

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

Date: March 15, 2018
Time: 4:00-5:00pm
Place: Laurentide 4012

Present: Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Interim Dean Frank Goza; Department Chair Athula Gunawardena; faculty and staff in the Computer Science program Zachary Oster, Sue Roberts, Jiazhen Zhou, Lopamudra Mukherjee, and Hien Nguyen; Audit & Review Team Chair Pascal Letourneau; Audit & Review team members Kerry Katovich, and Joan Littlefield Cook

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments: The evaluation team is impressed by the content of the self-study. The energetic group of faculty is aware of the importance of assessment. The program appears to be well aligned with the needs of the students and the dynamic industry for which they are preparing. The various tracks in the program are growing and have lots of growth potential. However, this growth needs to be well monitored to ensure good education quality.
- 4) The department chair explained the history of the computer science program, the ambitious enrollment goals that were set at the creation of the program in 2012, and how those goals were largely surpassed. The department created an advisory board and has connections with the industry which allows students to get more experience to better prepare them for their careers.
- 5) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) *Growth: After the Computer Science major was approved in 2012, an emphasis, two minors, and a certificate were added. There is a desire to bring enrollments from 307 to approximately 350 undergrads and 50 graduates per year. Do they have plans for other minors or emphases? The Data Science minor has a high growth potential, is the department ready to address the demand? Is the growth well aligned with the needs of the industry?*
 - i) The department explained they have more plans for growth. New minors are planned. They also explained their outreach objectives with surrounding high schools. The Provost suggested reaching out to Blackhawk Technical College and Rock County campus for further collaborations.
 - b) *Resources: The self-study mentions a need for computer labs, but what other resources are needed to address the program's rapid and dynamic growth? The self-study also addresses the issue of departmental budget. However, it is not clear what the budget would be used for. The graduate program is also growing and the evaluation team wanted to know what the impact is of the graduate program on the undergrad program.*
 - i) The department explained that the most pressing needs are for software budget and student lab support. They also have a need for office spaces. The Provost suggested to also look at external funding sources.
 - c) *Assessment: The self-study describes a thoughtful assessment plan, but it is not clear to what extent the assessment plan been implemented thus far. Please provide an update on progress on assessment.*
 - i) The department explained that there is good progress being made on the assessment plan. They will work on longitudinal assessment in the near future.
- 6) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 2 recommended action (see pages 13-14, point 4) related to program resources and assessment.

- 7) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns*
- Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
 - A shortened progress report (1 to 2 pages) is required to update the Dean and the Audit & Review team on the situation with resources and the program's progress on assessment. This "mini" progress report is due to the college Dean by December 1, 2020, and to the A&R committee by January 1, 2021.
 - Next full self-study will be due to the college Dean by October 1, 2022 and to the A&R Committee by Nov 1, 2022.
- 8) Adjourn.

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

Date of Evaluation 2/23/18

Short Self Study (SS*) _____

Program Computer ScienceMajor XMinor X**Evaluations submitted by:** Pascal Letourneau*, James Collins, Kerry Katovich, S. A. Welch, Joan Littlefield Cook**Review meeting attended by:** Pascal Letourneau*, James Collins, Kerry Katovich, 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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

Comments

1. Program offers good options for students in its array of minors.
1. Impressive list of publications and grants. The program clearly contributes to the university's range of programs, scholarly activity, and will soon contribute to graduate offerings.
1. Good connections to local businesses. The planned Software Development Center will be a very good addition.
3. The program has gender and international diversity in faculty.
3. Is the program making any intentional efforts to increase the number of women, African American, and Hispanic students? These are noticeably lower in the program (and in the overall field, I'm sure).
4. This is the first Self-Study.

4. this is their first A&R report

I see information that is applicable much later in the report (such as faculty activities, external funding, etc..) but I did not see much about how it supports the core mission of the U

this is the first self-study

This is a new program with no previous feedback from the A&R process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

2. What are the student profiles referred to in this section? Can you explain a bit more about the goals of these, and the student portfolios? Seem like good ideas, I'm just curious as to how you plan to make use of them.

