

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Information Technology Majors and Minors, 2017-2018**

Date: 3/14/2018

Time: 10:00-11:00 A.M.

Place: HH 4303

Attended:

Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean John Chenoweth; Department Chair David Munro; Faculty and Staff in the Information Technology program Roger Yin, Lilly Berhane, Christina Outlay, Andrew Ciganek, Onochie Fan-Osuala, Audit & Review Team Chair Hephzibah Kumpaty; Audit & Review team members S.A. Welch, Jiazhen Zhou, Ahmad Karim, Joan Littlefield Cook.

1) Call to order:

Dr. Kumpaty called the meeting to order at 10:05 A.M.

2) Introductions:

Dr. Kumpaty asked the members in attendance to introduce themselves and their affiliation.

3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments:

Dr. Kumpaty summarized the program's strengths that were listed by the review team. This is an attractive major to students and is a growing field with a high market demand. The program is an asset to both the college and the university as it attracts enrollments and meets workforce needs. The faculty are commended for their willingness to align the curriculum with trends in technology in order to offer updated and expanded curriculum to students. Other highlights include dedicated faculty who are active in scholarship and engagement, strong enrollments, attractive job placements, continuing education and business outreach to the community, commitment to improve areas of assessment, active learning strategies in upper level courses, partnering with external organizations, and involvement in campus diversity programs to expand student and faculty.

After the brief opening comments, Kumpaty invited the department Chair and others on the floor to provide any comments they may have and discuss accomplishments during the review period (2012-2016). Department Chair David Munro presented a brief overview of the department activities. He reiterated that the faculty are very engaged and dedicated. With regard to progress on assessment activities, concerns included how much to do, what needs to be focused on and how to balance all these activities with teaching and other obligations going forward. Chair Munro thanked the A&R committee for the self-study review and said the review was as expected and nothing was surprising. There was a good discussion on addressing student/faculty diversity in the department. Underrepresentation of female and minority students remains a national issue in the IT fields; and, the department has targeted efforts to closing the gap by running "Cyber-girls (technology) camps" over several years. The impact of these camps has been positive in terms of attracting students to the rare IT fields. The camps invite middle-high school female students to UW-Whitewater and engage them in activities to promote interest in IT fields. Dr. Outlay has been leading these efforts in the department and she has been very involved in campus diversity efforts to advance underrepresented students success. Provost Elrod commended the department's efforts and offered support to faculty who may wish to attend AACU STEM conferences or other such events that focus on STEM recruitment and retention efforts.

4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

a) *Diversification of the student body: Strategies and implementation plans for recruiting more female and minority students.*

Please see the above paragraph for initial discussion. The discussion followed on financial support for underrepresented minorities in recruitment/retention efforts. Dean Chenoweth commented that other campuses in the UW system such as UW-Madison, UW-Milwaukee and UW-Waukesha have been proactive in providing "free-ride" (i.e., full) scholarships to URM students and therefore it is becoming more difficult to recruit URM

students to Whitewater. The department is encouraged to figure out how to get more scholarships by working with the Provost, writing NSF grants, etc. There is interest from employers to hire this population/women but a follow-up with employers has not occurred. The Dean noted that one of the program's big strengths has been its focus on women and minorities. He mentioned that this program's enrollments of women and minorities are highest in the college with respect to SCH/FTE. Provost Elrod encouraged the department to set a specific goal (i.e., a specific number) and seek assistance from industry/advisors to meet the goal. Associate Dean Ahmed Karim encouraged the department to continue their outreach with Cyber-girls camps as this work plays a critical role in AACSB accreditation.

b) *Program assessment and dissemination:*

- *Articulate how the program is making use of data on student learning, and how it is systematically tracking data use in the decision-making process for curricular improvement and staffing needs. As the program collects and analyzes more direct data on student performance, these should play a bigger role in curricular discussions. Discuss the role of the department assessment committee to fully implement assessment plans in the future.*
- *The self-study says assessment data are primarily shared at the department and advisory board meetings. Consider sharing the data with students and other stakeholders.*

Kumpaty noted the department's progress on assessment work and invited Dr. Joan Cook to elaborate on the review team's evaluation with assessment. Joan Cook asked the department to review how the program is making use of data on student learning, and whether it is systematically tracking and using data in the decision-making processes for curricular improvement and staffing needs. Chair Munro noted that the current practice has been to share at the department level and advisory board meetings and not with students and others. The program is encouraged to collect and analyze data on student performances and have the department's new assessment committee to fully-implement assessment plans in the future.

c) *Mission and goal statement update:*

- *The program's mission statement is concise and provides the scope and nature of the program. Given the program's unique place in the market, a periodic review/revision of mission statement, goal setting is recommended.*

There was some discussion on this topic. The program is encouraged to do a periodic review/ revision of mission statement considering its unique place in the market.

d) *Resources and curriculum: Do you have specific staffing and other classroom, lab needs? In what areas do you anticipate growth and how can the campus help?*

There was a discussion on the department's specific staffing and other classroom, lab needs and how the campus could assist in meeting its needs. It was noted that the college has done an excellent job of supporting the program. Chair Munro mentioned the department is resource-challenged at times and could benefit from having additional staff given the curricular changes and additions to the program. Chair Munro inquired if a campus resource is available to send a team to attend a conference, explore options and do a project.

