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Background on Quality Checkups conducted by the Academic Quality Improvement Program

The Higher Learning Commission’s Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) conducts Quality Checkup site visits to each institution during the fifth or sixth year in every seven-year cycle of AQIP participation. These visits are conducted by trained, experienced AQIP Reviewers to determine whether the institution continues to meet The Higher Learning Commission’s Criteria for Accreditation, and whether it is using quality management principles and building a culture of continuous improvement as participation in the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) requires. The goals of an AQIP Quality Checkup are to:

1. Affirm the accuracy of the organization’s online Systems Portfolio and verify information included in the portfolio that the last Systems Appraisal has identified as needing clarification or verification (System Portfolio Clarification and Verification);
2. Review with organizational leaders actions taken to capitalize on the strategic issues and opportunities for improvement identified by the last Systems Appraisal (Systems Appraisal Follow Up);
3. Alert the organization to areas that need its attention prior to Reaffirmation of Accreditation, and reassure it concerning areas that have been covered adequately (Accreditation Issues Follow Up);
4. Verify federal compliance issues such as default rates, complaints, USDE interactions and program reviews, etc. (Federal Compliance Review); and
5. Assure continuing organizational quality improvement commitment through presentations, meetings, or sessions that clarify AQIP and Commission accreditation work (Organizational Quality Commitment).

The AQIP peer reviewer(s) trained for this role prepare for the visit by reviewing relevant organizational and AQIP file materials, particularly the organization’s last Systems Appraisal Feedback Report and the Commission’s internal Organizational Profile, which summarizes information reported by the institution in its Annual Institutional Data Update. The report provided to AQIP by the institution is also shared with the evaluator(s). Copies of the Quality Checkup report are provided to the institution’s CEO and AQIP liaison. A copy is retained by the Commission for the institution’s permanent file, and will be part of the materials reviewed by the AQIP Review Panel during Reaffirmation of Accreditation.
Clarification and verification of contents of the institution’s Systems Portfolio

The team reviewed two iterations of the Systems Portfolio before arriving for the Quality Checkup visit to gain an understanding of the College. The second included updates to the data reported deficiencies noted in the Appraisal Feedback, but did not include interpretation of the additional data of process improvements completed or under consideration. The May 2007 version of the Systems Portfolio was prepared solely for the Checkup visit and was not apparently intended as an additional draft. This caused initial confusion among the team, and may cause similar confusion among other readers. The team recommends the intent of the second edition be more clearly identified.

During the visit, the team verified and clarified the contents of the System Portfolio through discussions held with the Chancellor, Provost, vice-Chancellor, the Chancellor’s Advisory Council, Program Directors, representatives of both faculty an student associations, and various cross-functional groups that included students, administrators, faculty, and staff. The information and results described in the AQIP Systems Portfolio were consistent with the information and results witnessed on campus.

Discussions with campus groups included the Institutional Quality Program, Institutional Profile, review of USDE Compliance Requirements, the Systems Portfolio, current Action Projects, strategic planning and priority identification, opportunities for improvement from the first Systems Portfolio, student learning and assessment, technology to support student learning, and learning support services.

In the team’s judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution’s approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP’s expectations.

Review of specific accreditation issues identified by the institution’s last Systems Appraisal

The Systems Portfolio Appraisal did not reveal any accreditation issues.

In the team’s judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution’s approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP’s expectations.
Review of the institution’s approach to capitalizing on recommendations identified by its last Systems Appraisal in the Strategic Issues Analysis.

The Appraisal Team prioritized five strategic issues for consideration by the institution, including:

- A process to identify leadership candidates
- Usability of process measures
- Presentation of multi-year data points
- Need for additional comparative data
- Need for more results data

The Institution has begun to address the strategic issues identified in the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report (March 2006) and has incorporated historical data beyond one or two years as recommended by the System Appraisal Feedback Report. It was not apparent to the team, however, that the institution fully appreciated or embraced the strategic issues and opportunities for improvement that surfaced through the Systems Appraisal. The institution reported confusion regarding the expectation for reporting from AQIP staff on its actions concerning the Strategic Issues identified. By way of clarification, the team was not disappointed with the descriptions provided by the institution, but rather by the perception that the feedback did not appear to be particularly embraced as valuable.

