

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for  
Audit & Review Follow-up Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Gender & Ethnic Studies Minor, 2014-2015**

**Date:** Monday May 4, 2015

**Time:** 1:00-2:00pm

**Place:** Laurentide 4120

**Attendance:** Provost Beverly Kopper; AVC Greg Cook (substitute chair for this meeting); Dean David Travis; Program Coordinator Ellie Schemenauer; program faculty members Lauren Smith & Jo Burkholder; Audit & Review team member Dennis Kopf.

- 1) Call to order and introductions
- 2) Greg highlighted several strengths of the program including the value of this minor in helping students with personal growth and preparation for careers and civic engagement, the ability of the program to collaborate through layers of interdisciplinarity, the fact that the minor was intended to be online and serve as a complement for other online majors and programs, Jo Burkholder's NEH grant of \$50,000+, the ways that faculty members contribute to multiple programs on campus, the program gives lots of individual attention to students, the Diversity Leadership Certificate was added as a valuable option for students, and the program uses a portfolio approach for assessing student learning via a capstone course. Dennis noted that the portfolio approach is more effective with smaller numbers of students but might be a challenge if the program grows to have large enrollments. Ellie noted that the minor has 8 students enrolled as of Spring 2015, and all 8 are in under-represented student categories. The program can be delivered F2F; more online courses and staff would be needed to offer the minor fully online.
- 3) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
  - a) Strategic planning. The group discussed how the faculty members and others collaborate together to run the program, set goals, monitor progress, and develop a vision and goals for the future. All agreed that this is challenging with interdisciplinary programs. The program coordinator and a few core faculty members shoulder the responsibility. The group discussed the need for the program to determine where it wants to go and what the vision is for the future. Staffing is a challenge since the program isn't directly involved in the hiring that occurs in other departments even though those hires might eventually be needed to contribute courses to this minor. The group discussed how the program makes its course needs known to departments—it's a challenge, but the flexibility in the curriculum structure for this minor tends to ensure that students have eligible courses available.
  - b) Enrollment. Enrollment was discussed, and it was noted that the Diversity Leadership Certificate (which now has 75 students engaged) seems to be helping more students notice the minor and enroll (8 students are now enrolled in the minor). The program hasn't done any intentional recruiting. Lauren mentioned that it would help if they work more closely with the AA&EC advisors and others to better inform students about this minor. Lauren and Ellie discussed that program faculty considered suspending the minor due to lack of enrollment, but it seems that now they and others believe the minor should be continued to complement the resurgence of Race & Ethnic Studies programs and for the value that the minor provides to campus diversity efforts. Dennis noted that this minor would be valuable for Human Resource majors in COBE and for

many other majors across campus. Provost Kopper emphasized that this program is critical for our campus mission.

- c) Assessment. Some plans are described for collecting data on student learning, but most of the assessment information in the self-study indicates that assessment has not been implemented yet. Plans include use of student surveys to collect indirect assessment data and the use of capstone portfolios to capture direct assessment data. Program faculty agreed that more data will be collected as more students are enrolled.
  - d) Resources. The self-study seemed to argue in places that resources are needed. A main need is that more faculty and online courses are needed if the minor is to be offered fully online. The group noted that there are separate audit and review meetings scheduled for similar programs: Women & Gender Studies, Race & Ethnic Studies, and this Gender & Ethnic minor. The group discussed the value of considering enrollment and other issues together across these similar programs. Greg mentioned that departments that have multiple programs currently have the option of having separate A&R reviews for each program or instead bundling them into one A&R self-study (with each program treated within the self-study). The group wondered if that might be a good option for these similar programs related to gender and ethnic studies.
- 4) **Recommended Actions**: The evaluation report lists 3 recommended actions (see page 13, point 4) related to program mission, program planning and assessment.
  - 5) **Recommended Result**: *Continuation with major concerns*
    - **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
    - \*Submit a progress report describing progress toward the Recommended Actions, with particular emphasis on Recommendations 1 and 2. Due dates are March 1, 2017 to the Dean of College of Letters & Sciences and March 15, 2017 to Chair of the Audit & Review Committee.
    - **Next full self-study will be due in October 2019.**
  - 6) Adjourned at 2:00 pm.

