WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Meeting of June 25, 2021

ITEM: Approval of Undergraduate Program Review Recommendations

INSTITUTION: West Virginia University Main Campus, West Virginia University Institute of Technology, and Potomac State College of West Virginia University

COMMITTEE: Full Board – Consent Agenda

RECOMMENDATION: Resolved: That the West Virginia University Board of Governors approves the Undergraduate Program Reviews conducted by the Graduate Council in this cycle, for the 2020/2021 academic year.

STAFF MEMBER: Maryanne Reed
                              Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

BACKGROUND: The West Virginia University Board of Governors is required to review one-fifth of all programs offered at West Virginia University and its divisional campuses each year, so that all programs are reviewed every five years.

                              May 1, 2018, and effective June 11, 2018, established the procedure for this review, using a review committee.

Executive Summary – Academic Year 2020-2021

- 23 graduate and 15 undergraduate programs were reviewed and 26 follow-up actions from previous program reviews were completed
- 16 programs were discontinued
    - 7 were a direct result of the program review process
    - 8 resulted as the College of Education and Human Services reviewed its curriculum in preparation for the program review process
    - 1 was discontinued to change to a new name and academic focus
- 1 was recommended for merging with another program
- 3 will be on annual monitoring to achieve viable enrollment

Graduate Programs

- 23 programs were reviewed
- 14 were continued at the current level of activity
- 7 programs were continued with specific action
    - 5 actions were assigned to assessment of student learning
    - 3 actions were assigned around achieving viable enrollment
- 1 was recommended for discontinuance
- 2 were recommended for Program of Excellence
    - MA Literacy Education
    - PHARMD Pharmacy

Program	Follow-up actions recommended
EDD Instructional Design and Technology	Discontinuance
MA Special Education	Enrollment; Adequacy of faculty
MA Educational Psychology	Enrollment; Assessment of learning
MS Resource Economics	Enrollment; Assessment of learning
MA Education	Assessment of learning
MS Forestry	Assessment of learning
MS / PhD Animal and Nutritional Sciences	Assessment of learning

Follow-up Actions Assigned in Previous Years

- 7 programs had follow-up actions reviewed
- 2 programs were discontinued
- 4 programs resolved their issues
- MS Recreation, Parks, and Tourism Resources did not resolve concerns about its enrollment
    - Will be asked to follow-up again each of the next two years

Program	Follow-up action status
PhD Music Education	Discontinued
PhD Reproductive Physiology	Discontinued
MS Reproductive Physiology	Discontinued
DMA Music	Adequacy of faculty, facilities: resolved

MA Musicology	Enrollment: resolved
MS Recreation, Parks, Tourism Resources	**Enrollment: not resolved**
PhD Neuroscience	Assessment of learning: resolved
PhD Pharmacology and Pharmaceutical Sciences	Assessment of learning: resolved

BOG Graduate Program Review Reports AY 2020-21

Table of Contents

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

Graduate Certificate Program - University Teaching

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes

○ No

◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body

○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values. If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether ornot the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The program "creates a diverse and inclusive culture that advances education" by allowing students to take courses from different disciplines, take 3 credit hours in a course specifically related to learner diversity and inclusion, and by helping students become highquality and effective teachers.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program has one tenured professor, three directors of the Teaching and Learning Commons, and four instructional designers, one with a doctorateand the other three with master's degrees. All instructional designers have over 5 years of teaching and learning experience in higher education.
Certificate programs do not need to provide evidence of productivity. However, the full professor published 3 articles.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

○ Yes
◉ No

Q4.2. What was inaccurate?

> Expected time to completion appears to be missing.

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The program's enrollment increased every year but 2016-2017. However, after that year they increased their recruitment efforts and enrollment has goneup every year since. Because the program is not cohort-based, the number of students enrolled is higher than the number who graduated. They do not include time to completion in their review, but it has gone up considerably from 1.8 years in 2015-2016 to 4.3 years in 2019-2020. They do note that thereis no expected time to completion and that they have more doctoral students enrolling in the program, which takes them longer to graduate than studentspursuing a master's degree. They obtained information on student success through a survey and advisors keeping in touch with graduates. Through this,they identified that many are employed in higher education, some are pursuing their doctorate, and a few are employed outside of higher education.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

○ Yes
○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The Teaching and Learning Commons Director and Associate Director assess the products that students produce from GRAD 710, GRAD 680, and GRAD 685. The review does not identify what these products are or what the results of their assessments were. Students in these classes also provide mid-semester and end-of-the-course feedback that is then used to improve the courses. The review does not identify any feedback that has been given or how it was used to improve the courses. Each student that graduates completes an exit interview with a program staff member, which is used to improve the program and courses. No information was provided on what feedback they have received regarding improvement and what they have done with that feedback. In Spring 2021, a formal assessment of student's teaching ability will be conducted. There is no evidence of assessment in this program review.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

