

**Agenda and Evaluation Report  
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
General Education Program, 2021-22**

**Date:** 5/2/2022

**Time:** 2:00-3:00

**Place:** LT 4120

**Invited:** Interim Provost Robin Fox; Interim AVC Kristin Plessel; Dean Frank Goza (L&S); Associate Dean Susan Johnson (L&S), Dean Eileen Hayes (A&C); Interim Dean Lana Collet-Klingenberg (COEPS); Interim Dean Paul Ambrose (COBE); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Jessica Bonjour; faculty and staff in the General Education program Karl Brown, Angela Harlan, Rachel Chaphalkar, Tammy French; Audit & Review Team Chair Corey Davis; Audit & Review team member Russ Kashian, Assessment Representative Katy Casey

**In Attendance:**

- 1) Call to order: 2:04pm
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
  - a) How often are GE elective courses recertified? What is the process for that recertification? Is there assessment data provided for those courses as part of the certification process?
    - i) There has only been one recertification of elective courses. The reason for this was to align courses to the new GE learning objectives. It also served to remind instructors of the course purpose in the GE curriculum. The program does not see a need to conduct another recertification.
    - ii) There was wide-spread recognition and appreciation for the work that went into the recertification project. The GE team presented on the findings to campus groups and presentations at national conferences.
  - b) The ever-expanding assessment work provides voluminous insightful data, but not without a cost. Does General Education provide stipends to compensate GE instructional staff for this work?
    - i) Core course coordinators are provided some support, e.g., small stipend for the semester writing the self-study report. Additionally, some departments do more like English and Math (more common in proficiency than core courses).
    - ii) Current GE budget is \$17,000/year, was \$20,000 (at one point documented at \$30,000), when higher it included more professional trainings and travel to conferences
    - iii) The program is encouraged to consider a structure of assessment that provides direct information on learning outcomes, right now the GE self-study process does not ask for specific data on outcomes but allows programs to decide what they want to evaluate.
  - c) What is the likelihood the GE program will receive staffing necessary to bring course enrollments to what they perceive is a reasonable level? If there is not a plan in place, because there are not any additional resources, what is the plan moving forward? Should there be a consideration of redesigning the courses that are impacted to accommodate larger class sizes?
    - i) Staffing is not solely a General Education problem, because staffing comes from departments.
    - ii) Coordinator noted that increased enrollment is causing staffing issues across core and proficiency courses. Enrollments fluctuate depending on resources available to add sections and the number of new students.
    - iii) Dean Goza noted that the Chancellor is aware that additional staff will be needed to cover sections in fall 2022, and is holding on to FTE to hire more instructional staff if needed.

- iv) Interim Provost Fox asked if there are optimal course sizes: The following was reported: core courses were commonly at 35-40; WOTA in 60s (down from 80); COMM 110 at 32, recommendation is 20-25; Math capped around 30 but that has taken a toll on offerings in higher level coursework, English recommend cap at 18-24 for remedial and proficiency, but most English courses are up to 26
- (1) Interim Provost Fox is interested to learn more about the impact of staffing shortages on programs- and requested a brief summary on enrollment in core and proficiency courses.
  - (2) Coordinator shared that some projects, such as CORE 2.0, stalled because of the staffing issues
  - (3) Conversations about how to address staffing issues, e.g., use of distance education funds and increasing pool of instructors who are available

Discussion ensued about the format and structure of GE program review. The Coordinator and OAA plan to work together to ensure the next GE review aligns better to the program.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists four recommended actions (see page 15, point 4) related to assessment, data sharing and communication, and resources.
- 6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation without qualification*
- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
  - Click or tap here to enter text..
  - **Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:**
    - Next FULL self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, Choose an item. and to the Assessment Office on November 1, Choose an item..
    - Next SHORT self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2025 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2025.
    - A progress report on recommended action #4 will be due October 1 of 2023 to Dean, and October 15, 2023 to the Office of Academic Assessment.
- 7) Adjourn 2:54pm

