

DATE: 26 September 2002
TO: Peter Spear, Provost
FROM: Phillip R. Certain, Dean
RE: L&S Departmental Reviews

This report has been prepared in response to your request for information regarding program review, accreditation, and assessment of programs in the College of Letters and Science.

1. Academic Program Reviews

An annotated copy of the *UW-Madison Program Review Summary: Reviews Reported in the Past 10 Years* is attached (Attachment A). L&S completed seven departmental and administrative unit reviews in 2001-02, including reviews of five academic departments and the nine degree programs for which they are responsible:

- Chemistry (153)
- History (499)
- School of Journalism and Mass Communication (590), including Journalism (585) and Mass Communications (630)
- School of Library and Information Studies (612)
- Slavic Languages and Literature (913), including Polish (801) and Russian (891) language majors

In addition to these degree-granting programs, reviews of the Institute for Research in the Humanities and of the Biology Core Curriculum were completed. We have already provided copies of the final letters sent to the academic departments upon conclusion of these reviews. These letters contain summary review findings, as well as advice tendered and requests made to departments. For your information, we will attach the Guidelines under which these reviews were conducted (Attachment B).

For an update on reviews in progress, please refer to the L&S Program Review Planning Grid (Appendix C). At the time of their initiation, many of the reviews that appear on this grid had

not been reviewed in the past ten years; I am pleased to report that we have “caught up without falling behind.”

Additional notes on program reviews:

- The Industrial Relations Research Institute continues to be in transition. When that program stabilizes, it will be reviewed.
- Having now completed reviews of the Departments of History and History of Science, each of which contributes to the combined major these departments serve (504), we consider that major to have been subject to sufficient review.

2. Accreditation Schedule

The list of accreditation reviews has been annotated per your request (Attachment D). Your records should indicate that:

- The American Library Association visited the *School of Library and Information Studies* in October 2000 and awarded continued accreditation in January 2001. The program review reported above was an additional review of the doctoral program and other areas not addressed in the ALA review of the MA in Library and Information Studies.
- The UW-Madison School of Music will undergo an accreditation review by the National Association of Schools of Music in the coming academic year. The School is currently engaged in a self-study in anticipation of a site visit to be conducted early in 2003; at this time, we hope to work with the NASM reviewers to conduct a simultaneous review of programs and issues not covered by the accreditation process.
- The Planning Accreditation Board reviewed the UW-Madison Department of Urban and Regional Planning Master of Science in Urban and Regional Planning in February 2002. This accreditation review will be discussed by the PAB in November 2002. In addition, the Colleges of Letters and Science and of Agricultural and Life Sciences conducted a simultaneous, joint program review to consider questions related to the doctoral program. The L&S APC and representatives of CALS will discuss that review in Fall 2002-03.

3. Other Activities Related to Program Review

Revised Program Review Guidelines:

In Semester II, 2001-02, after extensive discussion of its role in program review and departmental assessment, the L&S Academic Planning Council revised the L&S Program Review Guidelines. Noting that this process is an important, College-wide means by which departments might be guided by a shared set of values, the APC revised the Guidelines in accord with the university's strategic plan, *Connecting Ideas*. The new Guidelines focus, unify and

align the goals of the College and its departments with the goals of the University; in addition, they call on departments to assess student learning outcomes and to use that information for decision-making. Overall, this revision should encourage departments to engage in reflective self-study and produce more “visionary” or “forward-thinking” documents. Furthermore, given that program reviews contribute so much to administrative decisions regarding allocation of resources, we hope that the revised guidelines will help the College and our departments build upon existing excellence and explore promising new avenues while maintaining strength in core areas. The revised L&S Program Review Guidelines (May 2002) are online at <http://www.ls.wisc.edu/handbook/chapterfive/chV-4.htm> (Attachment E).

