

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Economics Majors and Minors, 2015-2016**

Date: March 28, 2016

Time: 3:30 – 4:30 pm

Place: Hyland Hall 4301

Attended: John Stone (Interim Provost); Greg Cook (Asso. Vice Chancellor); John Chenoweth (Dean, CoBE); Yamin Ahmad (Dept. Chair); faculty and staff in the Economics program L. Denton Marks, Stuart Glasser, Eylem Ersal-Kiziler, Dan Teferra, Jeff Heinrich, David Welsch, Matthew Winden, Ran Tao, Cathy Xue, Nicholas Lovett, Shreyasee Das; Audit & Review Team Chair Eric Appleton; Audit & Review team members Corey Davis, Joan Cook, Dale Splinter, Ahmad Karim

- 1) Call to order and introductions
- 2) Overview of Evaluation and Program Comments. Department Chair Yamin Ahmad gave background of program and recent departmental efforts, noting that the past five years have focused on goal setting, departmental structure, and building upon the previous chair's work
 - a) Discussed History of Economics and Econometrics; examination of peer schools to compare curriculum regarding these courses; talked with Business Advisory Board and graduates regarding necessity of Econometrics
 - b) The department has a well-defined core
 - c) Clear SLOs; Has used learning outcomes to revisit curriculum
 - d) Examined the differences between BBA, BA, and BS degrees
 - e) Discussion of Diversity Issues
 - i) Report "Gender and the Undergraduate Economics Major" distributed
 - ii) Gender inequality exists across the field nationally
 - iii) Discussion of grants, resources available to increase female enrollment
 - iv) LEAP team focusing on gender issues within the major
 - v) Recruiting students to major has always been an issue; department always trying to think up new recruitment initiatives
 - vi) Noted that Economics is moving toward becoming a STEM area
 - f) Tracking graduates; through past five years have tracked 90 % of graduates; not working with Alumni Office as dept. already has the data; Looking at LO data to build picture of how program prepares graduates; in depth effort by individual faculty to track graduates – 'high cost' time investment by faculty members
- 3) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) Strengths:
 - i) It was noted that the field is traditionally research based and there is no real vocational licensing; nonetheless, the department believes strongly in developing students' lifelong learning skills, not just doing scholarship but focusing on analysis and use of research. The department employs a mentor/mentee model, which has entailed faculty trained as researchers focusing on improvement of teaching skills. The A&R committee noted that they

- were impressed with the degree of the department's research productivity and students' engagement with high impact educational practices such as research, internships, and FERC activities.
- b) Assessment: The A&R committee asked about assessment data collection, the status of the implementation of the assessment plan, and data from the capstone course.
 - i) Ahmad noted that the capstone data will roll in over the next five years. The program is looking to assess that data and then back track (take 'snapshots') through the curriculum to see what needed to happen at earlier points. It was felt there was a need to have a baseline before making changes. Discussion of regular assessment meetings to determine 'how we are doing,' and what that means based on embedded assignments, and including non-majors.
 - c) Resources: The A&R committee asked about plans for growth and resources required for growth.
 - i) Ahmad noted that it was not just the need of dedicated lab space, with the software and programs that would allow students to work on big data sets (not possible with lower end software), as well as computers capable of handling these programs and data; dedicated lab space would also promote conversation/collaboration among students
 - ii) The department would like to offer core courses every semester
 - iii) Discussion of Faculty/Staffing: Upcoming retirements; International Labor Economist (gender issues) needed; faculty skilled working with big data; staffing needs are indeed pressing; what faculty lines can support both the department and the college? Discussion of using graduate assistants to help with some of the courses, particular GenEd
 - iv) Dean Chenoweth noted that CoBE as a whole is experiencing lack of space due to enrollment; Hyland Hall is already full beyond it's intended capacity; resources for the program are bound up with the resources available to the college
- 4) Discussion of Recommended Actions: The evaluations report lists 3 recommended actions (see page 14, point 4 of report)
 - a) Discussion of 2b: it is difficult to get useful information out of Econ 101 and 102 as they both are filled with a substantial number of non-majors
 - b) Discussion of 3; Is there any way to make tracking easier? Can the department feed tracking into to the Alumni Association?
 - 5) Final Comments: Greg Cook noted that the department has made a lot of progress, has implemented meaningful systems and are hopefully useful to the program. Ahmad Karim noted that the department was comprised of a strong faculty who were working hard on assessment and diversity. Yamin Ahmad noted that assessment and department progress has been a group effort across the department, not just the effort of 1 or 2 people.
 - 6) Recommended Actions: The evaluation report lists 3 recommended actions (see page 14, point 4).
 - 7) Recommended Result: *Continuation with minor concerns*
 - Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
 - Next full self-study will be due in October, 2020.
 - 8) Adjournment