*Review team report is attached below, including Recommended Actions and instructions for Progress Reports (if required).*

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Review of Audit & Review Self-Study  
2021-2022**

Date of Evaluation 3/18/2022 Short Self Study (SS\*) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Program: General Education

**Evaluations submitted by:** Russ Kashian, Hepsi Kumpaty, Corey Davis, and Katy Casey  
**Review meeting attended by:** Russ Kashian, Hepsi Kumpaty, Corey Davis, and Katy Casey

**I. General Program Information**

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**2. The program is aware and reflective of changes affecting improvement since the last review.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
First self-study for the program	0

**3. Characteristics of the program set it apart from others when compared regionally and nationally. The unique aspects of the program attract students.**

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	1

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	1
First self-study for the program	0

**5. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate (only select N/A if there is no accreditation available).**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
N/A	0

### General Comments related to Section I

There was considerable discussion of the budgetary concerns regarding the ability to respond to the goals set in the last review. I found their efforts were considerable, while recognizing that the reduction in enrollment, matched by staffing limitations- and compounded by Covid-19, created a strong statement regarding the efforts and the outcomes.

2. Significant work has been done since the last review. This work addresses goals of the GE faculty in regard to program function and curriculum, but also address institutional needs and interests. Most notably, the elective recertification process and curricular updates in English and Mathematics. Part of the Core 2.0 strategic initiative was to create a 200-level sophomore seminar, what is the status of that work?

3. Some class sizes (e.g., COMM 110) set UW-W GE apart, but not in a good way.

3. Not sure how to compare general education programs, but there are certainly a number of notable aspects of UWW's program. The leadership of the GE Coordinator and GERC is instrumental in the program's accomplishments. Clearly defined outcomes, closely aligned with institutional outcomes, provide transparency to students.

4. I see that this is the second self-study for the program. I am looking for the F2F meeting minutes from last review but couldn't locate the document.

## II. Alignment within the University

**1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's Mission and Strategic Plan.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**2. The program supports general education and/or proficiency programs at the University.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**3. The program is collaborative and supports other academic programs across the College and/or University.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**General Comments related to Section II**

This program is critical to our success and the General Education leaders recognize and reinforce this ideal.

2. This review is for the GE program!!

3. The report addressed an interesting issue regarding elective courses and their use as gateway courses in majors/minors. I was not familiar with the potential disconnect between instructors who teach GE electives and the program. The syllabi requirement seems reasonable. Has there been discussion of how to continue to engage instructors who teach electives- could there be a scaled back version of regular recertification?

**III. Program Goals & Accomplishments**

**1. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve/advance the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**2. Goals currently in place will contribute to the program's advancement. Criteria for determining success were measurable and attainable.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

### General Comments related to Section III

As stated, their goals are limited by the resources offered. There were efforts to achieve the stated goals and the program did accomplish some of these objectives. However, due to the earlier stated limitations, the goals were not all achieved. The goals continue to be reasonable and can be kept in sight.

1. A number of goals were undertaken and met during the review period including, adoption and dissemination of the GELOs, elective recertification, revised GE categories, and signature assessments. Impressive work has been completed on promoting the GE program's value- work is ongoing.
2. The program went through significant revision of GE goals and outcomes and implemented the revised GE curriculum in Fall 2016. Recertification process of GE electives to ensure that the course-level learning objectives, instructional practices, and assessments are aligned to achieve the program-level GELOs.
3. Program goals are set at the beginning of each year. \*There were 11 goals reviewed in this report, many of which were multi-year projects. I wonder if it is wise to reevaluate the number of ongoing projects and prioritize.

### IV. Curriculum

#### 1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

#### 2. The program prepares students in majors, minors, and related emphases tracks in post-graduation and other applicable experiences.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

#### 4. Students participate in the high impact practices.

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

## General Comments related to Section IV

The attention to detail is noteworthy

1. The program emphasizes competencies in critical thinking, communication, life-long learning and inquiry, knowledge application, and problem-solving skills. To this end, the general education CORE, proficiency courses, and electives serve to provide the breadth and depth of learning experiences to meet the learning goals.

