p> <p>First-round external review team APR submitted to Provost</p> <p>Provost's office shares first-round reports with Dean(s) and Department Head(s) with cover memo and response deadline.</p> <p>Department response should be made in consultation with Dean and will include action items that emerge from review and support UW's strategic plan.</p>	<p><u>Fall:</u></p> <p>Provost's office meets with first-round programs' Dean(s) and Department Head(s) to review report(s) and response(s)</p>	<p><u>Fall:</u></p> <p>First-round reviewed program(s) submits progress report on APR action items to Provost's Office</p>

Appendix B: Guidelines for Structuring the Self-Study

The self-study provides an opportunity for departmental and program faculty to think in a focused and strategic way about the value and quality of the programs they deliver, their scholarship and creative activity, their service and value to the University, their college, and their state. A self-study should be in the range of 15-25 pages, not including appendices (links to websites are preferred, especially for syllabi or CVs.) Guiding principles for the self-study include:

- Building a basis for continuous self-evaluation and improvement in scholarship, teaching, learning, engagement, service, and extension activities.
- Focusing on the recent past and key points over the previous review period as context for present and future improvements.
- Concentrating on the academic degrees delivered, the undergraduate and graduate, student experience, and the scholarly, engagement, extension, service, and other contributions of the department or program.
- Reviewing program learning goals and assessment of learning in undergraduate and graduate programs.
- Understanding the current student experience with regard to academics, advising, climate, and career development.
- Understanding the current faculty composition and profile, the range of faculty scholarly activity, and how the department culture supports the development of excellence.
- Identifying program strengths and recommendations for improvements.

In some cases, a review will need to address specific program or department issues that are outside of these questions. In such cases, the initiating memo from the dean should specify these other program issues.

Appendix C: Components of the Self-Study

A. Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations

Summarize recommendations from the previous program review and how they were acted upon. If the program has not been reviewed recently, this is not required.

B. Overview of the Program

Describe the mission and goals of the program and how its structure (both of the program and of its governance) support them. Consider the following questions:

- Who are the current departmental faculty, by rank?
- What are department's resources, including facilities, and other assets such as collections, data resources, computing resources, studios, rehearsal/performance spaces, laboratories, and budgets?
- What is the program's external accreditation status, if any, or other external review results recently done?
- Provide current degree/major requirements as approved for both undergraduate and graduate offerings.
- How does the mission of the degree programs fit with the home department/unit, the school/college, and the mission of the university?
- What are the approved learning goals for each of the degree programs offered (i.e. bachelor's, master's or doctoral degrees?)
- What are the degrees' structures? For example, is there a single undergraduate program in the department, or does it have informal tracks/concentrations, formal named options or certificates?
- Describe any substantial and structured collaborations with other programs, such as dual, double or joint degrees, and any 2+2 articulation agreements with Wyoming or other community colleges, and benefits of these arrangements.
- If there are several degrees in the same academic department, how are they related to one another and what impacts do they have on student learning?

C. Current Departmental Faculty

Outline faculty job descriptions, expectations, and accomplishments, including:

- What are the teaching loads of faculty? Advising and mentoring loads? Research loads?
- Describe the grant and external funding activities of the faculty, if applicable.
- Using internal and external gauges of scholarly productivity, describe the quality of scholarly work in the department.
- Describe significant university, community, statewide, national, and international contributions of the department's faculty, including scholarly publications, creative activity, service to the university and state, extension and experiment station work, et al.
- What are the T tenure and promotion guidelines used by the department and college?

D. Departmental Community and Climate for Students and Faculty

Describe the efforts taken to foster overall diversity, a climate of respect and inclusion, and a sense of community by considering the following:

- Discuss efforts to welcome, orient, and retain new students. What is offered to connect students within the program, as well as with the greater campus community?
- Discuss efforts to welcome, orient, and retain new department faculty and staff. What is offered to connect faculty and staff within the program, as well as with the greater campus community?
- What efforts are there to enhance faculty/staff representation of traditionally underrepresented groups in the field? How does the unit rate its ability to attract and retain a diverse faculty/staff?

E. Departmental Governance and Resources

Describe the department's structure, resources, and accreditation status.

- How do the department's governance model, committees, and hiring criteria lead to active faculty engagement? How does succession planning work for leadership?
- What are department's resources, including facilities, collections, data resources, computing resources, laboratories, and university budgets? What are the department's grant budgets?
- What is the program's external accreditation status, if any, or other external review results recently done?