2. You've proposed innovative ways to think about how to give faculty more time for research, and have built in the requirement that they work with students on their research.
 2. "Theoretical Structures" is not a clear goal and definitely not a measurable goal.
 2. "Grow enrollments from 307 currently to approximately 350 undergrads and 50 graduates per year." A goal like this could have sub-bullet points with ideas on how to execute the goal.
 4. Good to see that one of your visions for the future is to track grads and placement success. This is important to do for every program but can be difficult. For this program, I suspect many of these students will be successful and good possibilities for mentoring students, funding scholarships, etc.
-
4. The program noted that this was their 1st A& R self-study and therefore were not in revision mode. However, given their short term and long term goals, and their process for evaluating the program with an advisory board, they might want to consider implementing a review of the program thus far.
-
4. "..., we will discuss way to address this issue." This is easy to write. However, you want clearer, measurable goals. Examples: a- Discuss and brainstorm ideas to address the issue. b- Evaluate and rank ideas. c- Implement one ideas and measure the impact.
 6. Can you explain a bit more why the ABET requirements would prevent CS majors from completing a bachelors within 4 years?
 6. Your Advisory Board has said that ABET accreditation isn't that important and doesn't seem to give a competitive advantage. Do you know how this accreditation is viewed in the overall field?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	2
---------------------	---

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

Comments

1. Interesting minors being planned. I suspect that Data Science one will be very attractive to many social science majors, especially those planning on graduate school.
1. The program has made thoughtful curricular choices, keeping credits to degree and appropriateness of the content in mind.
1. liked the thoroughness of their descriptions for the various minors.
2. The program does not offer dual-listed courses.
3. I see that: The Computer Science faculty have had 72 undergraduate curriculum proposals approved since 2011, but it is unclear as to what assessment data were used in these curricular changes
3. Curricular changes were based on several types of data, but assessment of student learning seems to have played a minor role (except the prereq change in 220 and 222). I encourage the program to keep the data on student learning that they are currently collecting firmly in mind as they consider future curricular changes.
4. A variety of good opportunities are available to students.
4. liked variety of extracurricular activities for students.
5. The student survey addresses "annoyances" felt by students. But does not assess the quality of the education provided. The peer-review can address those, but it is not evident from the short answer provided. Though there are no fully-online program, it would be important to increase the rigor of the assessment of online courses. Make sure the proper topics are covered and that the level of difficulty is high enough. Make sure the proper assessment tools are used, not only multiple choice online quizzes.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

- I encourage the program to review the wording of some of the SLOs and move away from "should be able to" or will "be aware of." We can assess whether a student demonstrates, evaluates, uses, etc... but not whether they are able to do something, or if they should be able to do something. It seems like a minor wording change, but it carries a lot of meaning.
- Next step in curricular mapping is to identify where in the curriculum each SLO is introduced, developed, and assessed.
- Consider breaking down the Intellectual and Practical LEAP skills to identify which ones your program is addressing.
- Ethics could be addresses in more than one course.
- Because of the use of the verb "will", it appears the assessment plan, is just a future plan. I recommend implementing it soon
- The plan described is a good one. To what extent has it been implemented at this point (i.e., many of the points are in future tense)?
- Good use of assessments embedded within courses.
- Has the program determined what level of performance is expected at a 200-, 300-, 400-level course? This would be very helpful in program discussions of data from these different courses.
- Is there any interrater agreement calculated on the embedded assignments? Even a small sample looking at this would be useful to ensure that all instructors have a similar understanding of the SLOs and their performance indicators.
- Good use of indirect data, good summary of how these data were used to improve the program.
- What is the "industry survey"? This sounds useful.
- Good sharing of data. Consider finding a way to share this with students too, and get their reactions to it.

