

**Audit and Review**  
**Discussion of the Progress Report for International Studies**

**Date of Follow-Up Meeting: 2/7/2022 Time: 3:30-4:30 Location: LT 4120**

**In attendance:**

- 1) Call to order: 4:00
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Review of the A&R Response and Conclusion:
  - a) Program strengths
  - b) Advisory board
  - c) Program goals and long-term planning
- 4) Program responses and comments:
- 5) No further progress reports required. The next report due is the self study (due 2023).
- 6) Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:30 am.

*Review team report is attached below. The next full Self-Study is Due to the Dean October 1, 2023 and to the Office of Academic Assessment on November 1, 2023.*

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater**  
**Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Progress Report**  
**Undergraduate Programs, Academic Year**  
**Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Program Name: International Studies

Date of Review Team Meeting: 1/26/22

**Evaluations submitted by:** Andrea Ednie, Katy Casey, Bruce Cohen, Corey Davis

**Review meeting attended by:** Andrea Ednie, Katy Casey, Bruce Cohen, Corey Davis

## Recommendation #1

Recommendation #1

---

Fully develop and implement the assessment plan: a. Continue to collect data to track achievement of each SLO using the timetable described in section II.B.5. Make sure to include the data in the progress report and in the next full self-study. b. Find a way to track how the data are used to make decisions about courses, curriculum, and any other aspects of the program. Make sure to clearly articulate information about the use of data in the progress report and the next self-study.

## Recommendation #1 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

Good Progress	4
Making Progress	0
Little/No Progress	0

## Comments related to recommendation #1

Commendations for a well-developed and discussed assessment plan.

---

Excellent progress. Program personnel collected quantitative data assessing multiple SLOs and provided meaningful interpretation of these data and their implications for the program.

---

The attached assessment plans and documents demonstrate the program is addressing this recommendation and that there is an established assessment plan with evidence of full cycles including closing the loop.

---

The program has reported out data collected, analyzed, and discussed for 4 SLOs since 2018 (3, 4, 5, 7). There were samples of student work collected to be assessed on rubrics aligned with SLOs. There seems to be a process in place to review and discuss the data, and that the program can manage. A plan is in place to assess the remaining SLOs in time for the next full self-study.

## Recommendation #2

Form a program steering committee of campus constituencies to guide program growth and continued success; and ensure that program processes are sustainable into the future if/as the program transitions across coordinators or home departments.

### Recommendation #2 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

Good Progress	2
Making Progress	2
Little/No Progress	0

### Comments related to recommendation #2

Thank you for assembling the requested committee. And for considering the request for a contingency plan. Your response that "no concerns" exist at this time does not, however, answer the question of contingency.

Program constituencies met and had meaningful discussions about the data collected. They identified possible issues to consider in the future (e.g., broader discussions of reflective writing) but made a convincing and practical argument for not making any major changes to the international studies curriculum.

The program has established an advisory board - and they have met twice to develop an assessment plan and to assess SLOs.

An advisory group was established with members from different departments at UWW. Has the program considered adding a member who is external to UWW, maybe an alumni or partner? The report indicated the task with coming up with an assessment plan for 2021-22. It is not clear if that was accomplished? Are there notes from the meeting? It seems important to me that if the group is going to meet, there are tangible results so the time spent is worthwhile.

## Recommendation #3

Update the program's mission, and set and monitor annual program goals with achievable timelines.

### Recommendation #3 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

Good Progress	0
Making Progress	4
Little/No Progress	0

### Comments related to recommendation #3

Thank you for the work accomplished. We look forward to ongoing and determinative results.

The committee met and considered relevant assessment data in concluding the program continues to be sustainable.

Mission has been developed, goals have not yet been set. The progress report mentioned goal setting would be an agenda item for the next advisory board meeting.

The previous self-study reviewers suggested setting and monitoring program goals. The program has focused energy on assessing student learning. There was not a description of setting and monitoring program goals; although, I believe this work is probably occurring as is evidenced by the progress made in assessment and the advisory board.

I like that the mission and goals are featured in the fact sheet, accessible to prospective students and academic advisers who might suggest the program to students. ISAC has a good plan with practical goals and a realistic timeline.

### Recommendations for next review. Additional progress reports required?

Yes, Please List Due Dates (e.g. in 1 year, 2 years)?	0
No	4

### Next report should specifically address the following:

The program should continue working on the recommended actions from the last self-study. Good progress has been made in assessment, and the program should continue with their evaluation of the last 3 SLOs. Program meeting times and notes can be shared as evidence of discussing student learning, and also setting/monitoring program goals. It is probably a good idea to figure out the goal of the advisory group to ensure the meetings are meaningful.

How will the program processes remain sustainable into the future if/as the program transitions across coordinators or home departments? Monitor and report two years of annual program goals with achievable timelines.