F. Degree Programs - Assessment and Evaluation

Summarize the assessment plan used to evaluate the extent to which students are meeting departmental or program learning goals and how the department is engaged in a coherent process of continuous curricular and program improvement.

- What has the department learned through assessment of its curricular learning goals? Provide evidence.
- What changes have been made to curriculum structure or content as a result of assessment?
- What are the emerging changes in the discipline? What is being done and can be done to move forward and seize emerging/future opportunities for degrees?
- If relevant to the program, how do leaders within industry, business, government, or non-profit organizations become involved in offering advice and perspectives on the program and the curriculum?

G. Student Recruiting and Enrollment

Analyze current practices and trends to determine if enrollment levels are consistent with plans and resources. Discuss relevant program data in the context of the following:

- Are enrollment levels consistent with plans, program resources, and career outcomes?

- What effort has the department/program made to enhance student diversity (traditionally underrepresented groups in field)? Have those diversity efforts been successful?
- If applicable, what do trends in enrolled students signal about program strength?

H. Student Advising and Student Support

Discuss the process by which students get regular advising and accurate program information. Reflect upon the following:

Undergraduate

- Who does advising for the department? Describe how advisors are hired, selected, and trained within the context of the centralized UW advising model. How are students transitioned between advisors when personnel changes?
- What is the ratio of advisors to students? How often do students to meet with an advisor?
- What other responsibilities do the advisors have in the unit?
- What material is available to support advising of undergraduates? How is that information kept up to date and accurate?
- How are advisor performance reviews conducted?
- How is the impact of the advising assessed? Is advising in alignment with the UW Advising, Career, and Exploratory Students Center (ACES) guidelines?

Graduate and Post-Baccalaureate

- How are advisors assigned and matched to students? How many advisees does each faculty member have?
- How often are program contacts and program information updated and made available online? Is the program information inclusive of program learning goals, program requirements as well as a program-level grievance procedure?
- How are students transitioned between advisors when personnel changes?
- How often and in what manner is satisfactory progress monitored? Do students receive written annual feedback on their academic progress? How is the impact of the advising assessed?

I. Degree Completion and Time to Degree

Referencing relevant institutional data and campus goals, describe efforts to help students make timely progress to degree. Include the following in your discussion:

- Use institutional data sources to examine and evaluate progress to degree metrics and comparison to peers.
- What efforts have been made to improve progress to degree performance and completion rates?
- Do students from educationally underrepresented groups (racial/ethnic minority, low-income, first generation in college) succeed in the program at rates comparable to other students? How are equity gaps addressed?

J. Career Services and Post-Graduation Outcomes

Evaluate student career outcomes, exit survey, and alumni survey data, and reflect upon how these outcomes are consistent with program goals.

- What do students do after graduation? How does the program prepare them for careers or further academic training?
- What career resources are available to students?
- What is the range of student career outcomes, and are these outcomes consistent with program goals? Does the program track the career progression of its graduates?

K. Graduate Student Funding

Discuss the department's student funding data and mechanisms, along with any goals for providing funding guarantees. Include a discussion of funding issues, such as:

- How is the program ensuring masters and especially doctoral students have adequate funding and taking steps to provide a multi-year funding guarantee upon admission, subject to success and progress towards degree? Are there opportunities for graduate students to secure individual extramural support?
- To what extent is the program making use of funding for diversity efforts?

L. Graduate Student Professional Development and Breadth

Discuss the professional development opportunities of graduate students and consider the following:

- How does the program encourage graduate students to participate in professional development opportunities that will enhance their skills and support their career goals?
- What resources and guidance are available for exploring academic and/or non-academic careers?
- What opportunities and funding are available to attend and present at professional meetings?
- To what degree does the program offer teaching experience and teaching-related professional development to graduate students?
- How does the typical graduate's program ensure exposure to breadth training? Does the program require a doctoral minor for doctoral students or evaluate other breadth requirements?

M. Overall Analysis of the Self-Study and the State of the Department or Program

What have you learned from the process of this self-study? Outline key findings from the departmental/program's self-study, including primary strengths and challenges, and priorities the department/program has identified for improvement. Highlight in your analysis the value the department/program contributes to the university, innovations made in degrees and curricular offerings, fundraising and grant-getting accomplishments and goals, research and creative work, and other departmental/program goals and changes that have been made to adapt to changes in the profession and higher education.