The team found the Systems Portfolio to be generally accurate and well understood. Although UWS agreed the Appraisal feedback was generally accurate, it appeared that efforts thus far to address opportunities for improvement identified within the Appraisal Feedback were largely focused on the expansion of data reporting rather than the more substantive observations offered within many of the opportunities for improvement. It appeared that UWS had not undertaken a particularly careful review or consideration of the points raised by the Feedback Report. For example, many observations noted declining trends, or institutional intentions (in the Systems Portfolio) to “ensure” certain processes or outcomes. It was not obvious that these trends had been analyzed, nor that consideration had universally been given regarding process development to ensure desired outcomes.

The team noted several interesting and exemplary activities while on campus, including, but not limited to: the continuous improvement approaches exhibited throughout the organization, the innovative use of technology, the process relationship between new initiatives and budget.
allocation, a planning process that provides broad-based and inclusive input to decision making, and a culture that clearly is data driven. The team was also struck by the use of the concept of “enduring goals” to reinforce constancy of purpose.

In the team’s judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution’s approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP’s expectations.

Review of organizational commitment to continuing systematic quality improvement

There was significant evidence of the University’s continuing commitment to systematic improvement:

- Broad participation in the Quality Checkup visit from multiple constituents, most of whom were aware of the institutional commitment to continuous improvement and at least familiar with its concepts and tools,
- Multiple meetings with the Chancellor, and the commitment and leadership of the Provost indicated a both a broad understanding and strong organizational commitment to continuing systematic quality improvement,
- The receipt of the National Performance Excellence Award further demonstrates the institutional commitment to the quality journey,
- The team notes, however, that a Baldrige application is a step in an award process, while AQIP is a re-accreditation process designed to advance student learning through continuous improvement. While there is ample evidence of organizational commitment to continuous quality improvement, there was not the same enthusiasm for the AQIP processes.

In the team’s judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. While the institution’s approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP’s expectations, the team believes the level of institutional performance can be improved by re-thinking and adjusting the quality improvement program to better use the AQIP system and processes toward that end.

USDE issues related to default rate (renewal of eligibility, program audits, or other USDE
actions

The institution provided a comprehensive and detailed documentation summary including:

- Student Loan Rate Default Evaluation
- Program Length, Credit and Tuition Policies
- Professional Accreditations
- The Student Complaint Process
- Third Party Comment
- Compliance with Title IV Regulations
- Sample Advertising and Student Recruitment Materials

While on site, the Checkup Visit team confirmed the accuracy of the data provided by the institution. Additionally, the Team noted the institutional participation with the Great Lakes Higher Education Guaranty Corporation and their thorough process to avoid student default. These complement the comprehensive loan management processes at the University (e.g. minimizing lenders among transfer students, conservative use of “alternative loans,” a loan consolidation campaign, and proactive student retention campaigns).

In the team’s judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution’s approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP’s expectations.

Compliance with Commission Policy IV.A.8, Public Notification of Comprehensive Evaluation Visit

In anticipation of the Team visit, the University presented appropriate public announcements in the Dunn County News on February 25, 2007, and in the student newspaper (Stoutonia) on March 8 and March 22, 2007. One response was received by the Commission, and it, coincidentally, was complimentary.

In the team’s judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution’s approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP’s expectations.
Compliance with Commission policy 1.C.7, Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Institutional policy noted in the UW-Stout Curriculum Handbook and based on the University of Wisconsin System Policy on Academic Year Definition and Assorted Derivatives establishes standards for program length, credit allocation, and contact hours. The Institution presented a listing of program lengths and all met the minimum requirement, although 83% of those listed exceeded the standard 120 credit hour expectation.

The team was surprised to learn that the university considered students enrolled for one credit hour of academic credit within a co-op placement requiring 40 hours of work per week as full-time students. When discussing this, there was some confusion on campus regarding the practice, however, the Director of Financial Aid provided Federal Regulations that documented institutional compliance. Since co-operative education is identified by the institution as an important characteristic, additional staff training on the practice of treating 40 hour per week co-op participants as full-time students might be beneficial.

Tuition at UW-Stout is calculated based on credit hours. Students are also subject to fees in addition to tuition. Credits and program lengths comply with state standards.