5) **Recommended Actions:**

The evaluation report lists 2 recommended actions related to program assessment and diversity (see page 14, point #1, a-e, and #2).

6) **Recommended Result:** Continuation with minor concerns

- Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
- Program's next full self-study is due to the Dean of the College of Business and Economics by October 1, 2021 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2021.

7) **Adjourn:** The meeting was adjourned at 10:59 A.M.

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2017-2018
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 2/5/2018

Short Self Study (SS*) _____

Program Information TechnologyMajor X Minor X

Evaluations submitted by: Hephzibah Kumpaty (review team chair), S.A. Welch, Jiazhen Zhou, Ahmad Karim, Joan Littlefield Cook

Review meeting attended by: Hephzibah Kumpaty, Jiazhen Zhou, Ahmad Karim, Joan Littlefield Cook

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

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

Comments

1. Table format for explaining how the program contributes to UWW Mission, etc. is helpful.

1. The answer to Recommendation 2: "Continue strategies for recruiting more female students and implement strategies for recruiting more minority students" could be improved. The answer sounds like the main strategies are through the courses taught by women and minority faculty. Likely the other faculty can also contribute to this area.

1. The program's contributions to fulfilling UW-Whitewater's core values and mission are well articulated. The evidence includes updated curriculum, continuing education and business outreach to the community,

active learning strategies in upper level courses, partnering with external organizations and involvement in campus diversity programs to expand diverse student and faculty in the department.

- 2 I like their outreach program, especially in their efforts to show young women the value of learning about technology.
3. The program has long been in support of advancing the campus IE efforts. This has been a focus since their last review to diversify student/faculty body. It appears that the department has made significant progress in diversifying the faculty. Are the efforts working in terms of diversifying student body? Are you tracking URM enrollment? You may want to compare your numbers with the national data for recruitment of women and minorities in IT fields.
4. Some progress has been made in assessment but more is needed. Due to program restructuring work done on a prior assessment could no longer be relevant. The faculty and the advisory board spent dedicated time and effort to revisit and revise the SLOs and assessment plans to align with the new curriculum. The program is working on creating a permanent assessment committee in the department.

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

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

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

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

5. The program, faculty/staff, and/or students have earned recognition or awards.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
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	3
---------------------	---

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

Comments

1. The program's mission statement is concise and reflects the scope and nature of the program. However, the "goals" part in mission statement looks somewhat general and may need a revision especially in the context of recent programmatic changes adding new emphases and a minor. Considering the program's unique place, with constant demand to offer relevant curriculum aligning with changes in technology, a periodic review/revision of mission statement is recommended.
- 2 I just completed the computer science review and a bit confused as to how IT program's goals differ from the computer science program goals. Is there a way that collaboration can occur between these 2 programs, especially in their dual goal of cyber security? * When I read further in the report, I am surmising that IT is more "global" than computer science. However, with the encouragement to work collaboratively, I still wonder if there is a way to work with the computer science program?
3. What role do data on student learning play in the process for setting goals? To what extent are data discussed and considered?
3. The program has six concrete SLOs which are mapped across the curriculum and measured annually at least once. The goal setting process includes faculty review at the end of each academic year as well as seeking input from alumni, advisory board and employers. Are there specific SLOs developed and assessed for any of the emphasis within the IT major? Something to think about in the next review cycle.
4. It was unclear to me, beyond "good education"--which I think is every department's goal--what their "vision" is
5. Are there any program-level awards and recognitions available in this field? Were there any student or individual faculty awards or recognition?

