

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Media Arts & Game Development Majors and Minors, 2016-2017**

Date: Thursday May 4, 2017

Time: 10:15-11:15 a.m.

Place: UC 68

In Attendance: Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean Bob Mertens; Dean David Travis; Department Chair Kathy Brady; Program Coordinator Jeff Herriott; MAGD program faculty and staff: Athula Gunawardena, Fred Leighton, and Gautam Wadhwa; Audit & Review Team Chair Corey Davis; Audit & Review team members Barbara Bren, Joan Cook, Deborah Wilk

- 1) Call to order: The meeting was called to order at 10:18 a.m.
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments.
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) Discussion of Art & Design Department's contributions to MAGD.
 - b) Continued development and implementation of the assessment plan.
 - c) Addressing faculty and student diversity.
 - d) Addressing resource needs within the College of Arts & Communication (e.g., space issues, S&E budget).
- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists four recommended actions (see page 13) related to diversity, mission statement, program assessment and resources.

The recommended actions were considered in the context of the following discussion:

Herriott began by mentioning that Computer Science faculty such as Zach Oster frequently give freely their own time to the MAGD program. Dean Travis echoed Herriott's comments, recognizing all College of Letters and Science faculty for their contributions to the MAGD program and thanking Herriott for his recognition. Herriott noted that joint appointments across departments and/or colleges might help faculty make more frequent contributions to MAGD. Provost Elrod suggested the university needs to rethink infrastructure issues with interdisciplinary programs, including a consideration of how departments or interdisciplinary clusters are organized. Such ideas might include "hubs" with effectively organized faculty offices and shared ADA support, etc. Elrod said the new Academic Plan might allow for such ideas.

Discussion then turned to intra college cooperation toward the MAGD program. Herriott said they need the Department of Art and Design to do certain things to advance accreditation efforts. Wilk and Herriott acknowledged that NASAD is also a barrier to offering some art classes (e.g., animation) and that Art and Design staffing issues are also a limitation. AVC Cook suggested that the College of Arts and Communication needs to create a dedicated budget specifically for MAGD. Herriott said that he wants to make sure people who contribute to MAGD get compensated for and get credit for what they do, while also agreeing that the university needs to figure out what the organization of MAGD will look like in the long term.

Joan Cook asked Herriott to discuss some of the progress MAGD made at the Assessment Institute. Herriott replied that the program tends to focus on holistic and qualitative assessments. AVC Cook said he would like to see more of the evidence decisions are based on, such as what student learning outcomes provide evidence for curricular decisions, noting that evidence could certainly be qualitative or even commentary, as long as rationale was provided. Wilk commented in her capacity as College of Arts and Communication Assessment Coordinator

that the MAGD program is most responsive and nimble in the College at using assessment data to make the program better. Gunawardena noted that the opportunity to enroll in the MAGD minor is very appealing when recruiting Computer Science majors.

When asked about the MAGD program mission statement, Herriott said the program was still working on revising the mission statement, noting that they have a draft but are working to revise the curriculum before finalizing the mission statement.

- 6) **Recommended Result:** The final recommended result was *Continuation with minor concerns*. No progress reports are required. Both Joan Cook and AVC Greg Cook commented that MAGD did a good job of addressing all of the recommended actions in their previous progress report.
 - **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
 - **The program's next full self-study is due to the Dean of the College of Arts & Communication by October 1, 2021 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2021.**
- 7) Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies

Undergraduate Programs, 2016-2017
Majors/Minors and Standalone MinorsDate of Evaluation February 8, 2017 Short Self Study (SS*) Program Media Arts & Game Development Major X Minor X**Evaluations submitted by:** Corey Davis, Hephzibah Kumpaty, Barbara Bren and Joan Cook**Review meeting attended by:** Corey Davis, Hephzibah Kumpaty, Barbara Bren and Joan 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	4
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	0
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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

- I.A.1. The program's contribution to UWW core values, mission and strategic plan are well articulated with appropriate reference to the mission and strategic plan statement.
- I.A.2. My rating of "not applicable" is due to the fact that the program alone doesn't offer GENED designated courses with the exception of ARTSTUDIO 213, COMM/MUSC 346 (GA) and COMPSCI 174 (GM) which are part of the MAGD curriculum but are offered by other departments. Since this is an interdisciplinary major connecting communication, Art Studio/Graphics and Computer Science, I don't see a need for this major to fulfill this obligation and therefore should be N/A.
- I.A.2. Strong connections to other campus programs.