Undergraduate Schedule

- E-Scholar (University-issued laptop)
  - Spring 07/Summer 07: $232.11 per credit

- Plateau (No Stout-issued laptop)
  - Spring 07: $229.94 per credit 1-12 credits
  - No additional charges for 12-18 credits
  - Additional $199.84 for each credit over 18
  - Summer 07: $229.94 per credit for 1-6 credits
  - No extra charge for 6-9 credits
  - Additional $199.84 for each credit above 9 credits

*Special note: Any customized instruction courses are charged separately from other courses in the plateau rate tables.
Graduate Schedule

- Per Credit
  - Spring 07/Summer 07: $317.02 per credit

- Plateau
  - Spring 07/Summer 07: $382.93 per credit for 1-9 credits
  - No additional charges for anything over 9 credits
  - Summer 07: $382.93 per credit for 1-5 credits
  - No additional charge for 5-8 credits
  - Additional $344.75 for each credit 9-10, no additional charge for anything above 10 credits.

*Special note: Any customized instruction courses are charged separately from other courses in the plateau rate tables.

Additional rate schedules are published for students participating in the Minnesota Reciprocity program and the Midwest Student Exchange Program.

In the team’s judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution’s approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP’s expectations.

Compliance with Commission policy IV.B.2, Advertising and Recruitment Materials

The Team took the opportunity to review much of the advertising and recruitment materials used by the institution. The Team found the material to be accurate and to reasonably represent the University to its constituents. The institution is at the beginning stages of a formal “redefinition” of itself as a “polytechnic” institution. The team found some uncertainty on campus regarding the impact of this change, and recommends the university proceed cautiously to ensure advertising and recruitment materials continue to accurately portray the institution during and after this transition.

None-the-less, in the team’s judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution’s approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP’s expectations.
Compliance with Commission policy III.A.1, *Professional Accreditation*, and III.A.3, *Requirements of Organizations Holding Dual Institutional Accreditation*