Appendix D: Template Self-Study for APR in [Department/Program Name]

Date submitted:

Primary Contact:

School(s)/College(s):

Response to previous program review recommendations

Summarize recommendations from the previous program review and how they were acted upon.

Overview of the Department/Program

Describe the mission and goals of the program and how its structure (both of the program and of its governance) support them. Consider the following questions:

- Who are the current departmental faculty, by rank?
- What are department's resources, including for example facilities, collections, data resources, computing resources, laboratories, and budgets?
- What is the program's external accreditation status, if any, or other external review results recently done?
- What departments or programs are peers and/or aspirational peers. At least some of these peers should be those identified by the university as institutional peers
- Provide current degree/major requirements as approved for both undergraduate and graduate offerings.
- How does the mission of the degree programs fit with the home department/unit, the school/college, and the mission of the university?
- What are the approved learning goals for each of the degree programs offered (i.e. bachelor's, master's or doctoral degrees?)
- What are the degrees' structures? For example, is there a single undergraduate program in the department, or does it have informal tracks/concentrations, formal named options or certificates?
- Are there any substantial and structured collaborations with other programs, such as dual, double or joint degrees, and any 2+2 articulation agreements with Wyoming or other community colleges, and benefits of these arrangements.
- If there are several degrees in the same academic department, how are they related to one another and what impacts do they have on student learning?

Current Departmental Faculty

Evaluate faculty job descriptions, expectations, and accomplishments, including.

- What are the teaching loads of faculty? Advising and mentoring loads?
- Describe the grant and external funding activities of the faculty, if applicable.
- Using internal and external gauges of scholarly productivity, describe the quality of scholarly work in the department.
- Describe significant university, community, statewide, national, and international contributions of the department's faculty, including scholarly publications (both authorships and editorships), creative activity, service to the university and state, extension and experiment station work, et al.
- What are the department-specific RT&P criteria used by the department and college?

Departmental Community and Workplace Climate for Students, Staff, and Faculty

Where applicable, evaluate exit survey and climate survey data. Describe the efforts taken to foster overall program diversity, a climate of respect and inclusion, and a sense of community by considering the following:

- Discuss efforts to welcome, orient, and retain new students. What is offered to connect students within the program, as well as with the greater campus community?
- Discuss efforts to welcome, orient, and retain new department faculty and staff. What is offered to connect faculty and staff within the program, as well as with the greater campus community and the community and state at large?
- What efforts are there to enhance faculty/staff representation of traditionally underrepresented groups in the field? How does the unit rate its ability to attract and retain a diverse faculty/staff?

Departmental Governance and Resources

Describe the department's structure, resources, and accreditation status.

- How do the department's governance model, committees, and hiring criteria lead to active faculty engagement? How does succession planning work for leadership?
- What are department's resources, including facilities, collections, data resources, computing resources, laboratories, and university budgets? What are the department's grant budgets?
- What is the program's external accreditation status, if any, or other external review results recently done?

Degree Programs - Assessment and Evaluation (all degrees, all levels)

Summarize the assessment plan used to evaluate the extent to which students are meeting degree programs' learning goals and how the department is engaged in a coherent process of continuous curricular and program improvement.

- What has the department learned through assessment of its curricular learning goals? Provide evidence.
- What changes have been made to curriculum structure or content as a result of assessment?
- What are the emerging changes in the discipline? What is being done and can be done to move forward and seize emerging/future opportunities for degrees?
- If relevant to the program, how do leaders within industry, business, government, or non-profit organizations become involved in offering advice and perspectives on the program and the curriculum?

Student Recruiting and Enrollment (all degrees, all levels)

Analyze current practices and trends to determine if enrollment levels are consistent with plans and program resources. Discuss relevant program data in the context of the following:

- Are enrollment levels consistent with plans, program resources, and career outcomes?
- What effort has the department/program made to enhance student diversity (traditionally underrepresented groups in field)? Have those diversity efforts been successful?
- If applicable, what do trends in enrolled students signal about program strength?

Student Advising and Student Support

Discuss the process by which students get regular advising and accurate program information. Reflect upon the following:

Undergraduate:

- Who does advising for the department? Describe how advisors are hired, selected, and trained within the context of the centralized UW advising model. How are students transitioned between advisors when personnel changes?
- What is the ratio of advisors to students? How often do students to meet with an advisor?
- What other responsibilities do the advisors have in the unit?
- What material is available to support advising of undergraduates? How is that information kept up to date and accurate?
- How are advisor performance reviews conducted?
- How is the impact of the advising assessed? Is advising in alignment with the UW ACES guidelines?