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

Date of Evaluation March 18, 2015 Short Self Study (SS\*) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Program Gender & Ethnic Studies Major \_\_\_\_\_ Minor X \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluations submitted by:** Dennis Kopf, Bob Kuzoff, S.A. Welch, Joan Cook

**Review meeting attended by:** Dennis Kopf, 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	1
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	3
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)	4

**Comments**

1. What is the relationship between WGS, RES, and GES? It is difficult to tell in places which program is being discussed. I suspect this is because most (all?) of the same individual faculty members are involved in all three programs, which makes it difficult to separate activities relating to mission, values, contribution to GenEd, etc. for just one program.
1. The program helps to create and support a positive environment for diverse students, particularly LGBT students and students with disabilities.
1. The Diversity Leadership Certificate is a useful contribution to campus.
2. The program contributes to other programs on campus (e.g., RES), but it is not clear if any of the courses for the minor also carry GenEd credit (e.g., for GenEd Social Science). The self-study does talk about how the minor supports the development of skills that are GenEd student learning outcomes. The self-study mentions providing leadership for GenEd 130 later (pg. 22), but doesn't explain in what ways this is done.
4. New Program, so no previous recommendations to be addressed.

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

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

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

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

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

**4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a "vision" for where it wants to be in the future and how to get there.**

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

**5. The program earned recognition or awards.**

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

**Comments**

- I'm not clear on specifically how this minor differs from the overall WGS major. Or is it intended that this program serve as the main minor for the WGS department?
- Is your mission statement really inclusive? As currently written, the mission statement seems to be an antithesis of inclusive excellence by excluding men. I recommend adding how the role of men fit into your program. How or do you plan on recruiting men to this program? What is the gender and ethnic composition of your program? Will Caucasians feel welcomed in this program?
- What other goals has the program addressed? Is increased enrollment a goal? Is there any way to work with hiring departments to make it more likely that the program can resurrect its online courses or replace the expertise that was lost?

3. What is the process for setting program goals, discussing data, etc.? Is it typically 'rolled into' discussions of the department as a whole? I'm wondering how separate the program is--that is, is the minor conceptualized as different from the WGS major?
4. I'm not getting a sense that the minor has a clear vision of where it wants to be in 5 years. Do you want to grow, try to add back the online minor, shrink? I'm assuming the faculty want the minor to continue, but what specific program goals do they have?
6. Accreditation is not available for this program.

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

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

## Comments

1. Lots of course options for students.
1. The explanation given here (pg. 10) is helpful in understanding the intent of the program. Is it still "virtually cost-free to the college and university"?
2. The program has few grad offerings, and no students have taken the grad classes in years. Is there a reason to keep these grad courses?
3. No changes were made to the curriculum.

3. Were there any changes within the courses offered? For example, does the capstone emphasize essentially the same skills, knowledge, application, etc. as when it was first offered?
3. Are any changes to the curriculum being considered? Could the Diversity Leadership Certificate be in some ways considered as a curricular change, if it functions as an honors program? (pg. 12)
4. Can you describe the internship more? How many students (what % of GES minors) participate?
5. The self-study was unclear as to how they evaluated online courses' effective delivery beyond saying that their faculty had gone through training to teach online
5. Are any of the online courses that are offered by WGS or RES faculty included in the GES minor? About how many?
5. Is there interest in seeing if the fully online minor can be implemented? It sounds like some (how many?) courses are offered online.