- I.A.3. Diversity and response to Advisory Board.
- I.A.3. The program is facing challenges advancing the campus IE efforts. This has been a focus since its last review in terms of attracting women and students of opportunity to the major, nevertheless, the response in self-study shows very little progress.
- I.A.4. The self-study has been responsive and addressed some of the recommendations from the previous A&R progress report (2014). Plans are underway to meet those recommendations yet to be addressed. The mission statement is still in works. It seems that the program would prefer to have curricular issues aligned in order to set the language in the mission statement.
- In my review, the program is farther along and it is advantageous to have a statement in place. In most scenarios, mission statements are written broadly and inclusive in nature leaving room for potential program growth and future needs.
- I.A.4. Another recommendation from the previous self-study was finding a “permanent home for the MAGD” program. The program is considering several options to find a home but their current need seems to be “IDENTITY & RETENTION” issues with the faculty. The program is supported by faculty from the Department of Communication, Computer Science and Art & Design, and recently there has been a total turn over with communication faculty. That turnover has been detrimental to the faculty currently teaching courses in terms of teaching and service loads going up. The program needs a dedicated ADA, as there is constant turn over with ADA’s as well.
-
- I.A.4. More focused on student portfolios for assessment, better partnerships with CompSci, addressing faculty retention issues.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0

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

Comments

- I.B.1-2, 4. Progress on mission and curricular revisions has been hampered by turnover and some kind of internal issues within Art & Design.
- I.B.1. The program's contribution to UWW core values, mission and strategic plan are well articulated with appropriate reference to the mission and strategic plan statement.
- I.B.1. "Mission statement" is still a work in progress. A draft is being developed during the summer 2016 assessment institute. I would encourage the program to complete the mission statement.
- I.B.2. The idea of having set program goals each year and evaluation and assessment are described well. The program has made significant progress towards meeting some goals and one significant outcome was the development of MAGD-technology minor pairing with compute science department. Plans to offer a double major with MAGD and computer science are under discussion for future program development.
- I.B.3. The program is facing challenges advancing the campus IE efforts. This has been a focus since its last review in terms of attracting women and students of opportunity to the major, nevertheless, the response in self-study shows very little progress.
- I.B.3. Is the goal-setting process working well? What steps are being considered if goals aren't accomplished? For example, expanding diversity has been a goal two times both in 13-14 and 14-15 year but there is no mention of this goal in the current year, 15-16 plan given that there has been slow progress as presented in the report.
- I.B.4. Significant course redesign with intro course (MAGD 150) which now includes lecture and lab.
- I.B.4. The program would like to develop MAGD major/minors integrated with other departments. The MAGD technology minor is a growing program and serves as a model for other programs. Another new minor, game development pairing with computer science major developed in fall 2016, is another success. The program recognizes a need to offer a BFA in the art and design of MAGD in future.
- I.B.6. The program has recommended offering a B.F.A. as opposed to B.A./B.S., but that change still needs to be finalized through approval of curricular changes.
- I.B. 6. The program has received NASAD accreditation with a recommendation to offer BFA as opposed to BA/BS.