The University has provided information regarding its various accreditation entities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accrediting, Certifying, or Evaluating Agency</th>
<th>Campus information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges & Schools (NCA-1932)** | **Scope of Accreditation or Certification:** Institutional  
**UW-Stout Contact:** Julie Furst-Bowe  
**Schedule of Visitation:** 7-year approval cycle  
**Most Recent Visit:** 1998  
**Next Scheduled Visit:** 2007  
**Most Recent Self-Study Report:** 2007 AQIP Systems Portfolio  
**Report Available From:** Provost’s Office or campus website |
| **National Association of Industrial Technology (NAIT-1981)** | **Scope of Accreditation or Certification:** B.S. in Packaging, B.S. in Graphic Communication Management, B.S. in Information Technology Management  
**UW-Stout Contact:** Ted Bensen, Steve Schlough  
**Schedule of Visitation:** 6 years  
**Most Recent Visit:** 2003  
**Next Scheduled Visit:** 2009  
**Most Recent Self-Study Report:** 2003  
**Report Available From:** Provost’s Office |
| **Council on Rehabilitation Education, Inc. (CORE-1994)** | **Scope of Accreditation or Certification:** M.S. in Vocational Rehabilitation, Rehabilitation Counseling concentration  
**UW-Stout Contact:** Kathleen Deery  
**Schedule of Visitation:** No on-site visit  
**Most Recent Visit:** 2005  
**Next Scheduled Visit:** 2013  
**Most Recent Self-Study Report:** Annual report submitted  
**Report Available From:** Provost's Office or 250 VR |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Body</th>
<th>Scope of Accreditation or Certification</th>
<th>UW-Stout Contact</th>
<th>UW-Stout Contact</th>
<th>Schedule of Visitation</th>
<th>Most Recent Visit</th>
<th>Next Scheduled Visit</th>
<th>Most Recent Self-Study Report</th>
<th>Report Available From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facility (CARF)</td>
<td>Services: Community employment, vocational evaluation, and assistive technology</td>
<td>John Lui</td>
<td>John Lui</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>John Lui, Director SVRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commission on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education</strong> (American Association of Marriage &amp; Family Therapy's accrediting body) (AAMFT-1977)</td>
<td>Scope of Accreditation or Certification: M.S. Marriage and Family Therapy</td>
<td>Bruce Kuehl</td>
<td>Bruce Kuehl</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Bruce Kuehl, HDFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Accreditation/Approval for Dietetics Education (CAADE) [ADA's accrediting agency for education programs]</td>
<td>Scope of Accreditation or Certification: B.S. Dietetics, Dietetics internship of the M.S. in Food &amp; Nutritional Sciences</td>
<td>Carol Seaborn (B.S.), Melinda Hanson (M.S. internship)</td>
<td>Carol Seaborn (B.S.), Melinda Hanson (M.S. internship)</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>2000 (B.S.), 1996 (M.S. internship)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Provost's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Available From: Provost's Office Council for Interior Design Accreditation (formerly Foundation for Interior Design Education and Research [FIDER])</td>
<td>Scope of Accreditation or Certification: B.F.A. in Art, Interior Design concentration</td>
<td>Ron Verdon, Program Director, or Maureen Mitton, Interior Design Department</td>
<td>Ron Verdon, Program Director, or Maureen Mitton, Interior Design Department</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Art Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PO Box 25217</strong>&lt;br&gt;Overland Park, KS 66225</td>
<td><strong>Samuel Hope, Exec Dir,</strong>&lt;br&gt;NASAD&lt;br&gt;11250 Roger Bacon Dr Reston, VA 22090&lt;br&gt;703/437-0700</td>
<td><strong>NASP</strong>&lt;br&gt;4340 East West Highway&lt;br&gt;Suite 402&lt;br&gt;Bethesda, MD 20814</td>
<td><strong>111 Market Pl., Suite 1050</strong>&lt;br&gt;Baltimore, MD 21202&lt;br&gt;(410) 347-7700</td>
<td><strong>Michael Holland, Exec VP</strong>&lt;br&gt;1717 North Loop&lt;br&gt;1640 East, Suite 320&lt;br&gt;San Antonio, TX 78232-1570&lt;br&gt;210.495.6161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope of Accreditation or Certification:</strong> B.S. in Business Administration</td>
<td><strong>Scope of Accreditation or Certification:</strong> B.F.A. Art, B.S. Art Education</td>
<td><strong>Scope of Accreditation or Certification:</strong> M.S.Ed/Ed.S. School Psychology</td>
<td><strong>Scope of Accreditation or Certification:</strong> B.S. Manufacturing Engineering</td>
<td><strong>Scope of Accreditation or Certification:</strong> B.S. Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UW-Stout Contact:</strong> Hugh Williamson</td>
<td><strong>UW-Stout Contact:</strong> CAS</td>
<td><strong>UW-Stout Contact:</strong> Jacalyn Weissenburger</td>
<td><strong>UW-Stout Contact:</strong> Rich Rothaupt</td>
<td><strong>UW-Stout Contact:</strong> Hans Timper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schedule of Visitation:</strong> 10 years</td>
<td><strong>Schedule of Visitation:</strong> 10 years</td>
<td><strong>Schedule of Visitation:</strong> 10 years (interim visits every 5 years)</td>
<td><strong>Schedule of Visitation:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Schedule of Visitation:</strong> 6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most Recent Visit:</strong> 2005</td>
<td><strong>Most Recent Visit:</strong> 1997</td>
<td><strong>Most Recent Visit:</strong> 2003</td>
<td><strong>Most Recent Visit:</strong> 2004</td>
<td><strong>Most Recent Visit:</strong> 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next Scheduled Visit:</strong> 2008</td>
<td><strong>Next Scheduled Visit:</strong> 2006-07</td>
<td><strong>Next Scheduled Visit:</strong> interim review due 2006</td>
<td><strong>Next Scheduled Visit:</strong> 2010</td>
<td><strong>Next Scheduled Visit:</strong> 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most Recent Self-Study Report:</strong> 2005</td>
<td><strong>Most Recent Self-Study Report:</strong> 1997</td>
<td><strong>Most Recent Self-Study Report:</strong> 2003</td>
<td><strong>Most Recent Self-Study Report:</strong> 2004</td>
<td><strong>Most Recent Self-Study Report:</strong> 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Available From:</strong> CTEM</td>
<td><strong>Report Available From:</strong> CAS</td>
<td><strong>Report Available From:</strong> Jacalyn Weissenburger</td>
<td><strong>Report Available From:</strong> Rich Rothaupt</td>
<td><strong>Report Available From:</strong> Provost's Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Scope of Accreditation or Certification</td>
<td>UW-Stout Contact</td>
<td>Schedule of Visitation</td>
<td>Most Recent Review</td>
<td>Next Scheduled Review</td>
<td>Report Available From</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Apparel and Footwear Assoc- Professional Leadership Council Associate Member (AAFA)</td>
<td>B.S. Apparel Design and Development</td>
<td>CTEM</td>
<td>5 year review</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>approval is through 2008</td>
<td>Gindy Neidermyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council on Family Relations (NCFR)</td>
<td>B.S. Human Development and Family Studies, certified family life educator</td>
<td>CHD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Robin Muza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Public Instruction (DPI-1917)</td>
<td>All DPI-certified programs</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Dean's Office, SOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Training Committee of the Wisconsin Certification Board, Inc (WCB)</td>
<td>M.S. Mental Health Counseling, AODA concentration</td>
<td>CHD</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Stephen Shumate, Rehabilitation and Counseling department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the team's judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution's approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP's expectations.
Compliance with Commission policy IV.B.4, *Organizational Records of Student Complaints*