## II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	0
---------------------	---

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

### Comments

1. The SLOs are well stated, and they tend to focus on higher levels of thinking. I wonder, though, how much differentiation there is between this minor and the others that are mentioned throughout the self-study.
2. Good alignment with LEAP ELOs.
3. What I saw was using capstone projects for assessment, which may be too late to see if students are adequately learning what they should be learning. The self-study did mention using courses (not clear which ones and where in the sequence they fall) but I'm not sure what aspect of the courses they were relying on for assessment
3. It makes sense to "piggyback" on assessments for the other programs mentioned, but do the assignments and assessments in these other programs adequately address the SLOs of this program?
3. Given the small size of your program, I agree that a portfolio-based approach should be used for direct assessment. This is a great way for you to distinguish the minor as an elite education opportunity.
3. Although having such a small number of students can pose challenges for assessing the program, it might also present some opportunities such as being able to do much more in-depth analyses, interviews, etc. that programs with a larger number of students might find difficult.
3. Minor draws information from WGS assessment data
3. The basics of an assessment plan are described, but more work is needed to fully develop this to the point that it can be implemented.
4. I marked "not applicable" because the program is too small to assess. But plans are underway to achieve this goal.
4. Can you work with the department and/or IRP to pull the information for your minors from your data? If you have students' ID numbers, you can track them by minor.
4. The observations based on the three students who completed portfolios are interesting. It will be important to see if these conclusions are supported by assessment with a larger N.
5. Evidence that curricular changes were propelled by assessment data is not provided, but the program is relatively new, so there may not have been enough time for sufficient assessment data to accumulate.
- 5-6. No processes developed yet.

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

#### 4-5. [MAJORS ONLY] Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students. Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University.

Sufficient Evidence	0
---------------------	---

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

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

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

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

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

#### Comments

1. Two degrees granted in past 5 years - however the program is relatively new.
- 1-2. As the self-study notes, the program needs to decide what it wants to do, if/in what format to continue.
- 1-2. The big question for me is whether it's worth keeping this minor given the very low enrollments. If there aren't plans to go online or otherwise increase the enrollment, could the same knowledge and skills be developed through advising students to take certain courses? Is it worth considering a certificate instead?
- 1-2. How much of a spike was there in Fall 2014 enrollment?
- 3-5. Program is not a major.
7. The department does acknowledge difficulty with being undersubscribed but do not seem to sort out how to deal with it
7. Under-subscription problem is supported with data.
7. Would the target of 40 minors require additional faculty?

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

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

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

#### 3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

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

#### Comments



1. Program is not a major.
2. They seem to talk of future benefits related to other majors, but have not addressed how their particular minor program would address employment opportunities (they wrote more in a global manner than a specific).
2. There really aren't data to address this question for this minor, but the argument made regarding good "companion" majors makes a lot of sense. I encourage the program to seriously think about how they might put this online, or at least how they could publicize and recruit more minors.
3. I didn't see where they tracked their graduates and according to a previous chart, there seems to be 2.
3. There have only been 2 graduates, so not surprising that they haven't done much tracking.

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

#### Comments

Again, they speak in future and global and not specific to their program.

### IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty Characteristics

#### 1. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.)

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

#### 2-3. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.

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

#### Comments

1. They have widely diverse faculty.

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

#### 1. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.

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

#### Comments

1. Faculty should be actively involved in promoting the program (for example, through advising).

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

#### 1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
<b>Comments</b>	
1. The assistant, associate, and professors seem quite active.	

<b>IV. Resource Availability &amp; Development: D. External Funding</b>	
<b>1. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.</b>	
Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
<b>Comments</b>	
1. It seems that most of their funding is internal to UW-W with the inclusive excellence programs	
1. Core faculty have been successful in getting grants, especially internal grants.	
1. Impressive NEH grant to Burkholder.	

<b>IV. Resource Availability &amp; Development: E. Professional &amp; Public Service</b>	
<b>1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.</b>	
Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
<b>Comments</b>	
1. Core and affiliated faculty are clearly very active in service	

<b>IV. Resource Availability &amp; Development: F. Resources for Students in the Program</b>	
<b>1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.</b>	
Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
<b>Comments</b>	
1. They seem to have a strong core of faculty, especially given the small size of the minor.	
1. I'm not sure whether the self-study is saying the program needs more resources or if it's okay.	
1. It seems that the program needs additional faculty, or at least some say in scheduling the faculty that contribute to the program. This type of cross-department collaboration can be difficult.	