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

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

Comments

- The program has a well-articulated, efficient, and market driven curriculum which includes four areas of specialty within the program. The 4 emphases offer students a good range of options in the field providing plenty of learning opportunities for students and success in the job market. The four-year plans in "Appendix A" look good.
- In part 3, one sentence is not clear: "It was clear also clear that....".
- Program does not offer dual-listed courses.
- All I saw was general statements alluding to consistent with student assessment/interest vs. specific assessment data that was used to make these rather significant changes. I did see some general statements about input from the advisory board. However, given the extent of their changes, I would encourage them to use more specific, tangible assessment data
- The self-study mentions that curricular revisions and programmatic changes made in the recent past have not entirely been tied to quantitative data. Qualitative data were used in making curricular revisions which is good. As the program collects and analyzes more direct data on student performance, these should play a bigger role in curricular discussions.
- A number of valuable co-curricular opportunities are available for students. The AITP student organization's work sounds like a great opportunity for students and industry professionals to connect. The students' participation in this work is also impressive.
- Good opportunities are available for students.
- To what extent are students involved in undergraduate research? Are faculty encouraged to work with students in this way?
- Good system for evaluating online courses is in place.

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

Comments

1. To what extent does the program review and consider data from the BBA assessments in their discussions of student skills, curriculum, etc.?
1. For program SLO #4, consider revising to remove reference to "the ability to." For example, this could simply be stated as "Students will effectively collaborate and engage in teamwork to accomplish tasks." Not a big deal, but we can't really assess whether students have the ability to do something, only whether they do it.
1. For program SLOs 2,3,4, and 5: Where are these introduced in the curriculum? In the pre-program BBA courses?
1. The data presented in Appendix D shows a matrix, mapping college specific traits in both lower and upper level business courses, measuring the traits through course embedded assessments. It appears like the program has a strategic process to assess the SLOs and the self-study shows 3 out of 6 traits were assessed. It is also mentioned that trait #1 is assessed by the college. Does the plan include finishing with the remaining SLOs in the next year or so?
2. The table showing SLOs alignment (both BBA and IT major) with LEAP ELO's is missing mapping critical thinking and foundations and skills for life-long learning.
2. Please explain the alignment of the program SLOs with LEAP a bit. It seems that a few could fit in a couple places. The current alignment is fine, I'm just curious as to the basis for the alignment decisions.
3. The general outline of the assessment plan is fine, but more details are needed. For example, have specific assignments been identified/developed that clearly assess each SLO? Have rubrics that clearly evaluate each SLO (independently of the others) been developed? What's the process for determining which SLOs will be highlighted in a given year?
3. Good that the program has established a standing assessment committee. This is an important and useful step.
3. Sounds like the program is preparing to assess their SLOs but haven't really implemented the plan to any significant extent at this point.

3. As they noted in their answer: " and is assessed already as part of the CoBE assurance of learning process." I found that this information shared was more of a general nature vs. specific.
4. Good use of the college data and SOAS data. What ETS subtest areas were included?
4. The program noted that there were poorer scores in the online course than F2F but this was attributed to the performance of non-majors.
-
4. The program collected assessment data through a variety of external and internal measures, both qualitative and quantitative, to track SLO achievement. The data presented in Appendix B4, ETS data 2012, depicts IT majors' percentiles relative to other schools. I do not think the information presented in the table looks complete as the national norms are missing. It is also not clear how this data is evaluated to track student learning and curricular revisions.
4. The SOAS data looks good! The CoBE AOL capstone measures data, measured over 14-15 and 15-16 shown in Appendix B4, is impressive as well. Overall, the IT majors scored higher compared to others in the college (Fall 2011-Spring 2016).
4. IT traits #s 3 and 4 were assessed in "ITSCM 385" over two semesters (fall 2015 and spring 2016). Do you have data available from ITSCM 314, 320, 420 and 421 courses? Table in Appendix D shows assessments were done in these courses as well.
-
5. As they noted in their answer: "The assessment information is reviewed to identify any unexpected results or trends that need addressing. When are the assessment data reviewed, by whom, and how often? At this point, it sounds like the data on student learning are adding very little to the program's discussions. What kind of assessments are needed to make a useful contribution to the (largely anecdotal?) information that's currently driving the process of program improvement?"
6. It sounds like there are useful discussions with the advisory board but that little/no data on student learning are shared. Little/no use of/sharing of data with any other groups (e.g., students). Are the data shared with the college?
6. I think it is good that they keep the lines of communication open with their advisory board.

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

4. Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students.

