

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for  
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Art & Art Education Majors and Minors, 2019-2020**

**Date:** Cancelled  
**Time:** Cancelled  
**Place:** Cancelled

*Due to circumstances surrounding COVID-19, this program did not have a Face-to-Face (F2F) or Follow-Up meeting for their 2019-2020 review. The review team's initial report, including its recommended result of "continuation with minor concerns," was sent to the program and review team for final verification. The document below is considered the program's final report for the 2019-20 audit and review cycle. Please refer to a document on our website titled "Audit and Review and COVID" for further information.*

- 1) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 4 recommended actions (see page 16)
- 2) Final **Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns*
  - **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
  - A progress report is required on the date indicated below.
  - **Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:**
    - A progress report will be due to the College Deans on October 15, 2021 and to the Assessment Office by November 1, 2021.**
    - Next FULL self-study will be due to the College Deans on October 1, 2024 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2024.**

*The 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, 2019-2020  
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 3/13/2020 Short Self Study (SS\*) \_\_\_\_\_  
Program: Art & Art Education Major  Minor

**Evaluations submitted by:** Yamin Ahmad, Sarah Hessenauer, Yeongmin Kim, Deborah Wilk  
**Review meeting attended by:** Yamin Ahmad, Sarah Hessenauer, Yeongmin Kim, Deborah Wilk

**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

**Comments for I.A.1**

- The narrative shows that the program, along with the Department and the Crossman Gallery, clearly contribute towards the core values, the Mission and the strategic objectives of UW-Whitewater

**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

**Comments for I.A.2**

- The program was able to demonstrate that it supports general education by relating how the program provides classes with the GA designation that serve both majors and non-majors alike. The narrative did not address specific general education goals.
- Many GA courses.

**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

**Comments for I.A.3**

- Although the narrative touched on a number of different IE goals, the program provided some specific examples of faculty awards, in order to address the Rewards and Recognition goal; they also directly addressed the Curriculum/Co-Curriculum: Universal Design goal.
- Class content, workshops, visiting lecturers/artists. High-impact practices. Recent curricular changes.

**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	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for I.A.4**

- The program attempted to address some of the recommended actions. At the same time, it does not appear to have made progress on some of the others (based on the information provided). There were 4 recommended actions (RA's) at the last self study:  
RA 1: Facilities issues. The program appears to have made some progress with working with administration to address facilities issues.  
RA2: MMR Restrictions in promotional materials. I am not sure I fully understand the argument made as to why there are restrictions for promotional materials, but the program appears to have made some (limited) progress here as well.  
RA3: Continue forward with Assessment. Here, there appears to be very limited to no progress regarding assessment.
  - Implement assessment plan. It is unclear at this point of the report whether there are program level SLOs, as well as course level SLOs that feed into program SLOs. The narrative indicates that they have not implemented anything as of yet, but intend to do so within the next year.  
Systematic processes for review. The program appears to have a systematic process in place. They review student's works at various stages through the program  
Tracking use/impact of data on student learning. This does not appear to have been started upon yet.  
Tracking graduates. The department reports that 100% of all graduates found jobs (which is something that both the students and the program are to be congratulated on!). However, it is not clear from the narrative whether the program is actually tracking the students post-graduation.  
RA4: Consider relationship with MAGD and develop coordination plan. The program appears to have made some progress here.
- 
- Have made steps, but still working on all goals.
- 
- The process of reviewing students' work every year is systematic.

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

- What would the process of using the assessment data and improving the curriculum look like as the department has more consistent leadership?

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

**Comments for I.B.1**

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

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

**Comments for I.B.2**

- Program goals were listed for every year under review. However, the narrative did not address the program's success in meeting the goals listed.

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

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

**Comments for I.B.3**

- There does not appear to be any evidence of "intentionality" towards goal-setting, nor of gathering and reviewing data regarding assessing programmatic goals.
- There does not appear to be any evidence that data is being utilized to determine long term goals aside from curricular actions trying to address goals required for accreditation. While the self-study speaks to the activities that result in long-term goals, the narrative partially addresses the "process" part. In part, this may be due to the changes in leadership arising from personnel issues.
- In regards to goal setting and strategic planning, the following needs to be addressed: Does the program have a specific strategic planning process by which it utilizes these activities and data? What is the timeline for this (although this may be addressed later on in the self-study)?
- There is an outlined process.

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

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

**Comments for I.B.4**

- Given the turnover in Department chairs, the suggested revisions for the program appear appropriate. I concur with the narrative that securing consistent leadership is an important first step towards advancing both the Department and the Program. However, even in the event that takes a while to occur, one suggestion could be the formation of a Departmental Strategic planning committee that takes ownership of developing strategic planning goals for the program. This would include developing the strategic goals (like curricular revisions and recruitment/retention) that have been identified already.
- Concerns with if these will remain consistent with new leadership.