Response to Changes in L&S Program Review Process:

Revisions to the L&S program review process continued to serve the College well in 2001-02. In March 2000, L&S introduced the use of *ad hoc* review committee “site-visits” to departments to streamline the inquiry stage of the review. This change has been well received, and the overall length of time required to conduct interviews associated with the review and to produce the committee report has been reduced dramatically. Although faculty and staff participating in reviews must contend with early and late semester deadlines and the long summer holiday, several reviews have nonetheless been completed within three semesters. Departments under review and faculty members serving on review committees report that the accelerated process for conducting interviews reduces the overall impact on their schedules, while increasing the quality and focus of the time spent on reviews.

Conclusion

In the past two years, the College has devoted resources and energies to extensive review of our departments and units. These reviews serve as our primary means of assessing – at the department level – the overall quality and strength of L&S. Information obtained through this process keeps us informed of the needs, strengths and future goals of the wide variety of entities that, as a whole, comprise the College. New ideas are subjected to thoughtful and substantive critique, and, often, new opportunities are pursued as a result of this process. Overall, this means of monitoring our work is both useful and productive.

4. Activities Related to Assessment

Annotated copies of the *Student Outcomes Assessment Activity in 2001-02* grids are attached. While L&S has much to be proud of in regard to review of our programs and units, and while there is much to praise about College-level assessment activities and activities undertaken by specific departments, developing a “culture of assessment” across all departments continues to be a challenge.

Campus and College-level Assessment

L&S Curriculum Committee

In 2000-2001, the L&S Curriculum Committee was asked to conduct a multi-year assessment of the coherence of the L&S undergraduate BA and BS degree requirements. Over the past two years, the committee has examined the requirements, exploring questions raised by advisors regarding “pressure points” in the curriculum, reviewing Degree Audit data to discern if particular requirements impede completion of degrees, and listening to students’ discussions of their impressions of the extent to which formal L&S requirements convey a liberal arts education. This work will continue in the coming year, during which time University Assessment Council grant funds will be used to survey L&S alumni 5-8 years beyond graduation. These alumni will be asked to reflect upon the liberal arts aspects of their education and upon the extent to which the formal requirements (a.k.a., the “breadth” and “credit” rules) may or may not have provided a broad, flexible, enduring, and useful liberal arts education.

The L&S Curriculum Committee has also evaluated and improved its own procedures. Last year, the committee implemented a series of structural changes, revising, clarifying and regularizing its duties and procedures. In 2001-2002, the committee implemented two important changes:

- Effective Fall 2001, the L&S Curriculum Committee began to require approval for changes in requirements for admission to L&S undergraduate majors and in requirements for majors themselves. Among other things, this process requires departments to communicate with each other when imposing requirements that affect other departments’ resources (*e.g.*, requiring another department’s course for admission to a popular major). Departments are also required to base changes to the major upon data - usually drawn from student outcomes assessment results. This requirement reinforces the importance and utility of program assessment by linking results to change. Furthermore, since departments are likely to undertake substantial revisions to undergraduate majors only once in a generation of faculty, the Curriculum Committee can serve as a resource and sounding board regarding curricular revision.
- Effective June 1, 2002, the Curriculum committee implemented new procedures by which departments propose to create, delete or change courses. The Committee now reviews course proposals and recommends breadth, level, and related designations such as Ethnic Studies and breadth designations *prior to* (instead of after) Divisional Committee Review. (L&S indicators are used campus-wide to reflect courses that satisfy the campus General Education Requirements.) This revision was undertaken in an effort to streamline a complicated and often confusing process that had evolved over many years.