Clearly report progress toward meeting and monitoring program goals- those geared toward improving and advancing the program. Include the proposed timeline for completing each goal, and criteria for determining success (part of self-study template under Program Goals and Accomplishments).

### Additional comments:

This progress report demonstrates impressive commitment to assessment - and the assessment documents appear to be very logical and well-designed. The advisory board appears to be a committed group and assessment results/implications appear to be clear, actionable items.

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for  
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
International Studies Majors and Minors, 2018-2019**

**Date:** 4/25/2019

**Time:** 3:15-4:15 pm

**Place:** TBD

**Invited:** Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean Frank Goza (L&S); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Jonathan Burkham; faculty and staff in the International Studies program; Audit & Review Team Chair Hephzibah Kumpaty; Audit & Review team members Andrea Ednie, James Collins, Fe Evangelista, Joan Littlefield Cook

7) Call to order

8) Introductions

9) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments:

This is an interdisciplinary program (major and minor) which prepares students to fill the gap in workforce that requires global citizenship, diversity, inclusion and LEAP skills. The program supports a diverse undergraduate student population, especially multicultural and international students. The revised international studies major curriculum addresses deficiencies stated in the last review by requiring students to complete a study abroad experience along with completion of a global engagement certificate. Emphases are relevant and interesting, and they use courses that are already taught by other departments. Other highlights include support for Gen Ed, a diverse student body, and the program's language requirement makes it unique and offers many opportunities for campus engagement along with a flexible curriculum. The review team commends program coordinator, Ann Hamilton's excellent leadership and dedication to assist the program.

10) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

1. **Program assessment and curriculum:** Articulate how the program is systematically tracking, analyzing, and making use of data on student learning, as well as in the decision-making process for curricular improvement and program needs. Discuss the role of department and advisory board to fully implement the program's assessment plan. Discuss issues with course sequencing and issues related to recruitment.

2. **Program curriculum:** Discuss issues with course sequencing and issues related to recruitment.

3. **Mission and goal statement update:** Discuss the program's overall vision, as well as specific objectives and goals. What is the program's timeline for achieving their goals?

4. **Resources:** Discuss program resource needs, particularly as the program is relocating to a new department.

11) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists four recommended actions (see page 14) related to assessment, mission and goals statements, forming a steering committee, and transition to a new program coordinator.

12) **Recommended Result:** *(Tentative) Continuation with minor concerns*

- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
- A progress report is required to address the recommended actions. This report will be due to the Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences by 10/1/2021 and to the Audit & Review Committee by 11/1/2021.
- The program's next full self-study will be due on 11/1/2023.

13) Adjourn.

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies  
Undergraduate Programs, 2018-2019  
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 2/21/2019 Short Self Study (SS\*) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Program: International Studies Major  Minor

**Evaluations submitted by:** Hephzibah Kumpaty, Andrea Ednie, James Collins, Fe Evangelista  
**Review meeting attended by:** Hephzibah Kumpaty, James Collins, Fe Evangelista, 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	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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	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	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

**Comments**

1. Impressive responses to all questions about mission, general education, and IE. Program seems very beneficial for our campus.
1. This is an interdisciplinary program (major and minor) which prepares students to fill the gap in workforce that requires global citizenship, diversity, inclusion and LEAP skills, therefore fulfilling the core values and strategic plan of UW-W.
2. Support for general education is well documented.
2. The program has several key strengths to offer; plays a large role in attracting diverse undergraduate student population, especially multicultural and international students. Emphasis is on cultural competence and global perspectives. The IS revised curriculum addresses deficiencies stated in the last review by requiring a higher # of credits to be earned abroad along with completion of a global engagement certificate and a 200 level LEAP skills course that provides the foundation as life-long learners
3. The IS program supports general education, proficiencies and goals as noted in the SLOs. The foreign language requirement for all IS majors is attractive which adds additional credit load to the general education requirement.
4. The program is supposed to track alumni data from Career and Leadership development office but the data provided was limited and the program is using its own effort ( tracking through a survey administered by the political science department and the data is yet to come.
4. Program appears to have made a lot of progress in responding to the recommended actions from their last self-study. Progress report notes are also positive. It appears the main two remaining needs are to continue to implement the assessment plan and to better track graduates.
- 4 - good progress made in responding to A&R recommendations, including attendance at Assessment Institute
4. Were any other resources needed? Evidence was provided for a few semesters, but it's not clear if this covered everything up to the present time. Otherwise, it appears that the program has been responsive to previous recommended actions.