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

5. [MAJORS ONLY] Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3

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

Comments

- The enrollments look steady, strong and sustainable. This is an attractive major and based on market projections the program will continue to stay in high demand. You should consider tracking graduates in the exit surveys for Race/Ethnicity populations.
- Their enrollment numbers definitely show steady growth. It was somewhat surprising that with 223 majors only 45 graduated. Are your students who transferred into the IT major and thus need more classes and time to earn the degree?
- The chart for this answer did not really indicate the information requested.
- As they note, the program lags behind university averages in female and URM enrollment (except "Other URM"--please explain who is in this category if possible). They are taking steps to address female enrollment in particular. It will be good if the nationwide data can be provided for comparison.
- 6 & 7. As noted in their responses: "overall, the program is neither oversubscribed or undersubscribed. By individual emphasis, there are some imbalances. "It would help both the A & R and I believe the department if there was tangible, verifiable evidence that addressed this more clearly. As it is, there does not seem to be much to guide future decisions by the department.
- Please clarify the response. I can't tell if the program is saying they need resources or if things are okay.
- Somewhere, I'd like to know what the program would like in terms of enrollment. Do they want to continue growing? In what areas? What do they need to achieve whatever their 'vision for the future' is?

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

Comments

1 & 2. Strong placement rates, projected strong demand for graduates.

1. You cannot do much better than 100%! What process is used in systematic tracking of graduates?

2. As noted in their responses: "We also have received feedback from students that IT minor is why they got a job." Were they able to determine what about the minor helped the graduates find employment? And, is only a minor necessary? So, what is the added benefit of the major that has led to employment?

3. Could use more detail on how effective these methods are for tracking grads, but this level of tracking is consistent with other departments across campus.

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

1. The program along with its four different tracks is an attractive major and has a high demand in the job market.

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

3-4. They definitely seem to have a clear understanding of the departmental needs in terms of faculty.

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

1-2. 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

1-2. The faculty have lead sessions to enhance teaching. Do they also attend events, training, etc. to enhance their skills?

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

1-2. 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

1-2. Faculty show strong research productivity.

1-2. It is impressive that faculty at all levels (professor, assistant professor, and academic staff) participate in scholarly activities

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding

1-2. 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

None

IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service

1-2. 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

None

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

Comments

The self-study says this is adequate, but more detail would be helpful.

1. Any specifics about what type of student help, service, and supplies are available to the department?

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

I'm not sure what to conclude here. I believe the self-study is saying there are developing facility needs? Please articulate this more clearly so the college and university can get a better sense of what the needs are (or are anticipated).

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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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

Comments

1. Part 3, "recommendations for action and improvement" did not list the possible development goals (such as new program development, plan for enhancing diversity) of the program.

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

1. Good curricular options for students. They have an active and dedicated faculty, strong research and excellent engagement.
2. Have worked hard to address the needs of students and industry. Have developed new curriculum and extra-curricular activities correspondingly.
3. The enrollments look steady, strong and sustainable. This is an attractive major and based on market projections the program will continue to stay in high demand.
4. Attractive outreach program, especially in their efforts to show young women the value of learning about technology.
4. The learning goals are measured annually through internal and external measures, on-line and exit surveys and other means of tracking students' progress.
5. Assessment results are reviewed at the department meetings and with advisory board members. The program has six concrete SLOs which are mapped across the curriculum and measured annually.
6. The goal setting process includes faculty review at the end of each academic year as well as seeking input from alumni, advisory board and employers
7. A number of valuable co-curricular opportunities are available for students. The AITP student organization's work looks impressive and an excellent opportunity to connect students with industry professionals.
8. They are aware of where they need to focus for recruitment. They seem to have done considerable market analysis to know where to focus the major

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

1. Have begun to address assessment of student learning more systematically but there is still much to be done in this area.
2. There are some areas for improvement which might have been addressed by the department, but were not clear in this report:
 - i. Specific data for assessment of student learning. They made generalized statements when tangible, verifiable data might be more useful
 - ii. Some of the data requested was not addressed (credits toward graduation, etc..).
2. Continue diversity efforts to recruit more under represented students in the major.
3. Implement strategies to track remaining SLOs in the next year or so and continue assessments activities in other ITSCM courses.
4. Continue efforts to improve advising both for IT majors and students in different tracks.
5. Share assessment data with appropriate internal and external constituencies for program growth and improvement.

3. Other comments/questions: N/A

4. Recommended Actions

1. Assessment:
 - a. Complete the development of and fully implement the assessment plan.
 - b. Develop and measure specific SLOs for each track in IT emphasis.
 - c. Identify/develop embedded assignments and scoring rubrics to assess program SLOs.
 - d. Clearly articulate how the program is making use of data on student learning, and systematically track data use in making decisions about courses and curriculum.
 - e. Systematically share the data with stakeholders, including students.
2. Continue efforts to diversify the program. Compare the program's demographic data related to gender and ethnic diversity with nationwide data for IT programs.

5. Recommended Result

Continuation without qualification	
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required at the discretion of the A&R Review Team.	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.	
Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	

* No progress report is required.

Program's next full self-study is due to the Dean of the College of Business and Economics by October 1, 2021 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2021.