**5. The program, faculty/staff, and/or students have earned recognition or awards.**

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

**Comments for I.B.5**

- Missing any program or student recognition.

**6. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate.**

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

**Comments for I.B.6**

- It appears that the program has been responsive to and is on track to maintain re-accreditation by NASAD. Well done!
- There is one area that needs to be approved (art history subject matter).

**No General Comments related to Section I.B**

**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

**Comments for II.A.1**

- Thank you for succinctly summarizing the major differences in the programs, as well as providing the check-sheets for the programs and the respective emphases. The programs appear to be distinct and purposeful.
  - One concern that I have is in regards to credits to degree for a number of the programs. 78 credits (e.g. for the BFA - Art Major, or BFA – Art major with graphic design emphasis) seems to be on the high end. Even 42 credits seems to be on the higher end from my perspective. Does this have any issues with students graduating on time? How does this impact time-to-degree?

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

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

**Comments for II.A.2**

- 
- The program does not have any dual-listed courses.
- 

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

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

**Comments for II.A.3**

- 
- The majority of the curricular changes initiated by the program within the period under review appear to have been driven by external information (e.g. best practices, feedback from alumni, opportunities for students to have a high impact experience) or driven by the needs of reaccreditation.
  - However, one part that is missing here is any curricular changes driven by assessment data – based upon student learning outcomes. It is unclear at this stage within the self-study whether any data is being collected regarding learning outcomes (even from the graduation milestones) and whether that information is being discussed, or being used to inform changes within existing courses.
  - Demonstrated changes, but only reported "assessment data motivated". Not sure what data or where pulled from.
- 

**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
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for II.A.4**

- 
- The program offers an impressive array of opportunities for students to learn beyond the classroom. They are to be congratulated on these. One question I have is that the self-study mentions that faculty mentor undergraduate research. Are these driven by the faculty? How are students made aware of any opportunities for research?
- 

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

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

**Comments for II.A.5**

- 
- The narrative here mentions a number of ways that students are assessed within an online environment, and these are to be commended (e.g. comparing the exam scores of face-to-face sections with those online). However, the self-study does not address programmatic assessment for online delivery and continuous improvement.
-

- One suggestion to address this would be for online instructors to go through Quality Matters (as one such example).

**No General Comments related to Section II.A**

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

**Comments for II.B.1**

- The program does have clearly articulated student learning outcomes for each major. These are articulated using the action verbs from Bloom’s Taxonomy, which is good to see. I have two suggestions:
  - The first suggestion is to do with the order of the SLOs: the order of the SLOs seem to be mixed in the sense that lower order and higher order learning outcomes are intermixed. I would suggest listing the learning outcomes starting with the lower order outcomes (Remember/Understand etc) and moving on to the higher order outcomes (Differentiate/Create etc).
  - Second, it was not easily apparent to me how the different programs differed altogether in terms of the SLOs. I would suggest creating a matrix of common learning outcomes across the programs (e.g. “Conceive and create works that demonstrate understanding of the elements and principles of art and design in 2-D, 3-D media and digital environments”, which is an example of a common SLO) as well as where the learning outcomes differ – just so that it is easy to see how they differentiate.
- For the rest of question II.B.1, unfortunately I did not see any evidence of course mapping to learning outcomes, nor whether any outcomes received any specific attention during the review period. The course mapping should articulate where students are being introduced to materials relevant for SLOs, where they are developing the material, etc. How do the learning outcomes for the minor differ from the major? This was not apparent.
- Also, the program should consider the instruments to be used to assess the SLOs and where to collect the relevant data. Once it has done that, it can begin to close the loop. In particular, it will need to continue working towards collecting, analyzing and discussing the data. It also needs to figure out a mechanism on how to share the data with relevant stakeholders, including those beyond the Art and Art Education program. Finally, there is still some work to do with regards to developing a system for taking data-driven decisions. These should all be addressed going forward as a strategic objective.

**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

**Comments for II.B.2**

- Good alignment with LEAP ELOs! Well done!

**3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.**

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

**Comments for II.B.3**

- Currently, it appears that assessment is done at the various graduation milestones. This is to be commended. While it is apparent that there is assessment occurring (through the reviews outlined in the narrative), it is unclear how the program is assessing the particular student learning outcomes listed. For example the Committee Evaluation document included depicts a number of items that the committee uses to assess student performance. What is not clear is which instruments are addressing specific SLOs. These need to be articulated better (or created if they do not do so).
- Which SLO is assessed by which assessment measure? Also, are there any course-embedded measures?