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	5
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	2

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

- 1-2. web site development and administration seems stagnant. Are there any plans to either promote and recruit more or should this be eliminated from the program?
 3. while the number of graduates is increasing, the number of credits for degree do seem high. Is this due to some students changing majors into computer science?
 - 4-5. The program certainly participates in efforts to advertise the program and draw students to it. It's a national trend that fewer women and URM students are in the field. The program is trying strategies to draw women to the program. Are there specific efforts to draw more URM students?
 5. I think the self-study has a complete analysis of the situation. The program is traditionally more attractive to male students, and the lower percentage of female is expected. The department shows it puts in place efforts to increase the recruitment of female in the program. However, the way the question is asked, it is difficult to give the best grade.
 6. Sounds like students can enroll at this point without problems, but that a problem might be developing. What is/can the program do to prevent this?
-
6. the report noted: "As the program gradually matures, these numbers will decrease." The reasoning behind this statement was not clear from the report.
 7. will there be funding available to add faculty? If not, does the program have an alternative plan to keep the student/faculty ratio steady?

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

Comments

1. Very impressive accomplishments by graduates
 1. What is the exact graduation rate for the program? (I'm not sure if this is available from IRP?)
 3. Good tracking of grads.
-
3. you do a nice job of tracking details of your alumni

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

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

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

Comments

The program can build the newly launched MS opportunity into their program advertising as a competitive advantage.

1. you have some attractive program qualities that should be inviting to students.

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

Sounds like they need more staffing

As noted previously, is funding available for new faculty? or if not, does the program have alternatives to remain competitive?

As noted in the report: "However, one difficulty we encountered during faculty recruitment is that the package we offered is not sufficient to attract high-quality candidates since we have to compete with industry." Alas, this is a common problem here. Does the program have alternatives to remain competitive? This seems to be an important factor as the challenges faced are not likely to improve much in the near future and as noted previously, there are other schools that you compete with.

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 does seem to participate in U events.

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

Strong research expectations. Nicely tied to including students in the research

1-2. It is impressive that many of the faculty are involved in scholarly activities, including the temporary FT faculty member

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding

1-2. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.

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

Comments

impressive external funding was obtained

I believe this was addressed in the very beginning of the report. Here, there was a chart that had more details. Are there any review/critique processes to address why the unfunded grants were not funded?

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

Comments

Need more budget allocated to the department, and more space. The self-study makes a compelling argument for these, particularly given the growth in enrollment.

1. the amount of your budget seems to be a problem given the growth of the program. Will it be necessary at some point to reduce the growth of the program to maintain the high quality of instruction that you currently provide?

This department would benefit from additional funding that will bring it in line with similar large departments in their college. The contrast of funding between Computer Sciences and Biology, as an example, is extreme and likely needs to be re-visited and adjusted. This department exemplifies how to "do more with less", which is a noteworthy accomplishment.

1- There are sufficient evidences to support the answer. But the program does not have adequate services and supplies.

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

Comments

More classroom space will be needed as the program continues to grow. Some of the minors propose are likely to attract good enrollments, which will increase the need even more.

* this too (as is the budget) seems to be reaching a critical point. Have there been discussions about ways to maintain high quality instruction given the challenges you face? Finding more room may not be an option in the future. Would more online classes help with this?

The department provided a reasonable rationale for needing additional properly equipped classrooms. Lack of adequate facilities will clearly serve as a bottleneck for continued sustained growth.

1- There are sufficient evidences to support the answer. But the program does not have adequate services and supplies.

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

Comments

What factors should be considered in adjusting (increasing) your budget? Are there unusual expenses that arise with running your program?

What additional resources would you need to add a cyber security program? You might want to address cost/benefit analysis in order to show a real need (beyond # of unfilled positions) to add this. Adding such a program would incur quite a bit of costs. How many students could you attract with this? What would be the financial improvement of adding such a program? These might be worthy of consideration.

2- 3- Would it be possible to apply for a grant large enough to solve the issue with limited classrooms?