2. I am not certain of there is sufficient data presented in the report that affirms student's success post- graduation. I do believe however; the GE program provides positive learning experiences and provides foundation for success to excel in the major and post-graduation careers.

2. GE is intended to prepare all students in the breadth and depth of knowledge necessary to engage in work and community. I thought addressing the transferability of courses was appropriate.

3. Yes, numerous assessment data inform GERC and home academic department decisions about changes (and non-changes) to curriculum.

3. Changes in curriculum are well thought out and reviewed by multiple stakeholders prior to going into effect.

4. Helpful table. I heard the news that Learning Communities are coming back; that's great.

## V. Assessment of Student Learning

### 1. The program has clearly articulated learning outcomes for students.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

### 2. Student learning outcomes are "mapped" to the curriculum.

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

### 3. The program provided a timeline indicating when faculty and staff assess SLOs. The timeline is manageable and sustainable.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	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

**6. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**7. Overall, the program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.**

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

### **General Comments related to Section V**

The primary outcome of the report is that, in a program that is contained in multiple colleges, with a great level of turnover, assessment is a challenge. This is a concern that the program recognizes and offers ideas to address this issue.

General comment: The program prioritizes aligning the GE curriculum to outcomes and ensuring that curriculum is informed by data. There are processes in place to support his work. Data, findings, and implications were provided for each GELO. The approach to collecting data was unique to each GELO. The summary was detailed and provided summative information, has there been consideration of a process for data collection that is not so disparate? Such as common tools to assess signature assessments? Additionally, these efforts are collaborative and the conclusions sections note a number of items that would require campus engagement in order to be most impactful (e.g., QR rubric, teaching skills across the curriculum, and engaging student affairs). It would be helpful to think about how assessment of ELOs and GELOs align- both in methods and logistics.

1. The report mentions that course-level learning objectives and assessments are helping students achieve the program-level GELOs.

1. Under Goal 6, (Personal & Civic Responsibility), has there been any discussion of integrating media literacy/social media literacy education to have students recognize the influence of media/social media (dis)information on "being an informed and active citizen?"

1. The GELOs are clear as to what knowledge is expected of students. However, the benchmarks and criteria for performance are not as clear. Defining these may be helpful in tackling the assessment of this program. For example, in the summary of assessment for goal 1 (knowledge of human cultures), 1a was described as "not assessable." So what data should be collected and what does the program want to know? (p. 66)

2. What's the cycle for review and recertification of GE elective categories? Gather annual course specific feedback on GE elective courses, enrollment data, to determine if such courses should be offered on a regular cycle in the future.

4-5. A voluminous variety of direct and indirect assessments are considered by faculty/program coordinators/GERC for every Goal/SLO/GELO.

## VI. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation:

### A. Trend Data

1. [MAJORS ONLY] Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

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

2. [MAJORS ONLY] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years, or reasonably efficiently. Not required to answer

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. [MAJORS ONLY] As a follow up to program enrollment and graduation, describe the strategies used to recruit and retain students. Not required to answer

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

**4. Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University.**

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

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

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

**6. 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	0
No/Limited Evidence	1

**General Comments related to Section VI.A**

I did not mean to answer the majors only questions. in regards to diversity--as the courses are required, the program reflects the campus diversity. In regards to the last two questions, this is the challenge of limited resources (as covered in the report). The question asked in this survey requires me to answer this is evidence-- however, the evidence is sufficient to create a concern regarding the optimal level.

The general education program has experienced challenges related to declining enrollment on numerous levels. These challenges seem to impact instructors most in terms of classes sizes, space, and resources. The problem is compounded due to budget deficits. Regardless, a number of curricular changes have been implemented to support students- e.g., English and Math.

1. Downward trend. But most recent freshman enrollment numbers (published after this report) are promising.

3. Some GE electives, Physics 120 and 181, are having enrollments issues.

4. "DFWI data suggests that these groups are overrepresented among students who need to repeat required courses." (p. 150) The GE program has been mindful of these data and has acted to address remedial education on campus.

