

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Geography/Geology Minor, 2014-2015**

Date: December 7, 2015

Time: 2:00pm-3:00pm

Place: Upham Hall 0322

Attendance: Interim Provost John Stone; Associate Provost Greg Cook; Dean David Travis; Associate Dean Frank Goza; Department Chair Peter Jacobs; faculty and staff in the Geography/Geology program Margo Kleinfeld, Jeff Olson, Dale Splinter; Audit & Review Chair Dennis Kopf; Audit & Review team member Joan Cook

- 1) Call to order and introductions
- 2) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
The A&R committee and administrators complimented the department for their outstanding progress and program offerings.

a) *Program goal selection and follow up. How does the department chose their goals and evaluate whether or not they are achieved? What barriers exist that keep you from achieving some of your goals?*

The audit and review committee noted that some department goals seemed to not get accomplished. The department indicated that annual and long-term goals are discussed two to three times per year at faculty meetings. Dr. Jacobs remarked that it is important that all faculty members in his department have a voice; everyone can articulate a goal. The department tries to reach a consensus on what goals are focused on as either short or long-term goals. The entire department must approve the list of goals. In their new process of vetting possible goals they are attempting to better align with the university strategic plan. Some goals are data-driven but a lot are anecdotal or a reaction to changing situations such as a faculty retirement. It was also noted that whoever articulates the goal tends to be the person responsible for working to meet the goal. As a result some goals are left to individual initiative instead of groups or committees to accomplish.

With respect to why there is little progress on some goals, department members remarked that the number one barrier is that everyone is extremely busy. Aside from this barrier, some of their goals are simply difficult to achieve (e.g., specific workplace experience can be very difficult for students to achieve). However, Dr. Jacobs noted that getting a lab (a recent development) should help the department achieve some of their important goals. Of course, the current university budget situation was mentioned as a current and likely future barrier that will be difficult to overcome.

Interim Provost Stone asked about the department's 3-5 year plans for the GIS program. The department noted that it has a plan but that more strategic decision making could be incorporated to improve the goal attainment process and to make sure that the right goals are chosen.

b) *Possible assessment strategies such as longitudinal data collection or the use of a portfolio-based assessment approach.*

Next, the A&R committee asked for details about their assessment activities. The department reports that data are being used effectively to improve assessment methods. For example, Dr. Splinter noted that the writing assessment was in a process of refinement. Assessment efforts of the department will be to continue to improve writing assignments and student understanding of department's writing rubric. With respect to possible faculty development or course improvements based on assessment data, the department expressed the need to be more confident in their data before implementing changes based on it (i.e., a better baseline and data across a greater number of students).

c) *Strategies to increase diversity in faculty, staff and students.*

It was noted that improvements have been made on gender equality and representation, and that the number of minorities (students) in the program as a percentage has skyrocketed in the past year. (not reflected in our current data) Systematic efforts in the department are underway to address diversity. The department is trying a strategy of personal connection with underrepresented minorities and other diverse students. They believe this has been key in improvements over the past year. As a result the department would like to continue to advocate a one-on-one method of recruiting.

d) *Resources needed for continued success and improvement of the department.*

Dr. Jacobs and other department members stated that students in their classes are missing valuable learning experiences to get out in the field for hands-on learning. The department is asking for better transportation resources. However transportation costs have increased dramatically (e.g., costs to rent a van, liabilities, etc.). There was discussion of ways to improve this situation. Administrators, Dr. G. Cook and Dr. Stone took notes during this part of the discussion and promised to look into further solutions to these problems.

The department noted that their physical space is sufficient and that the GIS labs are the nicest in the UW System. It was also noted that as the environmental science enrollment grows and the overall program curriculum expands, more resources may be needed.

Finally, Dr. Stone asked the department "Where is GIS going in 3-5 year time frame?" The department noted that it does indeed have a plan, but that perhaps more strategic decision making could be incorporated to improve the goal attainment process and to make sure that the right goals are chosen.

4) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 2 recommended actions related to program assessment and recruitment and retention of students and faculty (see page 13, point 4).

5) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation without qualification*

- Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
- Because the recommended result of this review is to continue without qualification, the program's next full self-study will be a "short" one focused on the recommended actions from the current report. This short self-study is due October 1, 2020 to the Dean of Letters & Sciences and November 1, 2020 to the chair of Audit & Review Committee.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:17 PM.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Dr. Dennis A Kopf, Faculty Chair of the Geology/Geography Audit and Review Committee.

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

Date of Evaluation 11/23/2015 Short Self Study (SS*) NO
 Program Geography/Geology Major Yes Minor Yes

Evaluations submitted by: Dennis Kopf (review team chair), Joan Cook, Tony Gulig, Rashiqa Kamal, Kerry Katovich

Review meeting attended by: Dennis Kopf (review team chair), Joan Cook, Frank Goza, Rashiqa Kamal, Kerry Katovich

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

Comments

1. Nicely Done.
2. Good contributions to GenEd. Emphasis on critical thinking and cultural diversity contributes to achievement of both GenEd SLOs and overall campus SLOs.