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments**

1. Good to have mission statements for each of the emphases.
1. The mission statement looks good and reflects the scope and nature of the broad international studies program. The mission statement also has specific language to each of its four emphases.
2. Discuss the process for setting goals. Has data been gathered and reviewed on student learning in the goal setting process?
3. Not sure about whether there is a process for setting future goals? Self-study mentions that a group met in 2017-18 - would that have been during participation in the Assessment Institute? When do they next plan to have a goal-setting session?
- 3 - Goal setting process needs to be further clarified. For example, it is not clear to me if PolSci dept members and L&S International Ed committee are always consulted and how often. Also, how would the process change now that the program coordinator is in a different department?
3. What role do data on student learning play in the process for setting goals?
3. Limited information was provided; more details here are needed to evaluate all areas.
4. Program vision and steps to achieve were not addressed
- 4 - Missing the vision part of the response
4. The vision part is not discussed in this report and it is expected that a more cohesive statement would follow once the new program coordinator assumes the role.
4. Two new objectives are in place, but vision is on hold for next coordinator. This should be a recommended action moving forward.
5. Awesome faculty!
6. Response of "NA" was provided by the program. I assume that no form of accreditation is available?

**II. Assessment: A. Curriculum**

**1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable).**



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments**

- 1 - good description of the curriculum and why it is efficient and purposeful; There is a long list of elective courses which offer students great flexibility - are there noticeable course enrollment patterns (some courses offered more than others) that can help inform the program?
- 1. Issues of Econ 431 and capstone - program should continue to work to resolve challenges in student enrollment for these courses.
- 1. This is a 54-credit super major with no minor. The curriculum has the breadth and depth requiring 24 credits in the major along with unique requirements to include foreign language proficiency, six credits study-abroad/ travel study and completion of global engagement certificate.
- 2. Program indicates that dual listed courses are not available
- 2. Program does not offer dual-listed courses
- 3. List of approved courses was last reviewed in 2016 - time to do it again?

3. Does the program coordinator need to meet regularly with a team? Seems this person is responsible for making decisions such as changing course credits, alone?
3. The program added a 3-credit new course, inquiry and writing in the major, based on previous self-study recommendation. Are you still offering the one-credit intro seminar course to the major?
- 3 - Were the requirements for a Global Certificate and additional 3 credits of coursework abroad added in this review period? If so, these were not addressed in this section.
- 4 - Students are taking advantage of co-curricular opportunities and actively pursuing internships. There is potential for increase participation in undergrad research has been identified, and the new course INTRAR 200 could help.
4. There is no mention of what type of data has been gathered and considered in curricular and programmatic changes. Appendix II. B. (2) table mentions AACU rubric to be used in upper level courses but data is lacking.
4. Seems to be lots of opportunities for learning outside of the classroom - encourage program to continue to consider undergraduate research opportunities.
4. Impressive opportunities for students!
5. Good job in starting the organization, freedom force!!
5. Program indicates that online courses are not available.

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

Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
--	---

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

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

**Comments**

- 1-3. There is now a plan in place for addressing each of the SLOs. Going forward, try to implement the assessment plans.
  - 3. There is a systematic assessment plan in place for the ensuing years proposed at the 2017-2018 assessment institute.
  - 3. The program lacks a systematic plan to assess student learning outcomes and the comments look general and lack details. It appears like the program did some work where three of its SLOs were assessed using AACU rubrics, UW-W writing matters rubric and speaking well rubric in capstone course and 300/400 level course. How often did the program implement these assessments during the past 5-year review period? What type of data was generated and how has it been useful in promoting student success? The program requires all graduating seniors to participate in the senior exit surveys and there is some evidence of programmatic changes. Again, there is an issue in the
  - 4. Appears assessments are currently being carried out for 2 SLOs. Recommend that the program follow-through with their plans for assessments on the other SLOs.
  - 4 - used both direct and indirect measures; only SLO #5 was assessed because of lack of work samples for SLO #1, but recommendations based on the assessment results were made; glad to see the use of existing rubrics
  - 5. Appears the program faculty are closing the loop with the data they have... just need to continue to collect data on the rest of the SLOs.
  - 6. Use of the newsletter to distribute assessment data is smart!
- The two tables presented in Appendix D (part A & B) show SLOs' alignment with courses and with campus LEAP ELOs.

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

**3. [MAJORS ONLY] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years, or reasonably efficiently.**

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

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

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

**Comments**

1. Their enrollments have declined slightly but the program is still in demand and sustainable. The current program, after revisions, perceived to be more rigorous than the previous one requiring study abroad credits. I hope the students are receiving some level of financial assistance from campus to complete the six credits of study abroad requirement.
- 1-2: It appears the program faculty and coordinator are doing everything they can to support the vitality of the program... and the numbers seem good to me.
- 1-2: Very plausible reasons for decline in majors were given including increased requirements, and competition with Japanese studies and International Business. I think this should be further studied because it can affect the program's vitality
4. Excellent recruitment of a diverse group of students.

