

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Follow-up Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
ENGLISH Majors and Minors, 2015-2016**

Date: 18 December 2015

Time: 10:30 – 11:30 AM

Place: LT 4012

Attended: Interim Provost John Stone; AVC Greg Cook; Dean David Travis; Department Chair Marilyn Durham; faculty and staff in the English programs Marilyn Annucci, Daniel Baumgardt, Erin Celello, Anna Hajdik, Daniel Holly, Susan Huss-Lederman, Jonathan Ivry, Donald Jellerson, Elizabeth Kim, Elena Levy-Navarro, Joshua Mabie, John McGuigan, Geneva Moore, Patrick Moran, Marjorie Rhine, Asmahan Sallah, Trudi Witonsky, Mark Zunac; Audit & Review Team Chair Angela Harlan; Audit & Review team members Joan Littlefield Cook, Andrea Ednie, and S.A. Welch.

- 1) Call to order and introductions
- 2) Angela Harlan summarized the strengths of the program including the progress made on assessment: clearly articulated SLOs, collection and use of data on student learning, and longitudinal analyses of students' development across time; four emphasis areas that are responsive to industry need and student demand; and the program's thorough analysis for this review period.

Department Chair Marilyn Durham provided a response to the comment in the audit and review report, "What are the trends in terms of number of MAJORS enrolled in each emphasis; that is, not number of students enrolled in the courses, but the number of students who have declared an English major, broken down for each emphasis?" (page 9 below) She commented that a table was included in the report, and provided additional data for Fall 2015.

- 3) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) *Facilities.* The program is in need of computer labs for classroom use. What is the current status of this issue, and what is needed to resolve it?
The program recently lost the right to schedule classes in the computer lab in McGraw 19C. This lab was reclaimed by ICIT for use in faculty training. However, the room is rarely in use, and the English program would very much like to have permission to schedule classes in it again. Dean Travis requested shared use of the room, but the request was denied; however some faculty have been successful in requesting the room for select dates. Another solution that the Dean's office is offered was the use of "laptops on a cart." This is a current practice for a few departments in the college. There are some logistical issues that need to be resolved. The hope is that this will be a temporary solution.

Dean Travis stated that he would like more details on the needs of the Film Studies program. Donald Jellerson stated that the Film Studies minor is very well supported by the Learn Center, both in classroom space and technology needs.
 - b) *Faculty.* The Professional Writing and Publishing emphasis is in need of a faculty position in order to be competitive with other programs. Are there plans to conduct a search to fill this

position?

A search for a tenure-track faculty member is under way. This is the third search conducted for the position. The first was a failed search and the second was cancelled last year due to budget constraints. The current search has yielded a rich pool of applicants, leaving the program very hopeful that the position will be filled this year.

- c) *Diversification of the faculty and curriculum.* *The program does not have a very diverse faculty, and is lacking in courses with domestic diversity. What strategies does/can the program use to increase faculty diversity? Are there plans to increase the diversity of course offerings?*

In past searches, the program has attempted to hire more diverse faculty. Unfortunately, the pool of applicants is not very diverse. Additionally, the program has difficulty competing for qualified minority applicants due to the high teaching load and inability to offer a competitive salary. One effort that the program has made in this area is its involvement in the Inclusive Excellence Fellowship Program. Alexandria Delcourt is a current fellow who teaches Multicultural Literature of the United States, one of the program's diversity offerings.

In response to the diversity in coursework, it was noted that there is a course in Hmong literature being offered as a special topics course, with plans to create a new permanent course in this area. There is currently no course in Native American literature, but the program's most recent hire is an expert in the area and, as a result, it is expected that such a course will be proposed.

Several faculty members argued that many of the current courses incorporate domestic diversity, including Survey of American Literature. There were also faculty members who expressed concern at not having specific courses dedicated to domestic minorities.

- d) *Assessment.* *The program has made good progress on assessment. Is the program working to create a full assessment plan? Which SLO's will be addressed each year, and how will they be assessed?*

The review team noted that the Assessment and Curriculum Committees meet together periodically, and finds this to be an excellent idea. The program is working to create a full assessment plan. One area in which the program has found students to be weak is in using evidence to construct arguments. There is discussion of holding a workshop to address this issue. The review team recommends that the program work with the Writing Center on this and other such ideas.

