

**Minutes 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: Laurentide 4012

Attended: AVC Greg Cook; Dean Frank Goza (L&S); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Jonathan Burkham; Audit & Review Team Chair, Hephzibah Kumpaty; Audit & Review team members Fe Evangelista, Joan Littlefield Cook.

1. Call to order: The meeting was called to order at 3:10 pm by Chair Kumpaty.
2. Introductions of all those in attendance.
3. Overview of review team evaluation, program comments: Chair Kumpaty highlighted the program's strengths that were listed in the evaluation report. The international studies (IS) major is an interdisciplinary program offering BA and BS degrees (major and minor) with four different emphases. The program prepares students to fill the gap in workforce that requires global citizenship, diversity, inclusion and LEAP skills. The IS program supports a diverse undergraduate student population, especially multicultural and international students. The revised curriculum addresses deficiencies stated in the last review by requiring students to do study abroad along with completion of a global engagement certificate. Emphases are relevant and interesting, and use courses that are already taught by other departments. Other highlights include support for Gen Ed, diverse student body and a significant language requirement. The program offers many opportunities for campus engagement along with a flexible curriculum. The review team commended the previous program coordinator Anne Hamilton for her excellent leadership and dedication to the program.

After the brief opening comments, Kumpaty invited the current program coordinator, Jonathan Burkham, to provide comments and discuss accomplishments during the review period (2014-2018). Dr. Burkham presented a brief overview of the program strengths. He mentioned that he took over the role as program coordinator in January and thanked Anne Hamilton for her time and effort preparing the entire self-study report. He stated that the real strengths of the program are requiring two full years of second language coursework and six credits of study abroad. He will be teaching both the intro and the capstone courses for the majors.

4. Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a. **Program Assessment and curriculum:** *Articulate how the program is systematically tracking, analyzing and making use of data on student learning and in decision-making process for curricular improvement and program needs:* The program has begun collecting some data on assessment but the process has been slow. The coordinator has received the assessment plan that was proposed at the 2017-2018 assessment institute and is making plans to implement it fully to assess the SLOs. It appears that the coordinator and other faculty involved are working towards closing the loop with the data they have and they just need to stay on track to collect data on the rest of the SLOs. Dean Goza asked individuals teaching these courses in the major to stay proactive in communication to improve program needs. In addition to data on student learning, Goza suggested pulling a 10-year data from the IRP dashboard on enrollments and graduation rates to review and discuss the trends.

Discuss the role of department and advisory board to fully implement assessment plans in future. Discuss issues with course sequencing and issues related to recruitment: Dr. Burkham noted that the program currently doesn't have an advisory board and it's a good idea to put together one soon. John McGuigan and Dan Collieran from the Office of Global Studies were recommended to be part of the team. Vice Provost Greg Cook praised the idea of building a community with shared values to assist the program.

- b. **Mission and goal statement update:** *Develop a program vision and articulate objectives and goals. Goals should have an achievable timeline:* This matter was discussed and the coordinator was asked to review the vision and goals statement that would have an achievable timeline.
- c. **Resources:** *Evaluate and address resource needs, particularly as the program is relocating to a new department.* Dean Goza asked what the program needs are and how best the college can help in meeting the program's growth. The college is reviewing the releases for chairs and coordinators and the Dean hopes to develop a fairer system in the college to help the coordinators conduct administrative duties. Dr. Burkham mentioned about the large number of advisees he will need to handle alone and the time commitment involved. Review team member Fe Evangelista mentioned the summer projects the college would fund to do assessment activities. Attending the UW-Whitewater Assessment Institute would help, especially for new program coordinators. There was a discussion on providing financial assistance to students to fulfill study abroad credits as this is a mandatory requirement in the curriculum. Former Dean David Travis had pledged partial assistance, about \$1000, to low income students for study abroad but this plan has yet to be formalized. The Warhawk Emergency fund may be another source to consider in meeting study abroad needs. Vice Provost Cook asked for suggestions to explore other opportunities to consider for low income students to fulfill the study abroad credits. Carol Scovotti in COBE connects UW projects with universities in Germany. The program is doing a good job, an important program in today's world, Dean Goza commented. Vice Provost Cook said this is a good program and is exciting to see how the program transitions into the future.
5. **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists three recommended actions regarding program assessment, establishing a program steering committee, and revision of program mission and annual goals (see page 14).
6. **Recommended Result:** Continuation with minor concerns.
- Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
 - **A progress report on the Recommended Actions is due to the dean of the College of Letters and Sciences by October 1, 2021 and to the A & R committee by November 1, 2021.** The program's next full self-study will be due to the college dean by October 1, 2023 and to the A&R Committee by November 1, 2023
- 6) **Adjourn:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:08 PM.

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	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 clearer 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. 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 of the self-study as a guide (pdf page 24 . 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.
 2. Form a program steering committee of campus constituencies to:
 - a. guide program growth and continued success; and
 - b. ensure that program processes are sustainable into the future if/as the program transitions across coordinators or home departments.
 3. Update the program's mission, and set and monitor annual program goals with achievable timelines.
-

5. Recommended Result

Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	X*
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion.	
Non-continuation of the program.	
Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	

*** A progress report on the Recommended Actions is due to the dean of the College of Letters and Sciences by October 1, 2021 and to the A & R committee by November 1, 2021. The program's next full self-study will be due to the college dean by October 1, 2023 and to the A&R Committee by November 1, 2023**