General Education Requirements:

In its role as trustee for the implementation of the campus-wide General Education Requirements, the College continues to be engaged in various activities, including:

- The General Education Committee has discussed the policy recommendations tendered by the Verbal Assessment Project's assessment of the Communication B courses (a report on possible action items will be forthcoming).
- A subcommittee of the campus-wide General Education Committee has worked with Testing and Evaluation Services (School of Education) to evaluate the curricular experience of students who have taken QR-A and QR-B courses. As reported last year, the QR-A subcommittee studied the curricular experience of students taking QR-A courses to determine whether some students encounter QR-A as a barrier to completion of the baccalaureate degree. That report found that, while QR-A had the greatest impact on a relatively small group of students who, prior to implementation of the General Education Requirements, might have been able to avoid "math" during their college careers, QR-A seems to have no ill effect for the majority of students. The current QR-B study, an extension of questions raised in the QR-A study, may result in policy recommendations to refine implementation of the Quantitative Reasoning requirements.

L&S Graduate Student Professional Development Survey

In November 2001, The College of Letters and Science, The Graduate School, and the Wisconsin Alumni Association administered a collaborative survey of University of Wisconsin-Madison Ph.D. recipients who graduated five to ten years ago. Expanding on an L&S survey conducted the previous year, this survey examined the timing and effectiveness of the L&S Summer Sessions courses offered to graduate students interested in teaching. The collaborative survey helped identify the professional skills that are most important to Ph.D. alumni, whether they have gone into teaching, industry, or other employment. The survey results will help the L&S Teaching Assistant Resource Center refine current teaching assistant training programs and develop new professional development programs for graduate students.

L&S Student Services and Program Areas

L&S Student Academic Affairs

In 2001-02, the Associate Dean of L&S Student Academic Affairs engaged the LEAD center to help this key L&S area develop an assessment strategy that would suit the array of SAA program units. These units will conduct on-going assessments, submit annual reports, and engage in self-study and review at least once every ten years. To facilitate this process, a standing assessment committee has been convened to serve as a resource to units as they engage in assessment activities, review (and, if necessary, revise) L&S SAA assessment processes and expectations, serve maintain a historical record of these processes and expectations, and review and update units' assessment plans. A key element of this overall process is that this work will be informed by student retention and longitudinal data. LEAD, in consultation with L&S SAA, developed a *Student Academic Affairs Assessment Guidebook* as a basic resource for SAA units.

L&S Honors Program

In response to the request that it produce a Self-Study for purposes of program review, the L&S Honors program requested and received funding from the University Assessment Council

(awarded FY2000). Using those funds, the program engaged the LEAD center to conduct an extensive study, the goal of which was to assess (1) the effects of the Honors Program on students and alumni and (2) the understanding of the Honors Program by faculty and departments. The center surveyed faculty, alumni, and students at various points in their academic careers (including students who had withdrawn from Honors or who were invited but chose not to enter). The LEAD Center report provided particularly useful data about student attitudes toward the effectiveness of the various different kinds of honors courses and the overall impact of the honors program.

In order to complete the self-assessment, staff of the honors program undertook extensive institutional research on Honors eligibility, enrollments, curricular offerings and seats available. Among other things the Program documented that more than half the incoming students are now honors eligible, that demand for the program is growing dramatically (with the class entering in fall 2002 about 50% larger than that entering in 2001), and that the college has a significant shortage of the seats needed to enable honors students to complete the honors requirements in breadth areas required for the BA/BS degrees. These data, together with information from the study by the LEAD Center, provided the foundation for the program's self-study and for a number of proposed curricular and programmatic improvements. (The L&S Academic Planning Council will consider this program review in the coming academic year.)

Assessment of Academic Programs

Since Spring 1999-2000, the College has asked departments to complete an annual survey on assessment activities. It has not been our practice to require submission of detailed reports; however, we are considering shifting our method of inquiry to a biennial request (asking half of our departments to respond each year of the biennium) which would require more extensive reports.

In the paragraphs below, we highlight the assessment activities of a few L&S academic departments or programs.