- e) *Final Comments.* Both Provost Stone and Associate Vice Chancellor Cook commented positively on the programs' progress in the area of assessment, as well as the contributions to General Education and to initiatives across campus, such as the Writing Matters Rubric. Dean Travis added that, not only is the program involved, but it serves as a leader for many of these events.

- 4) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 3 recommended actions (see page 14, point 4) related to program needs, diversification, and assessment.

- 5) **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.

- 6) Adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Submitted by Angela K. Harlan

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

Date of Evaluation 12/4/2015 Short Self Study (SS*)
 Program English Major X Minor X

Evaluations submitted by: Angela Harlan (review team chair), Joan Cook, Andrea Ednie, Pilar Melero, S.A. Welch

Review meeting attended by: Angela Harlan, Joan Cook, Andrea Ednie, Pilar Melero, S.A. Welch

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

Comments

1. Clear evidence of supporting the values, Mission, and Strategic Plan. The Professional Writing and Publishing program, first-year English course offerings in high schools, and English Language Academy stand out as unique representations of the UWW. The program's contribution to Gen Ed is huge.

1. Interesting point about requiring community-based learning (in response to “commitment to develop a sense of community...”). Please explain more about what this requirement is, how it’s implemented, etc.
 1. Campus-based center for providing editing services—excellent idea!
 2. 80% FTE is devoted to Gen Ed and proficiency
 2. Very strong contribution to Gen Ed. This degree of dedication to the GenEd goals and courses has an important impact on EVERY student at UW-W and is greatly appreciated.
 3. The emphasis on the A&R is on the program's work with international education. These achievements are worth noting, but the program could rethink their strategies for domestic diversity.
 3. What is the current status of the IE activities? For example, were the courses initially offered as Special Topics courses developed for inclusion in the regularly offered curriculum? The recruitment of the Fellow is great; any prospects for longer-term commitment (perhaps recruiting her for a tenure-line position)?
 4. Recommendation 2 stated that English needed to "Develop specific plans for how to increase faculty diversity with the hiring opportunities that are on the horizon." English recognizes that it has not been successful at increasing faculty diversity, ("Although there are no hiring opportunities on the horizon (witness our curtailed search for a PWP specialist last year), the program remains committed to increasing faculty diversity and has acted on all the valuable suggestions made by the review committee but without positive outcomes") but provides no evidence that there have been specific steps taken to recruit faculty of color. This is specially pressing given the demographic changes in the US. There have been no tenure-track faculty positions filled with faculty of color in English at least in the past ten years.
 4. Seem to be making progress on all recommendations; however, recommendations 2 and 5 have been more challenging to achieve.
 4. How can central campus offices help with achieving recommendation 5?
 4. Is there an overarching vision for the department as a whole? Each individual area has identified goals (or aspirations, in the area of Literature) but I don't get a sense of the department as a whole. Is this important, or does the department really function as 3 fairly independent units?
 4. Deciding what is a ‘vision’ and what are more specific yearly or biennial goals is difficult. Two areas (Creative Writing, PWP) have taken a goals approach, while Literature has taken more of an ‘aspirational’ approach.
 4. Have/how have the Literature goals been translated in more actionable statements? As currently written, it would be difficult to evaluate progress toward achieving. The goals for PWP are well stated for taking action.
 4. Good work in bringing English Ed alumni together. Would it be useful to think about this idea for the other emphases, especially professional writing? While it seems clear where students with an English Ed major will likely get jobs, it might be useful for students to hear from some of the wide variety of settings for which a degree in PWP might be appropriate.