Graduate and Post-Baccalaureate:

- How are advisors assigned and matched to students? How many advisees does each faculty member have?
- How often are program contacts and program information updated and made available online? Is the program information inclusive of program learning goals, program requirements as well as a program-level grievance procedure?
- How are students transitioned between advisors when personnel changes?
- How often and in what manner is satisfactory progress monitored? Do students receive written annual feedback on their academic progress? How is the impact of the advising assessed?

Student Degree Completion and Time to Degree

Referencing relevant data and campus goals, describe efforts to help students make timely progress to degree. Include the following in your discussion:

- Use institutional data sources to examine and evaluate progress to degree metrics and comparison to peers.
- What efforts have been made to improve progress to degree performance and completion rates?
- Do students from educationally underrepresented groups (racial/ethnic minority, low-income, first generation in college) succeed in the program at rates comparable to other students? How are equity gaps addressed?

Career Services and Post-Graduation Outcomes

Evaluate student career outcomes, exit survey, and alumni survey data, and reflect upon how these outcomes are consistent with program goals.

- What do students do after graduation? How does the program prepare them for careers or further academic training?
- What career resources are available to students?
- What is the range of student career outcomes, and are these outcomes consistent with program goals? Does the program track the career progression of its graduates?

Graduate Student Funding

Discuss the program's student funding data and mechanisms, along with any goals for providing funding guarantees. Include a discussion of funding issues, such as:

- How is the program ensuring masters and especially doctoral students have adequate funding and taking steps to provide a multi-year funding guarantee upon admission, subject to success and progress towards degree? Are there opportunities for graduate students to secure individual extramural support?
- To what extent is the program making use of funding for diversity efforts?

Graduate Student Professional Development and Breadth

Discuss the professional development opportunities of graduates and consider the following:

- How does the program encourage graduate students to participate in professional development opportunities that will enhance their skills and support their career goals?
- What resources and guidance are available for exploring academic and/or non-academic careers?
- What opportunities and funding are available to attend and present at professional meetings?
- To what degree does the program offer teaching experience and teaching-related professional development to graduate students?
- How does the typical graduate's program ensure exposure to breadth training? Does the program require a doctoral minor for doctoral students or evaluate other breadth requirements?

Overall Analysis of the Self-Study and the State of the Program:

What have you learned from the process of this self-study? Outline key findings from the departmental/program's self-study, including primary strengths and challenges, and priorities the department/program has identified for improvement. Bring to bear and highlight in your analysis the value the department/program contributes to the university, innovations made in degrees and curricular offerings, fundraising and grant-getting accomplishments and goals, research and creative work, and other departmental/program goals and changes that have been made to adapt to changes in the profession and higher education.

Appendix E: External Review Team – Sample Charge Letter

Dear Review Team,

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the Academic Program Review Team. Please examine the department and its programs and make recommendations that will help in planning improvements. Your resources are a self-study report prepared by the department, copies of materials from the program's last review (if appropriate), information you gain through personal interactions while visiting the University of Wyoming, copies of strategic plans and goal-setting documents at the department, college, and/or university level, and any additional information requested by you or by the department.

Within the broad charge of recommending ways the department can continue to improve are some specific questions that we would like you to address:

- Based on the data / information provided in the self-study report or gathered by the external review team, what are the department's overall strengths and weaknesses?
- How well do the department's strategic goals align with those of its college and with those of UW?
- How would you compare this department with its peers?
- What improvements (including student learning and faculty development) has the department made since the previous program review?
- With only current resources or a modest infusion of new ones, what specific recommendations could improve the department's performance, marginally or significantly?

This letter provides you with background on the Department of XXX and explains the expectations for our upcoming external review. Below is a summary of the department and its programs providing the number of graduates per degree program from the previous five years.

Please address the department's contributions to two guiding strategic initiatives developed by the University of Wyoming. The first of these is a document our strategic plan, *Breaking Through: UW 2017-2022*. The other is the College/School of YYY's strategic plan. Summaries of both documents will be provided to you upon your first meeting.