Biology Core Curriculum (Biocore)

The Biology Core Curriculum is an intercollege honors program devoted entirely to undergraduate teaching and learning. This broad-based program looks at the spectrum of biological science, providing some of the university's most talented students with an integrated, intense and challenging research experience at the sophomore/junior level. Biocore has clearly defined learning goals to which all faculty participants are committed, and assessment plays an integral role in the direction of this program. For example, the program director reports that in past years, many students were frustrated by Biocore and found it not to be what they were expecting. When the Office of Quality Improvement conducted student focus groups to help the program understand student expectations, they learned that many students enrolled in Biocore for the privilege of participating in a well-respected honors program, not because they understood the program's values, goals, and commitment to providing an integrated research experience that weaves together all types of Biology. The program has since implemented procedures by which it more carefully communicates with students about its goals, curriculum, and expectations so they can make better informed decisions during the admissions process. As a result, students

seem much more aware of what the program tries to accomplish. In addition to refining its work with students at the beginning of the program, students are also consulted as they are completing the program, when they are asked to consider their experiences and offer advice. Students' comments have resulted in important changes to presentation of material and the manner in which the four semesters of the sequence are integrated with each other.

East Asian Languages and Literature

In light of the relatively small number of students who major in Japanese and Chinese, the preferred method of assessing EALL is via exit interviews conducted with graduating majors. In 2001-02, six Japanese majors were asked to evaluate the program overall, considering every aspect from language instruction to the availability of "for majors only" instruction at advanced levels. After this general introduction, the interviewer asked students questions to evaluate acquisition of knowledge expected of majors to test whether those expectations have been met. All responses were deemed satisfactory, and the students were reported to be "generally happy." Language proficiency is evaluated at the fourth year level via performance evaluation in listening, reading, speaking, and writing in Japanese. In Spring 2002, fourteen students (seven majors) were assessed; all met program expectations. Finally, as a point of great pride, the Japanese language faculty notes that a recent graduate of the program passed the Japanese government's Japanese Language Proficiency test at the highest level.

Only two of six graduating majors in Chinese participated in exit-interviews in 2001-02; in this case, the program's response reflects that interviews conducted are considered advice tendered by individual students, rather than a comprehensive evaluation. Nonetheless, the program reports, "We have gathered worthwhile observations on our programs through these exit interviews. They will serve as useful information in our current self-study of our programs. Although our undergraduate majors seem to be quite happy with our programs, we hope to undertake some revisions in light of our findings. In the future, we would also like to undertake a questionnaire survey of our graduate programs."

French and Italian

A variety of assessment tools are used to assess student learning in this department, including the use of pre- and post-testing to evaluate students in the Professional French Master's Program. Assessment results are used to improve the curriculum, as when student responses to surveys led to the creation of "true" and "false" beginner sections of introductory French to meet the needs of students who come to the course with different levels of experience in the language. The department is not content, however, with its current plan, reporting that it intends to implement a new five-year assessment plan, undertaking one component of assessment each year of the cycle.

Geography

Geography 565 (Undergraduate Colloquium in Geography) is a capstone course for senior geography and cartography majors. The geography major, with its five concentrations, provides a wide range of training; the colloquium is designed to provide majors, no matter their concentration, with the opportunity to utilize their training in independent or group research. Students develop research projects (with the instructor's guidance) to obtain a research

experience that connects their geography training to a specific career area of interest. In this way, the “capstone experience” helps majors seriously consider and obtain hands-on experience applying their geographical training to their post-graduate careers.

As a Comm B course, Geography 565 requires students to produce a number of papers and oral presentations during the course of the semester. Since these materials all involve the application by the student of his or her geographical training, they provide a useful opportunity for the instructor and the Geography Department as a whole to evaluate the learning experience of individual students; specific concentrations in Geography, and the undergraduate program as a whole. Although Geography 565 instructors have noted the usefulness of this information and have changed the material in other courses to address “learning gaps”, a formal evaluation procedure that utilizes this information has yet to be developed.