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

- II.A.1. The program offers several different emphasis and degree options, BA/BS, with MAGD major. The curriculum is constantly evolving and some curricular revisions are yet to go through the curricular approvals. It sounds like the curricular process has been more demanding for interdisciplinary programs trying to satisfy the needs of departments connected with the program as well as meeting the accreditation requirements (NASAD).
- II.A.2. The program has not identified dual-listed courses offered in this major.
- II.A.2. I assume that NA means there are no dual-listed courses offered.
- II.A.3. Good data collection and assessment practices; The program has made several changes to courses and curriculum as a result of direct/indirect assessments and conversations with the advisory board. Examples include, revisions to courses, ARTSTDIO 480, MAGD 272, project management skills in a range of courses, student portfolios, team projects and development of new minors.
- II.A.3. Data are used in making decisions, but for the quantitative data mentioned (e.g., assessment of senior projects, annual assessments), it would be useful to know what specific results lead to your decisions.
- II.A.3. Qualitative data are mentioned (e.g., conversations with advisory board) as a basis for decisions.
- II.A.3. I like the idea of portfolio-based assessment for this program, but it isn't implemented yet.
- II.A.4. Lots of opportunities for growth beyond the classroom such as department annual expo which is a platform to showcase student projects and network with professionals in the field. The #'s are impressive in terms of student presenters (57 last year). This expo has been a success providing jobs and internship opportunities for students. Other opportunities mentioned are undergraduate research, capstone projects and involvement in student organizations.
- II.A.4. Several additional opportunities are offered for students. The Expo is a great way to bring students and professionals in the field together.
- II.A.4. How many students do internships? Undergrad research? Are there plans to try to increase the number of students in these activities?
- II.A.4. The Expo is great, but need to get more students placed in internships. Part of problem has been high ADA turnover, which resulted in lack of staff/institutional knowledge to place students.
- II.A.5. MAGD 210 and 220 should have some kind of regular assessment tool/measure connected to each.

II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

- II.B.1. The program has appropriate assessment plan and collects assessment data through a variety of measures to track students progress. The curriculum map shows SLO's are tracked in all course offerings with a designed timetable to track progress. Both direct and indirect assessment tools are used. The program tracks two of the learning goals each year through the following outlets: MAGD expo, capstone work, MAGD designated course sequence. It is commended that the program continues to invest lot of time and effort into assessment!
- II.B.1. Which SLOs differentiate the three different emphases?
- II.B.1. Good curricular mapping of SLOs to courses--very thorough, specifies where each SLO is introduced, developed, and assessed.

- II.B.2. Sufficient evidence of SLO's being aligned with campus LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes. Good progress.
- II.B.2. Good alignment with LEAP ELOs. I would argue that several of the program SLOs also address LEAP ELO "knowledge of human cultures..." if that is interpreted as discipline-specific knowledge.
- II.B.3. I like the idea of adding exit surveys to the MAGD exit surveys.
- II.B.3-5: I think the program is continuing to make progress toward effective assessment that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program and student learning.
- II.B.3. The program has done a good job of making a plan, trying to implement it to see how well it works, then adjusting as needed. It's still a work in progress, but that's okay—they're making progress.
- II.B.4. Good example of using data from the NSSE and SOAS to change advising materials.
- II.B.4. Something to consider: It seems the program is moving toward a more holistic scoring of work, which is fine. But based on holistic scores, it's not clear to me how the program can identify what specific aspects of courses/the program to modify. For example, the self-study notes that external judges say more than half of the students are making portfolio-caliber work (page 31). What can you take from that in terms of feedback for what to improve in your program? What is missing from the other half of students' work? As a second example: the self-study notes that creativity needs improvement (page 33). What is it in the student work that tells you this--how do you know?
- II.B.5. The development of MAGD-technology minor pairing with compute science department is one of the outcomes of assessment and they are working on other potential interdisciplinary majors/minors.
- II.B.6. Need to address how assessment data is shared with internal constituencies.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
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	0
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

No/Limited Evidence

0

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

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

Comments

III.A.1-2. Enrollments are strong and continues to grow. The MAGD offers attractive majors/minors in conjunction with Art & Design, communication and computer science. Seems to be an attractive choice for students interested in pursuing careers in technology, media arts and game development which is a high demanding field.

III.A.1-2. Are students officially enrolling in the MAGD Tech minor yet?

III.A.5. Ethnic diversity is comparable, but gender diversity is not.

III.A.6. Is there still difficulty getting MAGD students into Art and Design courses?

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

Comments

III.B.1. Given that so many grads end up in web development/videography careers, developing messages and message channels, it seems to make sense to keep a strong connection with communication programs.

III.B.3. The program has made good efforts here. This is difficult to do well without support from campus offices.

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

Comments

III.C.1. Connections to Communication discipline make the UW-W MAGD program unique in Wisconsin.

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

Comments

IV.A.4. Any new Art & Design line should be hired with the understanding that the person will contribute to MAGD curricular needs.