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

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. They address the program along with the 5 goals of education in the previous section, but I am unclear as to what, specifically, their mission statement is.
1. Mission statements aren't explicit, but are embedded within the text of this answer.
2. Clear goals, objectives, and initiatives stated for all 4 areas.
4. Some of the emphases addressed the question, while others did not. PWP is clear about their vision, assessment, and the realities of reaching their goals. While the other emphases have some good ideas, there is little mention of assessment as a part of the motivation. Additionally, Humanities Celebration Day sounds like a very large project that will require some amount of funding. A more concrete idea of how such an undertaking will be accomplished would be helpful.
4. Clear visions & objectives were described for three programs... all except English Education, which struggles due to enrollment decline and challenges associated with the public education system. The report does balance this challenge with discussion over opportunity for a literature masters degree that arises as a result of the potential public education changes.
5. This is a great statement!
6. The report states that no accreditation is available.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	5
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	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

English has successfully undertaken extensive curricular revisions. Some of their assessment tools have been featured as models of evaluation at Assessment Committee meetings. This is one of the program's strengths.

1. The curriculum appears to be purposeful - students take a good balance of required courses with choice courses and at a variety of levels. There is minimal overlap between the emphasis areas and the overlap that exists seems to make sense.
2. Are dual-listed courses needed? Given the very low numbers of students taking the graduate courses, the program might consider deleting these.
3. The CW emphasis was changed without assessment data - more updated by new faculty following multiple retirements.
3. No data were available as the program made curricular changes. As more data are gathered, I

encourage the program to develop a system to ensure that the data are reviewed and play a central role (not the only factor, but an important one) when discussing curricular changes.

4. Very active student organization - "Muse", undergraduate research opportunities, travel study opportunities, independent study opportunities, and internships.
4. Consider collecting data from internship supervisors to assess SLOs.
5. The types & number of online offerings is addressed, but I do not see how they are evaluated.
5. Faculty are attending trainings and enrollment data are being used to guide decisions about course offerings. The report discussed concern over using face-to-face measures for evaluating online teaching, and about how online syllabi and instruction are not peer-evaluated.

II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program has 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	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Very good progress on developing SLOs for each emphasis. Lots of effort went into this--thank you!
1. Thoughtful SLOs for each emphasis. A few seem difficult to assess (e.g., "situate major texts within the contexts"; "articulate literary value"). How will/have these been assessed?
1. Interesting SLO: "Produce a body of polished, original creative work." I agree this an essential outcome for the Creative Writing emphasis; what degree of productivity is expected by graduation?
1. Which SLOs received specific attention during the review period? Please clarify this.
1. The mappings are very thorough and (I hope) useful. Has the program addressed any 'holes' identified? For example, it appears that for the Creative Writing emphasis, 4 of the general SLOs are introduced but not developed or assessed.
2. Good alignment of SLOs with LEAP ELOs. I'd argue that at least a couple of the SLOs also address the "Knowledge of human cultures..." ELO in addition to the skills ELOs.
3. Where is the actual assessment plan? The self-study describes assessments that have been conducted and mentions that one was discussed at the summer 2012 retreat, but a clear and comprehensive assessment plan for assessing all SLOs was not included. (I understand this may still be a work in progress.)
3. It appears the faculty have collaborated on assessment plans and accomplished significant change & improvement.
3. The program has begun doing longitudinal assessment of students across Eng 271 and 400-level courses using the WM rubric--excellent!
4. Several direct measures using writing samples and essays - examples of how curriculum was changed as a result of assessments. Discussed senior exit survey as external data, but survey had extremely small sample size (7). However, the self-study contains detailed discussion of how suggestions and feedback are being taken seriously by the faculty. Also, they are attempting to track alumni as external data.
4. The data described are very good examples of implementing assessment of student learning, both in terms of process (e.g., considering interrater reliability, sampling of papers, etc.) and scope (assess different levels of courses; follow up with discussions of what the data mean and how it can be used). Nice work!
4. Good use of both direct and indirect data.
4. Interesting that on the SOAS, students report a fairly high degree of skill (4.0, 4.38) in developing extended arguments and in analyzing texts. This seems inconsistent with the direct performance data. Has the program discussed this difference?
5. EXCELLENT idea to have the department's Assessment Committee meet periodically with the Curriculum Committee. This helps ensure that the data are shared and increases the likelihood that they'll have an impact.
5. Good examples of how data were used to impact instruction within courses. I strongly encourage the program to find a simple way of tracking/recording specific examples of changes made to assignments, class discussions, etc., and to also look at "pre-post" scores (i.e., before the instructional changes were made vs. after). This type of impact analysis is gold!
6. Good use of faculty retreats, faculty meetings, and Assessment Day to share your assessment work.
6. Have the data been shared with students in the program? With alumni? Consider other groups of stakeholders who might be interested and/or have useful feedback as you move forward and gather more data.