International Studies

In response to exit surveys of students and an academic program review of the International Studies Program (completed in Fall 2000), a new, introductory core course was offered for the first time in 2001-02. The program reports that “the first run of that course was a tremendous success on several levels.” Not only did evaluations reveal that students found the course interesting and intellectually challenging, but they reported that they had a better understanding of what “international studies” is, indicating that the primary motivation for the creation of the course had been met. The program will continue to evaluate the efficacy of this course, which provides one of the few “core” experiences for this unique and broadly interdisciplinary major.

Languages and Cultures of Asia (LCA)

With the help of a University Assessment Council grant, LCA has, for the past two years, engaged in an extensive assessment of student learning outcomes for the undergraduate major. Faculty and outside reviewers articulated the goals of the department and identified student learning outcomes for the major, which served as “signposts” in a web-based benchmarking of 27 peer programs from fifteen North American departments. The results of this exercise were brought to the LCA faculty, which then conducted an all-course audit of courses offered. (It is worth noting that LCA is the university’s largest timetable department, thanks to the more than 25 less-commonly-taught languages LCA offers.) The LCA Curriculum Committee discussed changes to the undergraduate curriculum and outlined specific course requirements, ultimately presenting three proposals to the faculty for discussion and revision. Guided by the previously identified student learning outcomes, the Department approved a revised curriculum in May 2002. That curriculum will come before the L&S Curriculum Committee for final approval this fall, having been preceded in that committee by approval of a complete restructuring of LCA’s entire course array. This effort, in itself, required coordination with college and campus administrators to oversee the creation of two new timetable departments and ensure smooth approval of more than 300 proposals to add, delete or change courses so they conform to a systematic and clear course numbering scheme, the better to serve students seeking LCA and LCA-Language courses.

In the coming year, LCA will implement procedures to gather information about their alumni and to develop and maintain a database of responses to student surveys and exit evaluations.

Among other plans, the department will also consider developing a capstone course for undergraduate majors and whether student portfolios might be appropriately used in this major.

Linguistics

The Department of Linguistics has, over the past several years, engaged in a re-evaluation of its curriculum and undergraduate degree program. In keeping with this work, the Department has taken a serious look at its assessment program to consider what it might be doing differently for its students. In 2000-2001, the department received a University Assessment Council grant to develop surveys and other instruments intended to provide the department with information necessary to evaluating and maintaining the curriculum. As they stated in their proposal: “we want to know what it is we’re doing right, as well as what we can do to improve teaching practices, learning outcomes, and preparation for post-college life.” An initial survey was conducted by the UW Survey Center, and the department audited the curriculum and reviewed the sequence of courses in the major. As a result, a revised major will soon be brought to the L&S Curriculum Committee for consideration, with an eye toward implementing the new curriculum in the next catalog cycle.

Mathematics

Once again, the Department of Mathematics reports that it has relied upon the services provided by the university-funded Quantitative Assessment Program, which designed the extensive, ongoing assessment of the undergraduate Calculus 221-222-234 course sequence. This particular assessment moves somewhat beyond the QAP’s usual procedure of examining students on an array of skills identified by the instructor at the outset of the course. In assessment of this course sequence, skill sets identified in 222 and 234 also measure the acquisition of skills conveyed in 221 and 222, respectively, thus providing a measure of the articulation between the courses. Performance measures on skills required of students in 221 may also be used to gauge the accuracy of the university’s Math Placement Test. In addition, the use of the InfoAccess database may help the department discern whether variations in teaching method have an impact on student performance and student retention in these courses. Information obtained from these assessments will play a role in the department’s discussions of curriculum and placement.

The graduate program is assessed primarily via tracking placement information (offers and acceptances) of graduates and trends in graduate course enrollments. The former measure (one often used by graduate programs) indicates that the program is doing very well, as most of its graduates move on to distinguished post-doctoral fellowships. The latter indicator reflects changes in the faculty and the courses they are able to offer; in light of this review, the department has recognized that areas its caucuses may need to undertake a more comprehensive survey of course offerings and restructure accordingly.