- 4 - 5: Data shows the students in the program are more diverse than university population.
- 6. The capstone course is offered only in spring semester and with good advising the program is managing to assist students graduate on time. There is definitely a need in future to offer this course both the semesters to prevent delays in graduation.
- 6. Capstone and ECON431 can impede student progress... needs to be addressed but it's on the faculty's radar and issues are currently being resolved through advising.
- 7 - What is the reason behind the estimate of 75 as the optimal number of students in the program?

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments**

- 1. This information would be more clear if presented in table format. I appreciate the details about specific students, but a complete picture of outcomes is not provided.
- 1 - Tracking graduates is difficult so I commend the author for using sources other than Career & Leadership data to give us some information about career placement.
- 2 - This is a difficult question for this program because of the wide variety of jobs for graduates, so I appreciate the thoughtful response.
- 2. Program is waiting for alumni survey results. Should recommend that they follow-up on this.

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

**Comments**

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

**Comments**

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

**Comments**

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

**1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.**

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

**Comments**

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding**

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

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

**Comments**

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

**1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.**

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

**Comments**

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: F. Resources for Students in the Program**

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

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

**Comments**

1. Program support is transitioning to the Geography, Geol & ES Department - current support for the coordination of the program is insufficient and does not motivate program development. Address how resources will be shifted/ allocated now that the program will be housed in a different department. Additional funding needed to support student recruitment and retention; faculty stipend increase should be considered for those who lead travel-study courses.

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

**Comments**

1. Program indicated "no deficiencies" but did not explain what they do have. The program indicates that there are no deficiencies in this area.

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

**1. Program strengths are discussed.**

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

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

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

**Comments**

- 1 - I agree with the listed strengths. The minor was not addressed in this study except for enrollment numbers.
- 2 - I did not see the student recruitment plan.
- 3 - New coordinator need to address this.
3. No recommendations were discussed; deferred to the new Coordinator.
3. Recommendations are left to the next coordinator. I hope the transition will go smoothly?

**VI. Reviewer Conclusions**

**1. Strengths of the Program**

1. This is an interdisciplinary program (major and minor) which prepares students to fill the gap in workforce that requires global citizenship, diversity, inclusion and LEAP skills.
2. Key features include serving large diverse undergraduate student population, especially multicultural and international students. The curriculum prepares students to excel in cultural competence and global perspectives.



3. The revised international studies major curriculum addresses deficiencies stated in the last review by requiring students to do study abroad along with completion of a global engagement certificate.
4. Support for Gen Ed, diverse student body, language requirement makes it unique, many opportunities for campus engagement, flexible curriculum, excellent faculty leadership.
5. Strong interdisciplinary major - emphases are relevant and interesting, and use courses that are already taught by other department - the program strengthens options for students interested in global education - well- thought out student learning outcomes

**2. Areas for Work or Improvement**

1. Slow progress on assessment. Only three of the SLOs had been reviewed during the review period. Not clear as to what the program has been doing until their participation in the assessment institute which occurred towards the end of the review period. There is no mention of what type of data had been gathered and considered in curricular and programmatic changes.
2. The capstone course is offered only in spring semester and with good advising the program is managing to assist students graduate on time. There is definitely a need in future to offer this course both the semesters to prevent delays in graduation.
3. Implement assessment plan to track SLOs in the next year or so and continue assessments activities in other courses.
4. Competition from other programs (i.e. Japanese studies) may affect program viability so this needs to be explored further - implement the assessment plan - Are student concerns about career advising valid? The numbers are small, so it is difficult to draw valid conclusions. At the very least, it should be looked into.
5. Fix issue with capstone and ECON course as bottleneck
6. Develop a vision and future goals and objectives
7. Address concerns with course sequencing and issues related to recruitment.
8. There were some sections that were left up to the new coordinator that still need to be addressed.
9. Follow-up on alumni survey

**3. Other comments/questions**

Good job on the self-study!

**4. Recommended Actions**

1. Progress report and next self-study should include data; Fully develop and implement the assessment plans and continue tracking of SLOs. Articulate how the program is systematically tracking the data and using it in making decisions about courses and curriculum. Include data according to the timeline on page 24 of the self study.
2. Mission and goal statement update: Check program goals; goals should have an achievable timeline.
3. Work towards forming a program steering committee of campus constituencies.
4. Find a way to make transition of coordinator go smoothly.

**5. Recommended Result**

Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	0
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	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	1
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

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
Non-continuation of the program.	0
Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0

**\*Progress report on Recommended Actions due to dean by October 1, 2021; due to A&R Committee by Nov 1, 2021. Next full self-study due to college dean by October 1, 2023 and to the A&R Committee by Nov 1, 2023.**