4. Sufficient evidence. Exactly mirrors institutional diversity.

5. Students are suffering longer waits to get into WOTA and some Math courses. Other courses in Math and English are raising enrollment caps. Increasing class sizes is not done without negative consequences for student success. COMM 110 may need to cut sections creating longer waits if COMM 110 GIA revenue savings cannot be realized.

6. reported as "oversubscribed" and "under-resourced" The struggle to maintain manageable class-sizes in GE courses is ongoing. The program noted the size of classes makes it difficult to engage students in ways that we

know promotes learning and retention. It does not seem like this is a problem that is the sole responsibility of the program to solve.

6/9. No/limited evidence: Multiple GE core courses far exceed the recommendations by leading national associations. COMM 110 not only exceeds by 20% the national recommendation but is the largest class size in the UW System.

**VI. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation:**

**B. Demand for Graduates**

**Not required to answer questions in this section.**

**1. [MAJORS ONLY] Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**VII. Resource Availability & Development:**

**A. Faculty and Staff Resources**

**1. Information on numbers of full and part-time faculty and staff are provided. Expertise of teaching staff are aligned with the needs and future vision for the program.**

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

**2. Information is provided about changes in the faculty since the last Audit and Review.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**3. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**General Comments related to section VII.A**

The program does not make decisions regarding instructional staff. It seems we would benefit from a campus-wide examination of GE courses, related class sizes, and available staffing. The entire campus should support the work of GE and not just those who teach in the program.

1. Faculty/academic instructional staff expertise is excellent, but there are not enough faculty/academic instructional staff to adequately staff GE.

3. Yes, they have identified needs. No, those needs are not/will not be satisfied unless staffing shortages are rectified.

**VII. Resource Availability & Development:**

**B. Student Resources**

**1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.**

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	2

**2. The program has adequate facilities equipment, technological, and library resources to effectively serve its students.**

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

**General Comments for VII.B**

2. Students are underserved by fewer COMM 110 GIAs, a shortage that initially resulted from a shortage of quality candidates. However, despite a surplus of qualified candidates thanks to increased recruitment efforts, the ideal GIA staff of 5 will still not be staffed because of budget confusion over the fate of past GIA salary savings. University librarians provide outstanding services and resources to students.

As the pandemic recedes, there is once again a classroom shortage across core GE classes. Few existing classroom spaces have adequate, functioning instructional technology to present content in traditional F2F classroom settings, let alone to adapt to the demands of remote/hyflex instruction.

2. sufficient evidence was provided that the GE program would benefit from more flexible instructional spaces

**VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program**

**1. Areas of strength are discussed.**

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

**2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.**

	Sufficient Evidence	4
	Some/Partial Evidence	0
	No/Limited Evidence	0

**3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.**

	Sufficient Evidence	4
	Some/Partial Evidence	0
	No/Limited Evidence	0

**General Comments for VIII**

1. The UWW offers strong GE program to its students providing foundational learning experiences in the first two years of undergraduate education paving way for success in their chosen field of study and throughout their college career. The goals are not specifically tied to a major or department, rather, are dispersed across cross-disciplinary borders and fosters longitudinal emphasis in the whole of undergraduate study.

1. World of Ideas is unique in that it provides a junior-level general education for students. New GELOs have been implemented, and there is an excellent plan for assessment, with impressive data already pouring in.

2. Large class sizes remain a problem and will continue to be a problem. More students with fewer instructors also make assessment work more labor-intensive for the instructional staff tasked with assessing student learning AND producing student learning while only being compensated for teaching (and under compensated at that). Across campus, students (and many administrators, advisors, and even faculty) still undervalue general education. They still use the woeful and counterproductive phrase, "getting Gen Eds out of the way."

## VI. Reviewer Conclusions

### 1. Strengths of the Program

This is a critical area of education and is emphasized to the students. It provides an important view of education and the world.