Psychology

The Department of Psychology applied for a University Assessment Council grant to help develop we-based survey for its graduating majors. All graduating seniors are contacted by mail and are encouraged to fill out a program evaluation using WebCT; program faculty have

presented information about this assessment tool (now in its third year of use) to the University Assessment Council. In addition, graduate program assessment results – primarily conducted as evaluations of students’ products - have led to the creation of an individualized graduate major for those students whose research interests “do not fit neatly into any of [the department’s] existing ‘area groups.’”

School of Social Work

Since 1999, the faculty of the School of Social Work have been engaged in a major outcome study of programs at the graduate and undergraduate levels. (The study’s purpose and design have been discussed in previous reports, which also note that SSW was the recipient of a major University Assessment Council grant.) This year, the “pre-test” survey developed in Summer 2001 was administered at the beginning of the 2001-2002 school year to all master’s students and social work seniors. Designed as a self-assessment of students’ current knowledge of social work theory, practice knowledge and practice skills, the survey questions are related to specific curricular goals in each of these areas. In the “post-test” phase, additional items were added to the survey reflecting appropriate professional skill development students generally attain in the program. The post-test was administered to all master’s students and seniors in May 2002. Data analysis of the results is being conducted.

In the Ph.D. program, the doctoral committee conducts formalized ongoing review of student progress matriculating through the program, programmatic process reviews such as assessments of the preliminary examination, and the effectiveness of the program’s selection and admissions procedures.

In the future, the School of Social Work plans to present a report of the first year of data to the faculty and executive committee of the School. In 2002-2003, the School will consider the next phase of continued implementation of the outcome study (e.g., Portfolio design and Alumni or Employer surveys). In 2003-04, the School may begin a review of the undergraduate Social Welfare major.

Sociology

The Department of Sociology recently received a modest grant from the University Assessment Council. This grant will support a graduate assistant, who will be working on the department’s survey of graduating seniors. This survey will be supplemented by a survey of faculty who teach advanced sociology undergraduate majors. Topics to be addressed include faculty perceptions of students’ verbal, quantitative, and subject-matter competencies, student research experiences, and student preparation for future work in sociology.

Women’s Studies Program

Women’s Studies uses both direct and indirect measures for assessing students in the program, relying on evaluation of student papers collected from courses in the various sub-areas and surveys of seniors (administered in the capstone course) and alumni.

Evaluation of papers focuses on attention to scholarly writings in women’s studies, students’ grasp of important issues, and their ability to engage in critical thinking and analysis—goals

identified in the program's assessment plan. Students enrolled in the capstone course complete the survey of majors. The survey explains the purpose of assessment, indicates that responses are submitted anonymously, and that individual views are kept confidential. Students evaluate the utility of courses, quality of instruction and advising, and assess their own ability to think critically and analyze information as a result of having engaged in this major. They are also asked to consider whether identified curricular goals have been met (such as whether the major sufficiently covered cross-cultural, multi-cultural and diversity issues). Overall, students' responses in Spring 2002 revealed "no general areas in which students perceived deficiencies in the education they have received as a Women's Studies Major."

Finally, in conjunction with the program review in which the Women's Studies Program is currently engaged, the program conducted a survey of its graduates. Although the analysis is as-yet-incomplete, the program reports that most of its graduates are successfully employed, and more than the majority have completed or are attending graduate school, and "almost all" have indicated that they would complete the Women's Studies major again.

Concluding thoughts on student outcomes assessment

As we have noted in the past, the variation in size among L&S majors means that departments select assessment tools that provide meaningful information in context: large scale assessments of the major that might be employed by the Departments of Communication Arts or History would be inappropriate to impose upon a department such as East Asian Languages and Literature. Conversely, exit interviews such as those conducted by EALL would be unworkable in many of the larger majors. This variation means that L&S' assessment strategy cannot be a "one-size-fits all" approach; furthermore, L&S faculty are far from expert in student outcomes assessment, and providing education and support for their efforts has been a challenge. As always, University Assessment Council funds have been essential to our departments, several of which have benefited from UAC funds: Psychology, Social Work, Linguistics, Mathematics, Languages and Cultures of Asia. In these departments and others, the UAC funds have helped integrate outcomes assessment and the use of assessment results into the departments' curricular processes.