3. Geology for Native American women sounds very interesting.
3. Addition of a female STEM mentor (Dr. Duchesne) is good; department continues to work toward greater diversity in staffing.
4. Good response to previous A&R recommendations. In particular, the program has done a great deal of work on their system for assessing student learning.

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

Comments

1. Mission statement is thorough and concise, and aligns nicely with LEAP. I especially like the 3rd point (encouraging a sense of social responsibility).
2. Shouldn't the medium term goals in 2012-13 become short-term goals in 2014-15? Medium term goal like "°Create new courses, or redesign existing courses to more thoroughly address today's broader societal issues revolving around geoscience and environmental science-related topics, including, where appropriate, integrating aspects of civic engagement." needs to be re-evaluated. There has been no progress on this for the past few years. It should be revisited to identify what the barriers are in fulfilling this goal. The same is true for "°Work towards increasing the number of majors by a sustained amount."
3. Goals toward which no progress has been made need to be re-assessed.
5. Congrats on the Assessment Day award!
- 5 Assessment Day award
- 6 No program level accreditation exists.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Comments

1. A wide variety of different course types and opportunities are offered, out in the field, lab, computer, lecture, etc.
2. Dual listed course is scheduled to go away.
2. Essentially, the program doesn't offer dual-listed courses.
3. As the assessment plan moves forward and more data are available, please keep track of how the data impact the program. Include consideration of curricular changes, but also changes in assignments, discussions within courses, etc.
4. A variety of excellent opportunities are offered to students.
4. Faculty are heavily involved in UG research. This provides excellent training and skill development for students.
5. All online course instructors have received training in the LTC workshop.
5. As the course continues, the course should ideally have a continuous improvement process. (2 reviewers recommended this) The course seems to be developed using best practices for online learning. Well-done. The innovative nature of offering a lab science online is commended.

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

Comments

- 2. Good alignment with LEAP ELOs.
- 3. The program has a good assessment plan and has begun implementing it. They have developed rubrics and a content exam, used them, and refined them. There is still much work to be done, however, in figuring out assessments and/or rubrics for the remaining SLOs.
- 3. Have you started work on SLOs 3&4 yet (Integrate...)? This skill can be challenging to assess.
- 3. In Geography minor and Geography Ed minor SLOs, one is to "...appreciate that ...". Any thoughts yet on how to assess this? This might be a good item to ask alumni about, if/when you plan to assess them. "Appreciation" of the field might take a few years of experience to develop.
- 3. Interesting implementation of visual communication assessment. Perhaps other visually-oriented disciplines on campus could benefit from sharing your rubric and the process you used to develop it.
- 3. Do you plan to continue to develop the content, writing, and visual communication assessments over the next couple years, or are you ready to move to developing assessments of the next set of SLOs?
- 3. Do the same set of students take the pre- and post-test? Do all students participating in the pre-/post-test take the same courses?
- 3 Pre/post test data collection efforts are problematic. Results should be tied to individual students to provide meaningful data. The fact that the data was not tied to the individual students (correct me if I am wrong) means that the improvement statistics provide little meaning. The same problem applies to your writing assessment. It should be possible with effort to sample individual student improvement in the future. However, the fact that you collect the data and can analyze trends from year to year is sufficient as it will allow you to recognize programmatic changes or improvements. If you only have about 30 graduates/year, it may make sense to develop a portfolio method of evaluation to measure writing improvement. You don't necessarily have to analyze all 30 every year, but take a sample for analysis.
- 4. The Assessment Summary document is very interesting and helpful in explaining the work the program is doing on assessing content, writing, and visual communication, as well as student self-reflections on their learning.
- 4. There are no data yet for the minors, but this is okay. The emphasis has been on developing SLOs for all programs, and on collecting data for some of the overall department core learning outcomes.
- 4. Good work in this area. In the future, start to work on ways to efficiently collect data on the minors, using the tools you've developed for the overall department SLOs, and working on a reasonable rotation schedule, embedding assessments of the minors within assessments of the core learning outcomes as much as possible to make the system less burdensome and sustainable.
- 4. Good analysis & consideration of SOAS results, despite the issues with comparing across different

forms of this survey. Hopefully, this will become easier as the new format continues to be implemented.

4. Program uses a variety of assessment tools - pre and post-test, writing assessment, employer surveys, senior exit surveys.
5. Interesting that one of the results thus far is that students must be encouraged to take the portfolio process more seriously. I suspect this is something many programs encounter. Can students use their portfolio artifacts in job applications & interviews?
5. Will the assessment committee remain as a standing committee in the department? Is there an annual department meeting devoted to discussion of assessment results, processes, goals?
5. No major changes have been made in the curriculum based on assessment but the program recognizes that. Hopefully, they will utilize assessment data better in the future when the process is more streamlined.
5. The assessment data are too new to show how curricular changes were made. As time goes on I expect that this will change.
6. Is there a department Advisory Board? You might consider sharing results with the board to get feedback about the assessment tools, skills to focus on, etc.
6. Program should share assessment data with external constituencies like advisory board members, if appropriate.
6. Well-done, but the obvious improvement here would be to develop an external review board for your majors, so that you can share a summary of your outcomes with them and ask for feedback on how students are performing after graduation.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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