Students get a great foundation for their major/minor studies. LEAP thrives in GE; students get a well-rounded education that will serve them throughout their careers despite societal and technological changes.

The General Education program is robust and serves as a strong foundation for our students. The coordinators and instructors work tirelessly to support students in their first years on campus, which are critical to their success. The GELOs are particularly impressive in how clearly they communicate expected learning, and align to the curriculum. There was significant and time-intensive work done on assessment that yielded valuable information. This is an incredibly collaborative and hardworking program and it is a wonder they accomplish as much as they do.

1. This is an excellent five-year self-study and I commend the dedicated work of Liz Hachten (former coordinator) and Jessica Bonjour (current coordinator) to the program and the efforts that had gone into putting the self-study report together. Well done!

2. The UWW offers strong GE program to its students providing foundational learning experiences in the first two years of undergraduate education paving way for success in their chosen field of study and throughout their college career.

3. The General Education CORE, proficiency courses, and electives serve to provide the breadth and depth of learning experiences to meet the learning goals.

4. The program revised its GE Learning outcomes and implemented the revised GE curriculum in Fall 2016. The GE elective categories recertification process was a good one and the breadth of GE electives, 300+ available, provides opportunities for great GE learning experience.

5. The program has a systematic timeline to collect data, conduct analysis, and utilization to improve student learning experiences.

### 2. Areas for Work or Improvement

More resources

Some GE classes are near crisis level with classes that have enrollment caps that are too high. And, despite these bursting class sizes, there are still increasingly longer waits for some students to get into core GE classes.

Creating an assessment system that is sustainable. The campus should explore ways to meet the instructional and physical challenges associated with this program.

1. Core 130-individual and society or core 140 (global perspectives) could be reevaluated to include health focus (health perspectives) to stay current with the pandemic situation.

2. Is there a program level assessment done at the end of second year to measure student's knowledge and skills? I recommend using ETS heighten assessments in critical thinking, quant literacy during the first year and senior year to measure student's progress and growth during the college education.

### 3. Other comments/questions

Impressive assessment plan and impressive assessment data already collected. But I worry that much of this new and expanded assessment work is being done by already over-worked and under-paid instructional staff with little to no additional compensation.

It seems time for a real conversation about resources. What is the likelihood the GE program will receive staffing necessary to bring course enrollments to what they perceive is a reasonable level? If there is not a plan in place, because there are not any additional resources, what is the plan moving forward? Should there be a consideration of redesigning the courses that are impacted to accommodate larger class sizes?

Long has this campus been told that assessment data are the evidence needed to secure increased funding for resources. Instructional staff and coordinators have supplied the labor and produced the evidence. Work with Provost and Deans Council to get the resources the data demand.

How often are GE elective courses recertified? What is the process for that recertification? Is there assessment data provided for those courses as part of the certification process?

The ever-expanding assessment work provides voluminous insightful data, but not without a cost. Does GenEd provide stipends to compensate GE instructional staff for this work?

#### 4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

1. Work with OAA to design a sustainable assessment system in terms of reporting. Specifically, to consider common, streamlined assessment tools to evaluate the GELOs.
2. Create a plan to disseminate the data to stakeholders, including periodic reports to the faculty senate, chairs council and students about GE assessment activities and results.
3. Talk to the Office of Academic Assessment about a block of items on the Senior Outcomes Assessment Survey to solicit feedback from students on the impact of knowledge and skills acquired through GE curriculum.
4. The General Education Coordinator should document annual conversations with the provost, Deans Council and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs about what is being done to provide resources to address the concerns evident in this report, chiefly among those:
  - a) Staffing plan for the upcoming academic year, including prescribed class sizes for core GenEd courses, and b) Instructional technology in classrooms.

#### 5. Recommended Result

1	Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
2	Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report. Additionally, the program should provide a progress report on Recommended Action #4.	4
3	Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	0
4	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	0
5	Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	0
6	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.	0
7	Non-continuation of the program.	0
8	Report not submitted; refer to Provost for action.	0