Appendix F: External Review Team – Sample Visit Schedule

Day	Activities
One	<p>Welcome and briefing with college leadership Welcome and briefing with department chair Meeting with department faculty Meeting with faculty outside department with related teaching and research interests Tour of departmental and university facilities Review team meetings</p>
Two	<p>Meeting with undergraduate students Meeting with graduate students Meeting with support staff Meeting with assistant professors and academic professionals Meeting with senior faculty and academic professionals Review team meetings with additional stakeholders as needed Review team</p>
Three	<p>Review team meetings Debriefing meeting with college and department leadership</p>

College of Agriculture and Natural Resources							
Department	Program	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	5-Year Average
Zoology & Physiology	BS in Zoology and Physiology	1	0	0	0	0	0.2
College of Arts and Sciences							
Department	Program	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	5-Year Average
Modern & Classical Languages	BA in French	0	0	1	3	1	1
Modern & Classical Languages	BA in German	1	2	0	0	0	0.6
Philosophy & Religious Studies	MA in Philosophy	2	1	0	0	0	0.6
Criminal Justice & Sociology	MA in Sociology	2	0	0	0	0	0.4
Psychology	BA in Psychology	17	6	2	1	2	5.6
College of Education							
Department	Program	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	5-Year Average
School of Counseling, Leadership, Advocacy, & Design	PhD in Educ-Educational Administration	2	1	0	0	0	0.6
School of Counseling, Leadership, Advocacy, & Design	PhD in Educ-Higher Ed Administration	0	0	1	1	0	0.4
School of Counseling, Leadership, Advocacy, & Design	MS in Educ-Instructional Technology	13	5	4	0	0	4.4
School of Counseling, Leadership, Advocacy, & Design	PhD in Educ-Instructional Technology	1	1	0	0	0	0.4
School of Counseling, Leadership, Advocacy, & Design	EdD in Educ-Adult & Post Secondary Educ	2	1	0	0	0	0.6
School of Teacher Education continued	PhD in Educ-Literacy Education	1	0	0	0	0	0.2
School of Teacher Education continued	PhD in Educ-Mathematics Education	1	0	0	0	0	0.2
School of Teacher Education continued	PhD in Educ-Science Education	1	0	0	0	0	0.2
College of Engineering and Physical Sciences							
Department	Program	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	5-Year Average
Geology & Geophysics	BA in Geology & Earth Sciences	3	2	0	3	2	2
Mathematics & Statistics	BA in Mathematics	0	0	3	2	1	1.2
Mathematics & Statistics	BA in Statistics	0	1	0	0	0	0.2

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Native American Enrollment and Retention, Carman/Moore

- PUBLIC SESSION
- EXECUTIVE SESSION

PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED BY COMMITTEE:

- Yes
- No

FOR FULL BOARD CONSIDERATION:

- Yes

[Note: If yes, materials will also be included in the full UW Board of Trustee report.]

- No

- Attachments/materials are provided in advance of the meeting.*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Academic and Student Affairs will continue the discussion with the committee of recruitment and retention of our Tribal student population.

WHY THIS ITEM IS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE:

Requested by the committee as a follow-up from the July board meeting.

ACTION REQUIRED AT THIS COMMITTEE MEETING:

PROPOSED MOTION:

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Update on Saddle Up, Carman/Courtney

- PUBLIC SESSION
- EXECUTIVE SESSION

PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED BY COMMITTEE:

- Yes
- No

FOR FULL BOARD CONSIDERATION:

- Yes

[Note: If yes, materials will also be included in the full UW Board of Trustee report.]

- No

- Attachments/materials are provided in advance of the meeting.*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Review preliminary information on Saddle Up 2023. Highlight Poke Pack leaders and allow them to share their quick stories about this years' experience.

WHY THIS ITEM IS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE:

Requested by committee.

ACTION REQUIRED AT THIS COMMITTEE MEETING:

PROPOSED MOTION:

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Update on Next Gen General Education (USP), Carman

- PUBLIC SESSION
- EXECUTIVE SESSION

PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED BY COMMITTEE:

- Yes
- No

FOR FULL BOARD CONSIDERATION:

- Yes

[Note: If yes, materials will also be included in the full UW Board of Trustee report.]