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

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

**Comments for II.B.4**

- The program has some data that can be used for assessment: exit interviews and student responses from the Entry and Junior reviews.
- It is not apparent that the data collected can address the specific SLOs articulated in section II.B.1. at the course level, nor at the program level to date.
- It is not clear whether there has been any analysis done yet. This will be something that is ongoing, particularly with regards to the extent to which students are achieving the stated SLOs.
- Exit interview. Are there coursework assessment data?

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

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

**Comments for II.B.5**

- There is some evidence that the program is collecting data, although the amount of data at this stage is limited.
- There does not appear to be any evidence suggesting that faculty consider assessment data when making changes to the curriculum, SLOs.
- Based on information provided in section II.B.6. the program does appear to be making changes to the exit survey to extract additional information that may help with assessment in the future.



- The narrative suggests that “decisions regarding the curriculum and program have been informed by ... reports on internal assessment reviews ...” although no details on how that data was utilized is included. Presumably, this is based on reviews of the exit surveys, which appears to be the key source.
- There appear to be no embedded (internal) assessment instruments within the specific courses that is currently being used as feedback for the program.

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

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

#### Comments for II.B.6

- While existing data (from the reviews) appears to be shared within the Department, it does not appear that there is any dissemination to other stakeholders (beyond the Department) that is occurring.
- Not sufficient information on how the assessment information is shared with external constituencies.
- Concerns over classroom assessment, not just exit survey.

#### No General Comments related to Section II.B

### II. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: A. Trend Data

#### 1-2. Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

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

#### Comments for III.A.1-2

- Although the 5-year trends indicate that enrollments have declined somewhat from the 2015-2016 high, graduation rates seem to be on track. We might expect to see a decline there as the students who entered the program between 2016 – 2019 move through. The current numbers on the IRP website are marginally higher than those reported in the self-study for enrollment for the majors (-small typo for number of art minors in 2017).
- It appears that now, enrollment is available for MAGD by track. The visual media design track had the following numbers for the years: 2014-15: 68; 2015-16: 74; 2016-17: 85; 2017-2018: 82; 2018-2019: 1; Media Art: 2018-19: 85 (- I presume there is a switch to here from Visual media design track)
  - It would be nice to see the breakdown by gender and by URM to see how successful the Program has been in attracting diverse students.

#### 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

**Comments for III.A.3**

- The Program continues to have students graduating with a large number of credits above the 120 minimum, although they have declined in recent years. Credits to degree have ranged between 135.6 – 137.9 for the Art major, and between 137.5 – 148 for Art Education. This effectively translates into an additional semester (assuming 15 credits per semester).
  - While the narrative notes that this is because students need to develop a base level of skill, do they (for example) know to what extent students are coming late into the major?
  - Does the Program have some idea of what portion of the students graduating approximately a semester later because of difficulties navigating the major vs coming late into the major?
- Show 133.8-143.5 to degree.

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

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

**Comments for III.A.4**

- The Program has some strategies to recruit students into the major. The strategies in place appear to be designed to just increase the total number of students, but there does not appear to be specific strategies targeting the diversity of students in the Program.
- What portion of the students in the minor are male/female/URM?

**5. [MAJORS ONLY] Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University**

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

**Comments for III.A.5**

- Although the numbers provided are a little different to what is currently on IRP (which may be because they have been updated), the composition of student approximately mirrors the respective diversity at the University, although there is a big gender disparity.
  - Will this be a strategic priority for the Department going forward?

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

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

**Comments for III.A.6**

- The narrative refers to tracking student progress through a number of processes.
  - What are these processes? It would be interesting to find out.
  - How was student progress determined?
- What is the implication of 135 credits needed for graduation?

**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

**No Comments for III.A.7**

**No General Comments related to Section III.A**

**III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: B. Demand for Graduates**

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

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

**Comments for III.B.1**

- Well done tracking graduates and on the placement rate for those reported.

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

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

**No Comments for III.B.2**

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

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

**Comments for III.B.3**

- While the Program does appear to have made some efforts to track its graduates, it does not appear that this is a systematic effort; rather it seems that knowledge of student placement stems from the exit survey and with ongoing post-graduation connections between faculty and alumni.
- More systematic efforts will be needed at the departmental level.
- 2013 was most recent.

**No General Comments related to Section III.B**

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

**Comments for III.C.1**

- While the narrative points out the key strengths of the program, it did not address who the key competitors are, and what their competitive edge is with regards to the major here at UW-W.

**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

**No Comments for IV.A.1-2**

**3-4. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.**

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

**Comments for IV.A.3-4**

- The Program has lost four full-time faculty in recent years, which has obviously had a large impact on both the Program and the Department.
- The Program has identified what they currently need given recent retirements and other losses. These are obvious priorities. It may be instructive to delineate a prioritized list of positions that need to be filled so that the Program can return to a sustainable trajectory.