The University has a formal, documented student complaint process. The Team had the opportunity to review student complaint process data and found a well-defined process regarding grade appeal in which a committee reviews the contested grade and circumstance and can change a grade awarded. The non-grade related appeals process was not as clearly defined, with the process described as “informal” at its initiation. Exploration of the “informality” noted there was likely a standard process that was followed and it could, perhaps be better described to connote its systemic nature. Similarly, the tracking and analysis of student complaint data might benefit from review and refinement.

In the team’s judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution's approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP’s expectations.

**Other USDE compliance-related issues**

None.

**Other AQIP issues**

- The team believes the University would benefit from an examination and possible refinement to its collection of important measurable data.

- Similarly, the team believes your strategic planning process might be improved through the inclusion of formal affirmation of mission and vision.

- Finally, the team believes the institution may benefit from documenting its decentralized quality improvement practices to identify internal “best practices” and promote internal improvement opportunities.
AQIP Checkup Visit at UW-Stout
May 2-4, 2007

AQIP Site Visit Team:
• Dr. Timothy Schibik, Professor and Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence, University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, IN
• Mr. Thomas Sullivan, President and CEO, Cleary University, Howell, MI

Agenda:

**Wednesday, May 2**

12:00-1:00 pm Welcome Lunch with Chancellor’s Advisory Council  
*(Ballroom A, Memorial Student Center)*
- Janice Coker, Associate Vice Chancellor
- Hector Cruz, Minority Faculty/Staff Leadership Intern
- Julie Furst-Bowe, Provost, Academic and Student Affairs
- Cally Henderson, Assistant Director, Human Resources
- Mary Hopkins-Best, Interim Dean, School of Education
- Jan Jordan, Special Assistant to the Chancellor
- Joe Krier, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Life Services
- Doug Mell, Director, University Communications
- Bob Meyer, Dean, College of Technology, Engineering and Management
- Diane Moen, Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Student Life Services
- John Murphy, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
- Sue Pittman, Interim Assistant Chancellor, University Advancement and Alumni Services
- Timothy Schibik, AQIP Site Team Member
- Forrest Schultz, Chair, Faculty Senate
- Dennis Shaw, Chair, Senate of Academic Staff
- Charles Sorensen, Chancellor
- Thomas Sullivan, AQIP Site Team Member
- Joan Thomas, Interim Dean of Students
- Doug Wahl, Director, Telecommunications and Networking
- Donna Weber, Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action
- Meridith Wentz, Interim Director, Budget, Planning and Analysis
- John Wesolek, Dean, College of Human Development
  - Lunch includes: Chicken Kiev, house salad, buttered corn, buttered baby red potatoes, dinner roll/butter, coffee/milk and frosted brownie.

1:00-1:30 pm Institutional Profile Review  
*(Northwoods, Memorial Student Center)*
- Charles Sorensen, Chancellor
• Julie Furst-Bowe, Provost
• Diane Moen, Vice Chancellor

1:30-3:00 pm Review of USDE Compliance Requirements
(Northwoods, Memorial Student Center)
• Janice Coker, Associate Vice Chancellor
• Jane Griffiths, Bursar
• Beth Resech, Director, Financial Aids
• Don Steffen, University Editor
• Joan Thomas, Interim Dean of Students
• Donna Weber, Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action

3:00-4:00 pm Review of Updated AQIP Systems Portfolio
(Northwoods, Memorial Student Center)
• Julie Furst-Bowe, Provost
• Meridith Wentz, Interim Director, Budget, Planning and Analysis