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2014-2015
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors

Date of Evaluation February 16, 2016 Short Self Study (SS*)
 Program Economics Major X Minor X

Evaluations submitted by: Eric Appleton, Dale Splinter, Corey Davis, Ahmad Karim, Joan Cook
Review meeting attended by: Joan Cook, Corey Davis, Ahmad Karim

I. Program Purpose & Overview: A. Centrality

1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's core values, Mission, and Strategic Plan.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program has achieved or is appropriately working toward achievement of at least two goals of Inclusive Excellence.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Report; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

2. The program offers three GS courses, all three of which contribute to five different GenEd goals. However, all three seem rather specialized and CoBE/Ed specific (see bottom of page 3 of report).
3. pg 5 of report; A number of areas are remarked upon, and efforts are being made; much still seems to be at the preparatory stage.
3. One interesting example is that two faculty members completed a LEAP project to plan a Women in

Business Day for this summer.

4. The program made good progress toward meeting the recommendations from the previous A&R.
Thank you for your hard work!

I. Program Purpose & Overview: B. Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments

1. The program's mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve or advance the program.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals, and making decisions about changes to the program goals.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a "vision" for where it wants to be in the future and how to get there.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. The program earned recognition or awards.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

6. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

Comments

1. I'm always a little leery of mission statements that list having an excellent reputation or being the

best as a mission goal (being unrivalled). There's good, solid stuff in the threefold statement, but it could use a little editing.

2. Goals were identified, undertaken, and grad program goal was even achieved.
2. A couple of the goals say "encourage the department to..." (pg. 123 of hardcopy). Can you explain more about what this means? That is, what specific actions were taken or considered to "encourage the department"?
3. Dept. conducted a SWOT assessment.
3. Process for setting and monitoring goals is a good one.
5. No program-level awards or recognition, but an impressive list of accomplishments for individual students and faculty/staff members.
6. Economics is a part of CoBE AACSB accreditation. Individual majors are not accredited by AACSB, and accreditation is not available for Economics.

II. Assessment: A. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable).

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students; otherwise NA

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program provides opportunities for students to learn in ways that extend beyond the classroom, and discussed the extent to which students are involved in these activities and opportunities.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable)

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
--	---

Comments

3. The self-study provides evidence for why Econometrics was needed. There is no evidence provided to explain why History of Economic Thought (ECON 404) was no longer needed. Was 404 eliminated entirely or just removed as a core requirement?
3. Re: development of the Advanced Econometrics course--What data on courses offered at peer and aspirant institutions were examined?
3. How were students and faculty consulted on the need for an econometrics sequence?
3. There is no mention of SLO data being considered in making curricular changes. I understand that not much direct data is available yet, but were indirect data (e.g., from SOAS, other surveys) considered?
3. Were there any relevant data on student performance on the statistics items from the AoL assessments that supported the decision to replace History of Economic Thought with Econometrics? 4. Exciting work being done by students via undergrad research FERC, College Fed Challenge and World Bank internship!
5. All online courses must pass QM review, and classes/instructors in the bottom quartile of student evals receive additional review.
5. The preparation of faculty to teach online courses, and online course evaluation, seems very thorough.

II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program has a clearly articulated learning outcomes for students, courses are "mapped" to these learning outcomes, and some outcomes received specific attention during the review period.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgments about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2