As noted above, we will consider revising our assessment reporting strategy, calling on our departments to report less frequently, but provide more information when they do so. Those departments whose programs have languished would have more time to re-evaluate their assessment plans and implementation; those departments whose plans are progressing as scheduled but which are in a quiet phase (between surveys or major changes) would not have to report a misleading lack of activity.

Last but not least, we will continue to monitor the effect of having built a use for assessment into the functions of the two highest cross-college decision-making bodies. By requiring assessment as a component of academic program reviews considered by the Academic Planning Council and of curricular changes reviewed by the L&S Curriculum Committee, we hope to demonstrate the context for and utility of student outcomes assessment.

Attachments:

- (A) Annotated UW-Madison Program Review Summary, Reviews Reported in the Past 10 Years (October 2001)
- (B) L&S Guidelines for Program Review, 2000-2001.
- (C) L&S Program Reviews in Progress (20 September 2002)
- (D) Annotated UW-Madison Accreditation Reviews, Fall 2001 Report
- (E) L&S Program Review Guidelines (May 2002)
- (F) Annotated Student Outcomes Assessment Activity in 2001-02

XC: Deputy Dean Mary Anne Fitzpatrick
Associate Dean Charles Halaby (Social Sciences)
Associate Dean Judi Roller (Student Academic Affairs)
Associate Dean Jane Tylus (Humanities)
Associate Dean Herb Wang (Natural Sciences)
Associate Dean Nancy Westphal-Johnson (Undergraduate Education)
Associate Academic Planner Elaine Klein

L&S Program Reviews in Progress, September 2002

Department, program or Administrative Unit (major code, if applicable)	Initiated	Self-study	Inquiry	Report	Dept. Response	Discussion & Advisement
African Languages and Literature (018)	9/10/02					
Afro-American Studies (020)	3/9/01	Y	Y	Y		Fall 02-03
Applied Math, Engineering and Physics (072)	8/7/01	Y	Y	Y		Fall 02-03
Astronomy (094) and Astronomy - Physics (097) Ω	7/26/01, 5/22/02					
Botany (121) Ω	8/6/01, 5/22/02					
Classics (189), including Classical Humanities (542), Greek (481), and Latin (598)	8/7/01	Y	Y	Y		Fall 02-03
Communication Arts (201)	12/18/00	Y	Y	Y	Y	Fall 02-03
East Asian Languages and Literature, which houses the Chinese (171) and Japanese (583) language majors	11/12/01					
French (445) and Italian (580)	2/21/01	Y	Y	Y	Y	Fall 02-03
German (477)	2/21/01	Y	Y			Spring 02-03
Hebrew and Semitic Studies (497) and Hebrew (490)	2/21/01	Y	Y	Y		Fall 02-03
L&S Administration*	9/6/02					
L&S Honors Program*	1/29/02	Y				
L&S Learning Support Services*	6/11/01	Y	Y	Y		Fall 02-03
L&S Student Academic Affairs*	8/14/02					
L&S Student Academic Affairs Advising Group*	3/6/01	Y	Non-standard review (advisory to the Dean)			
Molecular Biology (684)	9/16/02					
Scandinavian Studies (900)	2/21/01	Y	Y	Y		Fall 02-03
School of Music (690, 687, 697, 696, 691, 688, 692)	4/16/02					
Urban and Regional Planning (979)	4/26/02	Y	Y	Y	Y	Fall 02-03
Women's Studies (993) Ω	2/21/01, 5/22/02					

* non-degree program Ω review "stalled" and re-initiated in progress Ystage complete