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings****1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, and technological resources to effectively serve its students.**

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

**Comments**

1. All they wrote was that they have adequate facilities, equipment & technological resources without any specifics given.

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
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	1
No	2

**Comments**

1. They spoke in future and global views for strengths.
2. They noted their powerlessness over hiring as their areas of improvement. But, they seemed to have missed that small size of their enrollment in the minor.
2. As a new program, the program administrators recognize the limitations that the program faces as well as the opportunities for expansion.
3. Growing the enrollment of the program by 100% per year for the next 6 years should be a goal of this program. Although not explicitly stated, program administrators do suggest that they could easily accommodate 30 students.

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

- “Understand the principles essential for continual mental and physical well-being”—This is an extraordinary goal of your program. I commend you for considering this as a goal for your students! Well-done.
- Despite losing 2 online faculty, they seem to have a strong and diverse faculty
- Faculty contribute to multiple programs on campus. Their knowledge and courses contribute to our efforts toward inclusive excellence.
- The faculty credentials are a major asset to this program. The faculty are knowledgeable, skilled, and very dedicated to their students.
- Workplace demographics are changing rapidly in the US. Students who understand diversity are better able to thrive in the contemporary workforce. There is a need for this minor, as it helps to prepare students for their careers and to have a well-rounded education—One that includes a thorough understanding of diversity.
- Lots of individual attention is given to students.
- The Diversity Leadership Certificate is a nice option for students.
- The program’s mission and student learning outcomes align well with the University Mission and diversity goals.
- The program’s use of a portfolio-based approach for assessment is a strength, allowing them to do a detailed level of analysis that programs with larger numbers of students might find difficult.

## 2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- Engage in program strategic planning to identify specific goals, and it needs to monitor progress toward meeting these goals.
- The program needs specific plans on how they might increase the enrollment in the minor.
- Enrollment needs attention. With an average of less than 2 students per year, and 2 graduates total throughout the review period, we have to ask if the program is really needed. What are the real costs and benefits of the program?
- The actionable goal of creating assessment measures is laudable and we will expect to see this in your next A&R.
- Elaborate on how personal ethics will be developed through the program. What types of ethical theories are the students exposed to in this program? How will you assess this?
- Your mission statement needs attention in my opinion.
- The assessment plan needs to be fully developed and implemented. The basics are there but need to be further developed.

## 3. Other comments/questions

- I am concerned about the future of such a small program, particularly given the current financial situation of the University.
  - This program is essential in helping the University reach its goals for inclusive excellence. Despite this, little effort has been expended by anyone that I can see to increase participation.
  - Small size of the program is used as an excuse, but it seems that in order to accomplish your strategic goals, you may want to consider a strategic objective to increase enrollments in your program.
  - Don't limit your attempts at increasing enrollment to minorities and women, but also embrace men and Caucasians into your plan to increase enrollments.
  - Low enrollment in this program and the lack of attention dedicated to it should be a major concern for the entire campus community.
- Give evidence to support "significant one-on-one engagement."

## 4. Recommended Actions

- 1) Mission Statement:
  - a) Review and consider revising the program’s Mission Statement to be more inclusive of the full range of Gender Studies, including men’s studies and LGBT.
  - b) Engage in program planning. The self-study identified two main issues that have interfered with program planning (pg. 9, changes in personnel and no control over hiring or scheduling). Develop new program

- goals and objectives that take into account the current situation.
- 2) Determine how the program fits with the current array of programs, and consider its future with respect to enrollment and program format.
    - a) Clearly articulate how the program differs from others offered.
    - b) Develop a clear plan for enrollment and for course formats.
  - 3) Fully develop and implement the assessment plan.

**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	X*
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.	

**\*Submit a progress report describing progress toward the Recommended Actions, with particular emphasis on Recommendations 1 and 2. Due dates are March 1, 2017 to the Dean of College of Letters & Sciences and March 15, 2017 to Chair of the Audit & Review Committee.**