4:00-5:00 pm Current AQIP Action Projects
(Northwoods, Memorial Student Center)
New Programs Priority
• Janice Coker, Associate Vice Chancellor
• Julie Furst-Bowe, Provost
• Christopher Smith, Director, Outreach Services
Global Priority
• Amy Lane (International Co-ops), Career Services
• Claudia Smith, Director, International Education
Internal Communication Priority
• Doug Mell, Director, University Communications
• Meridith Wentz, Interim Director, Budget, Planning and Analysis
Polytechnic Priority
• Bob Meyer, Dean, College of Technology, Engineering and Management
• Forrest Schultz, Chair, Faculty Senate

Thursday, May 3rd

8:00-9:00 am Continental Breakfast with Chancellor’s Advisory Council, Chancellor Sorensen’s Presentation to Team, and Discussion of Quality Program
(Cedarwood/Maplewood, Memorial Student Center)
• Len Bogner, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate
• Janice Coker, Associate Vice Chancellor
• Hector Cruz, Minority Faculty/Staff Leadership Intern
• Julie Furst-Bowe, Provost, Academic and Student Affairs
• Mary Hopkins-Best, Interim Dean, School of Education
• Jan Jordan, Special Assistant to the Chancellor
• Joe Krier, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Life Services
• Doug Mell, Director, University Communications
• Bob Meyer, Dean, College of Technology, Engineering and Management
• Diane Moen, Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Student Life Services
• John Murphy, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
• Sue Pittman, Interim Assistant Chancellor, University Advancement and Alumni Services
• Timothy Schibik, AQIP Site Team Member
• Forrest Schultz, Chair, Faculty Senate
• Dennis Shaw, Chair, Senate of Academic Staff
• Charles Sorensen, Chancellor
• Thomas Sullivan, AQIP Site Team Member
• Joan Thomas, Interim Dean of Students
• Doug Wahl, Director, Telecommunications and Networking
• Donna Weber, Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action
• Meridith Wentz, Interim Director, Budget, Planning and Analysis
• John Wesolek, Dean, College of Human Development

9:00-9:45 am  Review of Strategic Planning and Priority Identification Process
(Cedarwood/Maplewood, Memorial Student Center)
• Len Bogner, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate
• Janice Coker, Associate Vice Chancellor
• Hector Cruz, Minority Faculty/Staff Leadership Intern
• Julie Furst-Bowe, Provost, Academic and Student Affairs
• Mary Hopkins-Best, Interim Dean, School of Education
• Chad Johnson, Vice Chair, Stout Student Association
• Jan Jordan, Special Assistant to the Chancellor
• Joe Krier, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Life Services
• Doug Mell, Director, University Communications
• Bob Meyer, Dean, College of Technology, Engineering and Management
• Diane Moen, Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Student Life Services
• John Murphy, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
• Jessica Padellford, President, Stout Student Association
• Sue Pittman, Interim Assistant Chancellor, University Advancement and Alumni Services
• Steve Schlough, Past Chair, Faculty Senate
• Forrest Schultz, Chair, Faculty Senate
• Dennis Shaw, Chair, Senate of Academic Staff
• Charles Sorensen, Chancellor
• Robin Sweeney, Classified Staff Representative
• Joan Thomas, Interim Dean of Students
• Doug Wahl, Director, Telecommunications and Networking
• Donna Weber, Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action
• Meridith Wentz, Interim Director, Budget, Planning and Analysis
• John Wesolek, Dean, College of Human Development

9:45-10:30 am  Review of Opportunities for Improvement Identified in the AQIP Systems Portfolio Review
(Cedarwood/Maplewood, Memorial Student Center)
• Julie Furst-Bowe, Provost
• Meridith Wentz, Interim Director, Budget, Planning and Analysis
10:30-11:00 am   Break

11:00-noon   Discussion of Student Learning, Assessment in Major and Program Review
(Cedarwood/Maplewood, Memorial Student Center)