No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

6. Results of assessment efforts have been shared with appropriate internal and external constituencies.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Report page 20 notes that there has been limited progress on unique learning goals for the minor and that they plan to address this more concretely. Is there a timeline for this work?
1. It looks there are really 12 SLOs, although they're grouped into 3 proficiencies. Is it (going to be) difficult to assess all 12 on a regular basis? The program may want to revisit the SLOs after they've collected direct data from the capstone to see if all 12 are needed.
1. This feels a little picky, but just a comment: Phrasing of SLOs as "students will be able to..." is more common than "students should be able to...". In practice, it probably doesn't matter but is there a specific reason for choosing 'should' rather than 'will'?
1. The program recognizes that it needs to finish the SLOs for the minor. This shouldn't take long--I'd encourage them to finish it.
- 1-4. SLOs are identified and mapped to courses. However, all of the assessment is being done in the Capstone. There is little to no evidence that specific SLOs were targeted. Also, how does the Department assess the individual courses and their influence if all Departmental direct assessment is being conducted in the Capstone? (It looks like there is some assessment data collected by the College for ECON 202 and 245.) Even for the Capstone Course, there is no data available yet.
4. How do Master's program assessment data inform the undergraduate program?
4. What are the faculty reflection assessments based on? How did they arrive at these percentages for competent, accomplished, etc.?
3. The assessment plan is good, and includes a good mix of direct and indirect measures. However, most have not been implemented yet.
4. Not a lot of data (especially direct data) collected yet, although they have plans to begin doing so.
4. The direct data available from the BBA assessment is not just for the program. It includes both majors and non-majors. Can this be disaggregated?
4. There is direct data from the ETS test in 2012. Are there plans to administer this again?
4. Good consideration of the data from the "SOAS." I'm not sure what it means that the ratings on advising have "become an area of focus" for the program. What have been some themes emerging from the discussions, any actions decided on yet?
4. The Faculty Reflection data are interesting and (not surprisingly) reiterate the faculty expectations. Are they based on specific assignments, on general experience, on something else? Be careful to not overemphasize these data, but it will be interesting to see the level of concordance between these and direct performance data as more becomes available.

4. Any discussion of the lower-rated item about "feel connected to the department" on the SOAS?
This is an interesting result, and one the program could take action to address.
- 11.B. 4-5 Report page 26 Faculty reflection notes that faculty believe students are performing well in various proficiencies. I wasn't clear about the data that backs up this reflection conclusion. Faculty belief appears to be corroborated by ETS scores.
5. Yes, but there isn't much direct data to consider at this point.
5. The process for considering data is good; lots of progress on developing these processes since the previous A&R.

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: A. Trend Data

1-2. Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. [MAJORS ONLY] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years, or reasonably efficiently.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4-5. [MAJORS ONLY] Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students. Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

6. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

7. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level is justified or supported by examples or data.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

- 1-2. Good analysis of trends in the data, thoughtful comments.
- 1-2. Enrollment and graduation numbers seem low (17-20) but steady.
- 4-5. I would like to see some specific examples of schools or programs that were specifically targeted

to increase diversity. Also, how does an "Annual pre-commencement celebration for graduating majors" function as a retention strategy if the students are graduating? It's a nice thing to do, but I don't understand what it does for retention.

4-5. The issue for the program is in gender imbalance, not ethnic minority imbalance.

7. Page 50 of report notes need to cover International Economics and Labor Economics, with need for labor economist focusing on gender issues. Another area of anticipated need is International Economics, and a need for an associate director for the Fiscal and Economic Research Center, as well as a Department Associate position. It all appears well justified by the report.

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: B. Demand for Graduates

1. [MAJORS ONLY] Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

The department collects its own data through Linked In, email, and phone. Does the Alumni Association offer any resources for graduate tracking?

3. I encourage the program to use their extensive database of graduates and 'mine' them for more information about how well the program prepared them for their careers. This is not easy to do; collaborate with campus offices (e.g., Alumni Office, Career & Leadership Development) to see how they can help you.

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: C. Comparative Advantage(s)

1. The program has unique features that distinguish it from competing programs--giving it a competitive edge

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Multiple forms of evidence suggest the UW-W Econ programs are among the best (and arguably, by some measures, the best) in the state.
1. I'm not sure what makes a program like this unique; the breadth of scholarship seems appropriate, but I'm hard pressed to note anything particular aspect beyond excellent teaching and research that sets UWW Econ program apart from others at similar institutions. The FERC seems like it could a unique feature, but due to my lack of knowledge of other programs I can't form a conclusion. The mission statement would be a good place to note the program's truly distinguishing features.
1. FERC is an excellent opportunity. How many students are able to be involved in this?

IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty Characteristics

1. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.)