- No

- Attachments/materials are provided in advance of the meeting.*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

In Fall 2020, then-Interim Provost Anne Alexander assembled the Next-Generation General Education (NGGE) Committee and tasked them with redesigning UW's general education program (currently USP2015). Delayed by the pandemic and by administrative change, a subset of the committee began limited preliminary work in Summer and Fall 2021. In Spring 2022, Provost Carman assembled eight sub-committees with focused charges based on recommendations from the NGGE Committee. The identified sub-committees were First-Year Experience, Transfer Relations, COM Revision, Digital Literacy, Cultural Competence, Best Practices in Structure and Pedagogy, V Requirement, and Assessment. The sub-committees worked through the 2023 spring semester and submitted draft reports of their recommendations to the Provost on May 1, 2023. An Executive Committee that consisted of chairs and representatives from the sub-committees met during May and June to develop a draft model for UW's general education program. With Provost Carman's approval of the model, the Executive Committee will work this fall to draft any policies related to the programs and review/solicit feedback from groups of constituents along with a campus-wide feedback survey.

WHY THIS ITEM IS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE:

Requested by committee.

ACTION REQUIRED AT THIS COMMITTEE MEETING:

PROPOSED MOTION:



Subcommittee: NGGE First-Year Experience

Report due: Final report May 1, 2023

Taskings:

- Provide guidelines and serve as consultants to programs using the USP elective during the AY23/24 First Year Seminar (FYS) pause.
- Assist the VP for Undergraduate Education in establishing answers and guidelines to FAQs related to the FYS pause.
- Review and explore the relationship and benefits of different elements of the first-year experience, including Saddle Up, the First Year Seminar, Freshmen Interest Groups, and the Bridge Program.
- Explore different models for FYS, including larger-enrollment sections, 1-credit vs. 3-credit, and college-specific vs. general.
- Gather information about common learning outcomes and institutional goals for first-year programming.
- Estimate the cost of existing FYE components, and explore alternate staffing and funding models for the first-year experience, including the First Year Seminar.
- Explore the impact of any FYE-related curricular changes on UW's ability to participate in the WICHE Passport Program.
- Develop two+ models to illustrate how UW might revise FYS/FYE elements to more effectively meet a clear set of outcomes and institutional goals.

Subcommittee: NGGE Transfer Relations

Report due: Subcommittee midterm report May 1, 2023, final report December 1, 2023.

Taskings: Community college and transfer student implications must be considered so that students who join UW after completing coursework or degrees elsewhere will not be at a disadvantage.

- Gather current gen-ed requirements for each of Wyoming's community colleges and identify key pressure points (existing) and opportunities (potential/proposed) for ease of transfer
- Explore the framing of *statewide* general education in other states to determine common practices/parameters for in-state transfer articulation.
- Explore and address barriers to non-resident transfer students and distinguish between those who transfer with an AA degree vs. those who do not come with a degree.

Subcommittee: NGGE COM Revision (Communication-Intensive Courses)

Report due: Subcommittee midterm report May 1, 2023, final report December 1, 2023.

Taskings:

- Review existing outcomes and approaches to communication skills at UW and comparator schools.
- Review existing assessment practices at UW and comparator schools to determine a possible *cycle* of ongoing assessment for communication outcomes.
- Identify a list of specific revisions that will improve the delivery of communication intensive instruction

- Craft a preliminary narrative to communicate and advocate for the holistic “WHY” of the essential communication skills and learning outcomes.
- Explore policies/approaches that provide more flexibility in satisfying COM requirements for students who are transferring from other institutions.

Subcommittee: NGGE Digital Literacy

Report due: Subcommittee midterm report May 1, 2023, final report December 1, 2023.

Taskings:

- Consider the possible role of a gen-ed digital literacy component in making UW “more digital...”
- Develop a working definition of digital literacy.
- Provide a potential list of digital literacy development guidelines, outcomes, and delivery standards for gen ed. (Consider WDE’s K-12 Computer Science standards as well as digital-literacy-related gen-ed outcomes at other universities.)
- Evaluate the potential impact of a standalone “digital literacy” designation on ease of transfer.
- Review existing assessment practices at UW and comparator schools to determine a possible *cycle* of ongoing assessment for digital literacy outcomes.
- Craft a preliminary narrative to communicate and advocate for the holistic “WHY” of the essential digital literacy skills and learning outcomes.

Subcommittee: NGGE Cultural Competence

Report due: Subcommittee midterm report May 1, 2023, final report December 1, 2023.

Taskings:

- Explore the diversity of student populations that UW serves, and develop a list of variations in scaffolding these populations may need.
- Explore gen-ed cultural competency requirements at other institutions to identify a list of possible learning outcomes.
- Review existing assessment practices at UW and comparator schools to determine a possible *cycle* of ongoing assessment for cultural competency outcomes.
- Craft a preliminary narrative to communicate and advocate for the holistic “WHY” of the essential cultural competency skills and learning outcomes.