- Carolyn Barnhart, Program Director, B.S. Food Systems and Technology
- Len Bogner, Program Director, B.S. Information and Communication Technologies
- Charles Bomar, Program Director, B.S. Applied Science
- Janice Coker, Associate Vice Chancellor
- Wendy Dittmann, Program Director, B.S. Management
- Susie Eberhard, Program Director, B.S. Vocational Rehabilitation
- Brian Finder, Planning and Review Committee Chair and Interim Program Director for M.S. Risk Control
- Barb Flom, Program Director, M.S. Guidance and Counseling
- Tom Franklin, Program Director, B.S. Golf Enterprise Management
- Julie Furst-Bowe, Provost
- Ed Harris, Program Director, B.S. Service Management
- Ray Hayes, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
- Diane Klemme, Program Director, B.S. Family and Consumer Sciences Education
- Tom Lacksonen, Program Director, M.S. Technology Management
- Kathleen Maglio, Program Director, B.S. Retail Merchandising and Management
- Lou Milanesi, Program Director, M.S. Applied Psychology
- Carol Mooney, Associate Dean, College of Technology, Engineering and Management
- Bob Peters, Program Director, M.S. Vocational Rehabilitation (on-line) and Associate Dean for College of Human Development
- Bob Salt, Associate Dean, College of Human Development
- Steve Schlough, Program Director, M.S. Information and Communication Technologies
- Carol Seaborn, Program Director, M.S. Food and Nutritional Sciences
- Juli Taylor, Program Director, B.S. Career, Technical Education and Training
- Ron Verdon, Program Director, B.F.A. Art
- Hugh Williamson, Program Director, B.S. Business Administration

12:00-1:00 pm   Box Lunch
(Northwoods, Memorial Student Center)

- Andrew Barrette, Stout Student Association Representative
- Len Bogner, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate
- Renee Howarton, Faculty Senate Representative
- Vi Jones, Past Chair, Senate of Academic Staff
- Michael Lubke, Stout Student Association Representative
- Jessica Padellford, President, Stout Student Association
- Timothy Schibik, AQIP Site Team Member
- Forrest Schultz, Chair, Faculty Senate
- Dennis Shaw, Chair, Senate of Academic Staff
• Thomas Sullivan, AQIP Site Team Member
• Darrin Witucki, Executive Committee Member, Senate of Academic
  Staff

1:00-2:30 pm Discussion of Technology to Support Teaching and Learning, E-scholar
Program, Learning Technology Services, and Teaching and Learning Center
*(Oakwood, Memorial Student Center)*
  • Jane Henderson, e-Scholar Training Manager
  • Anne Hoel, Director, Teaching and Learning Center
  • Nicholle Stone, Director, Learning Technology Services
  • Doug Wahl, Director, Telecommunications and Networking

2:30-3:00 pm Open *(Oakwood, if needed, Memorial Student Center)*

3:00-4:30 pm Discussion of Learning Support Services
*(Oakwood, Memorial Student Center)*
  • Jeanne Foley, Director, Math, Teaching and Learning Center
  • Cindy Gilberts, Executive Director, Enrollment Management
  • Joe Krier, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Life Services
  • LaMont Meinen, Director, Career Services
  • Lucy Nicolai, Director, Memorial Student Center
  • Paul Roberts, Director, Library Learning Center
  • Joan Thomas, Interim Dean of Students

*Friday, May 4th*

8:00-8:45 am Campus Tour of Classes and Laboratories
  _ Meet student tour guide in Bowman Hall 134.
  _ Student tour guide will bring to Harvey Hall 403/404.

8:45-9:00 am Tour Math Teaching and Learning Center Classroom and Tutor Lab Complex
*(Harvey Hall 403/404)*
  _ Jeanne Foley will discuss the program.

9:00-10:00 am Team Members Prepare Findings
*(Ballroom A, Memorial Student Center)*

10:00-11:00 am Share Findings with Chancellor’s Advisory Council
*(Ballroom A, Memorial Student Center)*
  • Janice Coker, Associate Vice Chancellor
  • Hector Cruz, Minority Faculty/Staff Leadership Intern
  • Julie Furst-Bowe, Provost, Academic and Student Affairs
  • Mary Hopkins-Best, Interim Dean, School of Education
  • Jan Jordan, Special Assistant to the Chancellor
  • Joe Krier, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Life Services
  • Doug Mell, Director, University Communications
  • Diane Moen, Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Student Life
  Services
  • John Murphy, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
• Sue Pittman, Interim Assistant Chancellor, University Advancement and Alumni Services
• Forrest Schultz, Chair, Faculty Senate
• Charles Sorensen, Chancellor
• Doug Wahl, Director, Telecommunications and Networking
• Donna Weber, Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action
• Meridith Wentz, Interim Director, Budget, Planning and Analysis
• John Wesolek, Dean, College of Human Development

11:00 noon Share findings with UW-Stout Faculty, Staff and Students
(Ballroom A, Memorial Student Center)