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2-3. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Table 1 offers names, ranks, and accomplishments but doesn't offer information as to diversity except what assumptions can be made from names. The text discusses gender and international status of faculty, but does not discuss ethnicity of faculty members.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement

1. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Table 2 suggests that some faculty do a lot, and some do very little. The Professors have nothing listed, whereas the Asst. and Asso, (and Lecturers) do.
1. "There are no formal expectations by the DoE for faculty and staff with regards to improvement of teaching." Several faculty members have no teaching improvement activity listed. Perhaps some formal expectations should be articulated.
1. Although there may not be department-specific expectations for teaching and learning enhancement, there are formal college expectations that the department must adhere to.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities

1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

- "This research tradition within the Department has been one of the key factors that led the recent AACSB reaccreditation team to commend the DoE as a strength of the College of Business and Economics with regards to research." Very impressive.
- The department is very active in scholarship

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding**1. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

- Table 4, Again, it seems rather uneven. Three appear to do the lion's share. What is the emphasis on bringing in funding; does the department spread this kind of activity out -- as long as someone's doing grant writing they're okay with other pursuing service, teaching, etc?
- Again, very impressive; especially considering the large sums of FERC grant money, which presumably involves students in the research projects.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service**1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments**IV. Resource Availability & Development: F. Resources for Students in the Program****1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. As noted before, there are upcoming staff issues they would like to address

IV. Resource Availability & Development: G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings**1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, and technological resources to effectively serve its students.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. The program notes that they lack proper dedicated lab space for upper level majors and grad students. They also would like more digital access to a greater number of periodicals and journals (Andersen funding?)
1. The self-study notes the need for lab space.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program**1. Program strengths are discussed.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. Other comments by the program (not rated).

Yes	4
No	0

Comments

2. Should also discuss need to attract more female faculty (and students) and need to expand direct assessment beyond capstone course.
3. Why is the M.S. program repeatedly mentioned in this self-study? It seems that information should be in the graduate A&R self study.

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

- It appears that the department has done a lot of work in the past few years and has a much clearer sense of direction since the last report. Enrollment is increasing; alumni are tracked. Faculty appear engaged in teaching improvement efforts, research, and service.
- Well-defined assessment program.
- Relevant curriculum.
- Outstanding faculty.
- Diverse faculty.
- High student engagement.
- Good placement.
- The program offers an array of outstanding opportunities for undergraduate research and internships and scholastic competition. The program is highlighted by highly productive research agenda of its faculty members. The program also provides valuable GS courses to CoBE.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- Continue working on assessment activities.
- Learning goals for the minor
- Address lab and library resource issues.
- Continue working on diversity/inclusive excellence issues, and increase student diversity.
- Continue working on recruitment issues (how can the university as a whole aid recruitment efforts?).
- Continue working on advising issues.
- Increasing numbers of student majors in undergraduate program.
- External funding outside of FERC.
- Direct assessment is a glaring need. It is concerning that the Department is only collecting assessment data from the Capstone course, yet is using the data from that one course to draw conclusions about the achievement of SLOs mapped to multiple courses. It is particularly concerning that there is no assessment of the GS course ECON 201. It is also unclear if there is any assessment of the GS course ECON 202, other than the assessment of the quality of the online experience in the course.
- Assessment. The plans are good and are in place, it's time to implement.

3. Other comments/questions

- Strong department with excellent faculty and rigorous curriculum. High reputation.
- What is the regular teaching load for a faculty member in the Economics Department? What additional internal funding (if any) is provided to support faculty research efforts?
- I have some concerns that the focus will remain on the M.S. program over the next few years, which is understandable given the new program. I encourage the program to make sure the undergrad program remains a top priority.
- LOTS of work has been done, LOTS of progress made since the previous A&R. Thank you for all your efforts!
- It looks like they have a solid set of items to work on, and have laid out procedures to move forward.
- We understand that some faculty are involved in both the undergraduate and graduate programs but the focus of this review is just on the undergraduate.

4. Recommended Actions

1. Work on increasing enrollments in undergraduate majors, with special attention to student diversity.
2. Implement the assessment plan:
 - a. Gather data, analyze, and discuss it.
 - b. Consider expanding assessment activities to include direct assessment of courses other than the capstone course so the program can identify where student learning takes place. Consider likely additional courses in the major/minor core.
 - c. Track the use of the data, both within class instruction and in curricular changes. What impact do the data have?
 - d. Finish the SLOs for the minor.
3. Work on ways to consolidate graduate tracking efforts with other campus resources; are there ways to make this a less 'high cost' extra time commitment by the department faculty?

5. Recommended Result

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	
Continuation without qualification	
Continuation with minor concerns	X
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion.	
Non-continuation of the program.	