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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
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	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. According to the chart provided, there seems to be a drop in major course enrollment.
1. What are the trends in terms of number of MAJORS enrolled in each emphasis; that is, not number of students enrolled in the courses, but the number of students who have declared an English major, broken down for each emphasis?
 1. Number of degrees granted overall is steady.
 3. The students seem to take significantly more than 4 years to complete their degree program.
 3. Why are the English BS credits high (152 average)?
- 4&5. Many specific examples provided.
4. Diversity is slightly below university average.
6. Concern over ENG 371 in particular.

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

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

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

Comments

1. Seem to be obtaining the best alumni employment data they can.
2. There is no data concerning employment opportunities, job growth, etc.

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

Comments

Unique faculty backgrounds, famous writer in the area, learning opportunities.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty Characteristics**1-2. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.)**

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

3-4. 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

Many recent faculty/staff changes.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement**1. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.**

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

Comments**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

Provided a table showing scholarly works for 2/3rd of the faculty.
This is another strength for the program.

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

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

Comments

Three faculty members pursued external funding.
The one choice for "Not Applicable" is given to recognize that external funding is uncommon in Languages and Literature.

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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

No explanation provided.

Those scoring this area as “Some/Partial Evidence” are doing so to recognize that the department needs a faculty line and new/updated facilities.

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

Comments

Listed key changes needed - computer lab, presentation equipment, and air conditioning in Heide classrooms.

While they addressed this portion of the review adequately, we should note their facility needs.

Inadequate technology is a serious problem that needs to be addressed - especially with the push from administration to incorporate more technology in the classroom.

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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
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	2
No	3

Comments

This was quite thorough.

2. English offers students a vibrant program, with excellent faculty and a varied assortment of courses, majors and minors. The only weakness I see is the program's lack of domestic diversity within its faculty.

2-3. These concerns are well placed here, but I would also like to hear about areas of improvement for the program itself, as well as recommended actions for those improvements.

3. Need facilities (computer lab, presentation equipment) and a new faculty member.

VI. Reviewer Conclusions**1. Strengths of the Program**

- Thorough analysis of its position for this review period.
- Faculty, assessment, research and creative activity.
- Curriculum - 4 emphasis areas seem to be responding to need, attracting and retaining students.
- Assessment - many direct assessment initiatives and examples of curriculum changes based on the data.
- Faculty committees and groups seem to efficiently work together under whatever formation meets a particular need.
- There has been a lot of improvement and work on assessment since the last review. The PWP has very clear, well-organized goals and plans.
- The program has made excellent progress in its assessment activities, from little meaningful work just a few years ago to clearly articulated SLOs, collecting and making use of data on student learning, and establishing a department environment that is positive toward assessing student learning. This has required a lot of hard work.
- The program is starting to conduct longitudinal analyses of students' development across time.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

Some areas were only addressed with charts. Discuss the data the charts provide.

Develop a plan for meeting the goals set during this review period. Continue to develop and implement a full assessment plan.

Diversity: courses, faculty and students

3. Other comments/questions

Need a faculty member to support the new emphasis and a computer lab!

4. Recommended Actions

1. Work with the dean to address faculty and facilities needs.
2. Develop and implement a plan to diversify the program, both the faculty (as lines become available) and curriculum options, specifically to include more domestic diversity.
3. Continue the good progress on assessment:
 - Articulate a full assessment plan, including which SLOs will be assessed in which years, and which will receive more in-depth analysis.
 - Continue to track development of student skills over time (i.e., longitudinal analyses). This is an area of strength for the program.
 - Continue to develop assessment tools to assess each SLO.
 - Develop ways to track use of assessment data for program improvement (both in curricular changes and in pedagogical changes within courses).

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.	

***The program's next full self-study will be due October 1, 2020 to the Dean of Letters & Sciences and November 1, 2020 to the chair of Audit & Review Committee.**