**No General Comments related to section IV.A**

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

**No Comments for IV.B.1-2**

**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

**Comments for IV.C.1-2**

- The faculty appear to be very active in their scholarly work.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding****1-2. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.**

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

**No Comments for IV.D.1-2****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

**No Comments for IV.E.1-2****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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments for IV.F.1**

- It would be useful to see some calculations on SCH per FTE numbers to assess whether there is sufficient faculty that can serve the program, particularly given the recent changes. If this is high enough, an argument could be made to the Deans for additional FTE faculty.
- There is other evidence provided in the self-study to suggest that this is indeed the case. The strongest of these is the feedback from the accreditation body that the amount of staff is too low for a Department of this size. This is a strong argument for considering additional resources for the program in order to meet student needs.
- The S&S budget decline in real terms has to be addressed to allow for depreciation of existing equipment.
- Concerns about updating and expansion.

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

##### Comments for IV.G.1

- The narrative makes a strong case (also based on feedback from the accreditation body) that additional instructional space is needed to improve safety. Other aspects like the availability of accessible bathrooms to serve the needs of students.
- Additional technological resources may be needed: if faculty are having to use their own personal computers for instruction, then this is a shortcoming that needs to be addressed.
- Concerns about space and facilities.

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

##### 1. Program strengths are discussed.

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

##### Comments for V.1

The dedication of faculty and instructional staff towards students is to be commended.

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

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

##### Comments for V.2

- The Program has some clear ideas on where they can improve.
  - Assessment is a big area that has been recognized as one where there is room for additional progress.
  - Other details would be helpful, particularly as to whether the Program has considered the impact of declining enrollments, and if this trend continues, how will it affect existing resources?

##### 3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

**No Comments for V.3****VI. Reviewer Conclusions****1. Strengths of the Program**

- 
- The program is clearly served by very dedicated faculty whose focus has been student orientated – to serve the needs to of the students. This is to be commended.
  - It offers general education courses that address diversity.
  - The Program utilizes high impact practices including undergraduate research and community based learning.
- 
- Faculty commitment, regular advising, involvement of community/professionals with the program
  - Congratulations on the 100% placement rate
- 

**2. Areas for Work or Improvement**

- 
- I have two main suggestions:
    - First, additional work needs to be done on Assessment and this has been recognized by the program in the self-study. While the program has articulated student learning outcomes, it is not clear that current assessment practices actually measure those outcomes. In my opinion, there are three key priorities for the program when it comes to assessment: (a) , create an assessment map to determine in which courses students receive instruction on the learning outcomes to be assessed, and where that assessment will actually occur; (b) align SLOs in specific courses with program level SLOs; (c) , determine where program level SLO's will be assessed and with what instruments. Once the data begin to come in, the program needs to close the loop and begin to use the data to drive decisions.
    - Second, develop a robust strategic planning process, even in the event that a Department chair cannot be found in the immediate future. This could be done through the formation of a Departmental strategic planning committee consisting of a subset of faculty members in the Department. This committee could help the faculty in the Department determine and coordinate on short term strategic priorities as well as long term goals in a consistent manner.
- 
- More clear articulation of how each assessment measure is used to assess SLOs and ELOs.
  - Needs to be addressed with new leadership. Need to address space. Need more thorough assessment process.
- 

**3. Other comments/questions**

No other comments/questions

**4. Recommended Actions**

1. Continue to develop Assessment practices:
  - a. Create a curricular map that aligns courses and SLOs. In addition, identify on the map where in the program the SLOs are introduced, developed, and assessed. Examples of curricular maps are available from the Office of Academic Assessment.
  - b. Determine what instruments (embedded/internal/external) will be used for assessment.
  - c. By the time of the required progress report, have collected, analyzed, summarized and (time permitting) made use of data that clearly address at least 2 of the program’s SLOs. Include details on this work in the progress report.
  
2. Explain how the program uses data to drive curricular and programmatic decisions. Document examples of how data are used to impact these decisions.
  
3. Strategic Planning:
  - a. Create a timeline for annual strategic planning
  - b. Explain the process of setting and evaluating program goals
  
4. Personnel:
  - a. Continue to work with the Dean’s office to secure additional personnel
  - b. Continue to address personnel issues.

**5. Final Result: *Continuation with minor concerns, progress report required***

Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	1
<b>Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.</b>	<b>3*</b>
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns	0
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
Report not submitted; refer to Provost for action.	0

*\*A progress report will be due to the College Deans on October. 15, 2021 to the College Deans, and to the Assessment Office by November. 1, 2021. to Assessment, of 2021*

*\*Next FULL self-study will be due to the College Deans on October 1, 2024 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2024.*