Subcommittee: NGGE Best Practices in Structure and Pedagogy

Report due: Subcommittee midterm report May 1, 2023, final report December 1, 2023.

Taskings:

- Explore the use of alternative modalities of delivery, including micro-credentialing, might be used to meet learning outcomes
- Evaluate the use of gen-ed course *sequences* to reach and reinforce learning outcomes.
- Evaluate the appropriateness/value of building experiential components and career services skills into the Next Gen USP. (Consider the findings from the UW “Careers Everywhere Report” as well as relevant AAC&U publications.)
- Craft a preliminary narrative to communicate and advocate for the holistic “WHY” of non-traditional elements (e.g., micro-credentialing, sequencing, experiential learning) that you have found compelling
- Explore university-level student learning objectives to determine how innovative requirements/elements can help gen ed to better meet overall student learning objectives.

Subcommittee: NGGE V Requirement (American/Wyoming Government)

Report due: Subcommittee midterm report May 1, 2023, final report December 1, 2023.

Taskings:

- Access the Wyoming constitution and/or other relevant legislation to determine the *specific* parameters of UW's obligation to a requirement related to US and Wyoming constitutions.
- Explore gen-ed cultural competency requirements at other institutions to identify a list of possible learning outcomes for a revised V.
- Craft a preliminary narrative to communicate and advocate for the holistic "WHY" of a revised V requirement.
- Review the current delivery modalities for "V" courses and evaluate whether other modalities may be more effective/efficient.

Subcommittee: NGGE Assessment

Report due: Subcommittee midterm report May 1, 2023, final report December 1, 2023.

N.B. Assessment should be an integral part of UW's gen-ed program; however, the sub-committee should not omit learning outcomes that are important to our students' success simply because they are difficult to assess during students' undergraduate careers.

Taskings:

- Collect gen-ed assessment models from other institutions. Identify at least 3 models that seem both sustainable and appropriate to UW's context.
- *Beyond the course level*, identify other existing or potential forms of data-gathering (e.g., NSSE/FSSE, program exit surveys, qualitative measures, teaching evaluations) that can provide relevant information about teaching and learning within the gen-ed program.
- Develop a tentative plan to show how student SLOs will be regularly assessed via an efficient, sustainable, *ongoing cycle*. The plan should describe processes/stages that show how assessment results can be used to inform continuous improvement.
- Stage 2: Review the assessment plans developed by other sub-committees to determine their feasibility/validity and provide recommendations.

Next Generation General Education Program – Draft Model (July 2023)

UW's general education program is designed to develop citizens for a dynamic, global world. Effective citizenship requires students to be ready to pursue immediate goals as well as adapt to significant personal, cultural, and workplace changes they may not be able to imagine or anticipate. Accordingly, UW's program is designed to foster essential skills and mindsets that will prepare students to succeed in whatever fields of opportunity they choose upon graduation. The program aims to:

- *Introduce students to ways of thinking and understanding across disciplines, and with respect to interdisciplinary challenges, such that they become critical thinkers, successful problem solvers, and effective collaborators and leaders.*
- *Provide learning opportunities to broaden students' horizons of knowledge and help prepare them for opportunities, relationships, and impacts they may not yet imagine.*
- *Promote exploration of knowledge in areas of students' personal interests and values.*
- *Develop skills that prepare students to be productive, ethical, and inclusive members of a diverse world and that are of value to the workplace, community, and to them as individuals.*
- *Prepare students to become life-long, self-aware learners*

Required Coursework (Total: 29-35 credits)

- **Saddle-Up** (1 credit)
- **First-Year Foundation** (1+)
- **First-Year Composition** (3)
- **Foundations in Oral Communication** (3)
- **Quantitative Literacy** (3)
- **Physical and Natural Sciences** (3-4)
- **Arts, Humanities, and Creative Expression** (3; a partial replacement of H requirement, potentially based on WICHE "Creative Expression" competencies)
- **Society, Interactions and Institutions** (3; a partial replacement/restructuring of H requirement, potentially based on WICHE "Human Cultures" and "Human Society and the Individual" competencies)
- **Citizenship and the Constitution** (3)
- **Wyoming Constitution** (0-1)
- **Digital Literacy** (3)
- **Disciplinary and Professional Communication** (3)
- **Experiential Learning and Civic Engagement** (0-3)