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

- Program has shown impressive growth since its beginning
 - Program has a thoughtful and clear plan for continued growth.
 - Good progress on assessment plan. Some data have been gathered and used, although more work is needed.
 - Very impressive emphasis on research and external funding, nicely tied to the expectation that faculty work with undergraduates on the research.
-
- They have a thorough means of assessing class objectives and individual evaluation.
 - They utilize much detail in tracking alumni
-
- Critical part of our undergraduate program
 - New faculty appear to be motivated to assess and engage in the curriculum.
 - Important connections to the applied business world.

- This program has many strengths and they were nicely described.
- Rate of growth is impressive and I appreciate the efforts that faculty are taking to continue developing the curriculum in response to changes in skills that students will need following graduation.
- It's impressive that so much has been done in such a small amount of time; particularly in light of resources that the department had available during this period of review.
- The program was created recently in response to well identified demands. The members of the department appear to be well connected to the reality of the students, their needs, and the needs of the industry. Actions and reactions are done within a documented process, yet it appears to be efficient (not slowed by paperwork.)

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- Assessment. The program has made good progress but needs to continue to develop and implement assessment, making sure to articulate their SLOs in an assessable way, talk about the program-level data.
- The program needs additional resources. College needs to work with the program to support growth. I'm not an expert in this field, but it seems that program and proposed new areas have good potential for successful graduates who might remain well-connected with UWW, providing mechanisms for future internships, mentoring, scholarships & other support.
- I would suggest considering a uniform, global, rubric to assess student learning for the entire program. I suspect you are missing an opportunity to show financial benefit to the University which could be used to vie for increased departmental funding.
- Need to obtain more teaching and research space.
- Increase more in public service, getting more faculty involved.
- Explain *why* more funding is needed (what will be done with these funds)?
- Explain why the department is looking at growth given the current restrictions in space and resources; what is the advantage of the graduate program, and provide reasons this is needed and not pulling from the undergraduate program.
- I agree with all areas that the department identified in Section V, Item #2. Listed areas are comprehensive and align with narrative statements made throughout the self-study.
- It appears the assessment plan is only a plan for now. It should be made official and some should be responsible for to make it "live".
- The assessment of online course should be either better documented, or improved.

3. Other comments/questions

- Good context provided throughout the report. This was helpful in understanding where the program is in its development, where it wants to go.
- Report was well-written, thorough without being too detailed.
- I am concerned at the possibility that due to rapid growth (and with considering a new cyber security program), that the quality of education will suffer.
- I do have concerns about the interests in new faculty, with most comments on their areas of interest and little about their ability to teach.
- This is among the best self-study documents that I've read since becoming a member of the A&R Committee. Excellent attention to detail and I appreciate all of the hard work that this department has invested in their students, faculty, and the program.
- The internship program is important. The department needs to make sure they monitor, assess, and evaluate the internships.

4. Recommended Actions

1. Work with the college and university offices to secure the following
 - a. Budget for the department that is better aligned with their needs and their enrollment, and the support they need to grow the program. Clarify their funding needs.
 - b. Appropriate facilities, particularly classroom space

- c. Adequate staffing to accommodate developing programs and increasing enrollments. This will probably require discussion about how to provide a starting salary that will be more competitive with private sector opportunities.
- 2. Continue to work on refining and implementing assessment of student learning.
 - a. Review the SLOs and determine if they are expressed in a way that allows them to be meaningfully assessed.
 - b. Review the curricular map and identify where in the curriculum each SLO is introduced, developed, and assessed.
 - c. Consider what level of performance is adequate at the different course levels. Students should progress throughout the program. What can be reasonably expected at different course levels?

5. Recommended Result

Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the Audit & Review Committee.	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.	

***A shortened progress report (1 to 2 pages) is required to update the Dean and the Audit & Review team on the situation with resources and the program’s progress on assessment. This “mini” progress report is due to the college Dean by December 1, 2020, and to the A&R committee by January 1, 2021.**

Next full self-study will be due to the college Dean by October 1, 2022 and to the A&R Committee by Nov 1, 2022.