- 1-2. Keep in mind the service provided by the dept./program to other programs. Don't be overly bothered by the apparent desire to count majors as a measure of success. Well-rounded, liberally-based education models need a breadth of methodological approaches/methods of inquiry, regardless of numbers of enrolled majors.
2. Efforts should be made to try to increase enrollment. It is one of the medium-term goals of the program but no progress has been made on it.
3. Credits to degree have fallen--good.
- 4-5 Specific strategies need to be articulated in the future. Also, I strongly recommend documenting efforts to not only recruit minorities and females, but also to create an inclusive atmosphere for minorities in your department. That being said, the entire campus seems to have issues with minority recruitment and retention.
- 4-5. Heavily white male student population. Is recruiting diverse students (and faculty) something the department is interested in emphasizing (ethnic diversity as well as more females)?
- 7 Good enough.

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

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

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

Comments

- 2 Graduate programs are a strong option for your students, which is a strong indication of the quality of your program.
- 3 LinkedIn will be a strong tool to help you continue this endeavor in a future. Well-done.

- 3. Limited tracking of graduates.
- 3. How can campus offices help with tracking graduates? This is difficult but important to do.

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

Impressed with the GIS opportunities for students.

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

Strong argument as to why positions are needed, clear argument made as to how they fit into the program.

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

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

Comments

- 1. Faculty are active as mentors for UG research
- 1. Faculty have made good contributions to campus GenEd program, to assessment of student learning (e.g., development of the UWW Critical Thinking rubric)

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

1. Faculty are active researchers with numerous professional presentations & publications

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding

1. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.

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

Comments

1. For the few faculty who aren't receiving funding, are external funding opportunities not available in their fields or are these faculty not actively pursuing these opportunities?

1. What would help increase funding success? Would "seed grants" or something similar be helpful?

1. The self-study notes they'd like to see more funded grants, but it should be noted that the faculty have received numerous grants.

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

1. Faculty & staff are active contributors to service in their profession and on campus

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

1. Program could use more support for hiring student help for research activities.

1. Students should have better access to field activities, especially in this major. Department has asked

for more student help but is still short in this area.

1. Need additional staff to maintain current programs.

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

Comments

1. Resources seem adequate for now, but I encourage the program to work with the Dean to plan ahead for future needs as much as possible.

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	0
No	3

Comments

This continues to be a strong department for the University of Wisconsin - Whitewater with meaningful contributions to the mission of the university at all levels.

I love that the program says "the geography degree is the ultimate liberal education..."--indicates an understanding and appreciation of what LEAP means for our campus.

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

Provide a wide diversity of courses and areas of research, from natural sciences to social sciences.

Provide unique courses and opportunities for our students.

Training in valuable skill sets, such as GIS training. Coverage of many important courses for the UWW, importance to our Gen ED line up.

Varied course offerings, GIS Center, Learning opportunities for students beyond classroom instruction

Lots of opportunities for students, offering HIPs for them –

Dedicated & active faculty

Good progress on assessment of student learning

Students are getting experience and training on important equipment that gives them some relevant skills that will help them in their first job experience.

Your productive research portfolio is a great strength of the department.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

Continued evaluation of the Quantitative Techniques emphasis, is this really strong enough to be an independent track or should it be revised or incorporated into some other format?

Development of a travel studies trip with a strong Geology/Geography focus.

Continue search for suitable space to expand lectures, discussions.

Continue to investigate ways to secure vans needed for field related courses.

Student enrollment, hiring and retention of diverse faculty/staff.

Assessment methods could use improvement, especially in the pre/post-test and sampling issues. Low number of majors means that a portfolio method for every student including entering of individual test scores and writing examples from the beginning and end of the program would make assessment much easier. In the future, look to assessing other areas of LEAP such as critical thinking.

You have a great start on assessment. Continue the good work!

3. Other comments/questions

I appreciate the hard work that went into all the progress reports, and into developing and implementing the assessment plan.

The self-study is a thoughtful and well-written reflection on the program's current state and future needs.

4. Recommended Actions

1. Continue to develop and implement the assessment plan.
 - a. Continue to develop assessment tools for rest of SLOs such as critical thinking.
 - b. For the pre and post test for writing ability, continue doing this but maintain student identifiers so that the students can be paired with the pre-post test. (longitudinal study)
 - c. Document how the results for your assessment study are used in the curriculum or to improve the program.
2. Work with on-campus resources to continue to improve efforts for recruitment and retention of underrepresented minority students and faculty, including the recruitment of more female students.

5. Recommended Result*

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	
Continuation without qualification	X
Continuation with minor concerns	
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.	

*** Because the recommended result of this review is to continue without qualification, the program's next full self-study will be a "short" one focused on the recommended actions from the current report. This short self-study is due in October 2020.**