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

Comments

IV.B.1. Have Leighton and Hwang completed/applied for the online and blended teaching workshop?

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

Comments**IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding****1-2. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1

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

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

Comments

IV.F.1. Need to have consistent, dedicated ADA FTE. Also need games-focused faculty line in Communication to complement current faculty expertise and to replace the expertise lost through staff departures.

IV.F.1. No S&E budget.

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

Comments

IV.G.1. Need dedicated classroom/lab space in McGraw, Andersen, CA or elsewhere.

IV.G.1. The program identified several areas of need (e.g., equipment, facilities).

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1

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	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	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
4. Other comments by the program (not rated).	
Yes	0
No	4

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

- This is apparently an attractive and a growing interdisciplinary major serving 190+ majors and about 60 minors connecting three major departments, Art & Design, communication and computer science. The program offers several emphasis within the major, which is a complement for students in other departments on campus. There is a potential for several new programs to evolve from this interdisciplinary MAGD program. The job growth and market is in high demand.
- It is impressive how the program continues to thrive and grow working through some obvious challenges with staffing, faculty identity, budget and lack of a home department. The program coordinator and faculty are very dedicated and KUDOS to all their efforts!
- The program tracks student learning outcomes annually through both direct and indirect assessments, capstone courses and projects, team-assignments, advisory board and exit surveys.
- Multidisciplinary nature.
- Helps meet growing workforce needs for digital media professionals.
- I don't think I saw a description of the advisory board, but I would think its recommendations could provide some force behind desired program changes. I like the use of the Expo to give students external appraisal of their work. In the absence of more feedback from alumni, these provide the best feedback on the success of the program. I am very glad that 150 was changed in a way that will help students determine whether this is an appropriate area for them.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- Program needs stability in staffing both the faculty and ADA support.
- The administration should assist the MAGD to find a "permanent home".
- Need to attract more female students.
- Need to retain faculty better.
- Figure out BA/BS/BFA issues related to Art & Design cooperation and accreditation issues.
- This program has a lot of challenges, some caused by the interdisciplinary nature of the program, split demands on faculty, turnover, and issues with one of the related departments. These seem to be drivers for the difficulties making sustained progress. There are a lot of ideas and possibilities, and various attempts (some successful) to do everything that should be happening, but there have been, and seem to continue to be, many growing pains. It seems to me that it is imperative to have a good understanding of how successful graduates are and to try to get their feedback on the preparation they received.

3. Other comments/questions

- a. I think there should be conversations about how the curricular process/approvals are handled with a interdisciplinary majors on campus. I note that the approval process has been slow as other departments have a say in decision making which has a negative impact in terms of progress and the program's failure to offer a new curriculum when it wanted.
- b. This program needs dedicated learning spaces for students.
- c. I don't know what kind of participation the student organizations have, but I wonder if they could help with maintaining contact with graduates. Can the desire for feedback in a year or so be communicated with exit interviews (or is it now)?
- d. This program has worked consistently throughout the review period to systematically improve their assessment of student learning, and they have made significant progress. The efforts of the faculty are greatly appreciated.
- e. What is the composition of the advisory board? Would they be influential in making arguments for increased resources?
- f. Does the program coordinator have sufficient release time?
- g. Are there any female Expo judges? Have you made efforts to recruit female judges?

4. Recommended Actions

1. The program should continue to address diversity issues, or at least demonstrate convincingly that lack of gender diversity in faculty is representative of lack of gender diversity in the professional field.
2. Complete revised mission statement.
3. Continue to develop and implement the assessment plan.
 - a. Develop at least one SLO that differentiates the emphases from one another.
 - b. Continue to develop assessment tools (e.g., rubrics) to assess each SLO in a way that it will provide actionable data.
 - c. Develop a way to track the impact of data on student learning, or better illustrate how assessment data is used.
4. Work with the college to address resource needs (e.g., department assistant, S&E budget, space, internship database, clearinghouse, shared drive, etc. that can be sustained, even with intermittent ADA help).

5. Recommended Result*

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.

Continuation without qualification

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.

X

***The program's next full self-study is due to the Dean of the College of Arts & Communication by October 1, 2021 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2021.**