Learning outcomes were revised to more accurately reflect what students learn and to more clearly align with the activities and assessments of the certificate. The elective requirement was changed to Instructional Excellence, which allows students to learn more about effective teaching and learning. Courses were reviewed and some were removed and others added to better meet student needs. The review indicates that in Spring 2021 they will be instituting a formal assessment of student teaching. Graduate council suggests the program document and provide evidence of their assessment, which led to these specific changes/improvements.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
○ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ○ Maybe
- ◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

- ◉ Continuance at the current level of activity
- ○ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
- ○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
- ○ Identification of the program for further development
- ○ Development of a cooperative program
- ○ Discontinuance

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

EdD Instructional Design & Technology

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes
○ No
◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The program does not explicitly state how the program aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values, however, the program does provide program objectives that support WVU's mission, vision, and values. The program objectives particularly aim to develop programs that train students in best practice in the design of instructional delivery environments from the classroom to the boardroom, develop working relationships with other WVU units aswell as corporate and non-profit organizations, and develop a national reputation for the Instructional Design and Technology program in the areas of instructional design and online teaching as well as faculty specializations. The program aims to provide students with IDT foundational knowledge, and IDT competencies in interconnectivity, instructional design, and software/multimedia design and implementation, and prepare for employment in higher education teaching and research and in educational, corporate, governmental, and nonprofit institutions.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken toaddress those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources. The program did not experience any significant issues in adequate and accessibleinfrastructure resources.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Though the number of tenure track faculties has declined over the five-year period, the total number of instructional staff has remained constant. The average faculty grant monies reported for this time period are approximately $12,205 per tenure track faculty member per year. Similarly, an average of
1.73 journal articles, conference proceedings, or book chapters per year was reported by tenure-track faculty members during this time period. Eachfaculty member teaches either three or four sections per year.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

There is a decline in student enrollment from 17 to 12 FTE. The program is also having difficulty in finding applicants who met the admissions criteria.The IDT faculty voted in Fall 2020 to sunset this program.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The program has created a set of assessment objectives and is working towards achieving those objectives. The learning outcomes have been operationalized based on five standards for initial IDT programs from the Association for Educational Communication and Technology (AECT). Student grades in these classes are used as the basis for assessing these standards. All 8 graduates of this program during the five-year review period have earned grades of either "A" or "B" in these classes, indicating that they are successfully meeting these standards.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

> The program has lost four faculties in the review cycle. A new program in the same department offering a Ph.D. in Learning Sciences & Human Development was approved, and this program offers a specialization in IDT. In order to avoid duplication of effort for two substantially similar programs, and in order to allow the existing faculty to focus on rebuilding the M.A. program in IDT as well as to develop potential undergraduate offerings, the IDT faculty voted to discontinue the IDT Ed.D. program. As of September 2020, the program is no longer accepting applications. Existing students will be supported through the completion of their program of study and graduation.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ○ Maybe
- ◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

- ○ Continuance at the current level of activity
- ○ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
- ○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
- ○ Identification of the program for further development
- ○ Development of a cooperative program
- ◉ Discontinuance

Q8.4. Provide a rationale explaining the recommendation for discontinuance.

The program has lost four faculties. There is also a new program in the same department offering a Ph.D. in Learning Sciences & Human Development was approved, and this program offers a specialization in IDT. In order to avoid duplication of effort for two substantially similar programs, and in order to allow the existing faculty to focus on rebuilding the M.A. program in IDT as well as to develop potential undergraduate offerings, the IDT faculty voted to discontinue the IDT Ed.D. program. The program faculty voted to "sunset" the program, which will require approximately six years to support the studentscurrently enrolled in the program through their graduation.

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

MA Educational Psychology

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes
○ No
◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The MA in Educational Psychology program prepares students with skills in the following areas of Ed Psych: 1.) learning and development, 2.) instructional development, and 3) measurement, research and statistics. It includes 2 majors (Educational Psychology and Program Evaluation and Research). The degree program is aligned well with the land grant mission of WVU in that it prepares highly qualified professionals to serve in the educational sector by providing valuable services in public and private schools, colleges and universities, extension service, and various human serviceagencies. By doing so, they enhance the well-being of and quality of life of individuals in WV and beyond.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken toaddress those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources. They indicate no issues with any physical infrastructure, technology support, accessto library, and note they are able to provide student accommodations as needed. They also report having adequate faculty and staff to meet their needs/mission.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Faculty appear to be highly productive in regards to publication and grant money received. (118 journal articles, 7 book chapters, 6 proceedings, $170kin grant money). They also engage in multiple public and professional service roles. They note that there has been a significant amount of faculty turnover in the past few years, with tenured faculty leaving and the hire of new tenure track or non-tenure track faculty to replace them. Currently only 1tenured faculty member and 4 pre-tenure/tenure track faculty on the unit.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

○ Yes
◉ No

Q4.2. What was inaccurate?

The Child and Family Studies major is still listed.

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Student enrollment has declined over the past several years, although continuance for enrolled students is high. They note a couple of reasons for this. First, they stopped admitting students who had a specific interest in behavioral analytics/special education because they had lost faculty members with that specific expertise. They also discontinued the Child Development and Family Studies major, as they had decreased numbers of students in this track. They now only have two tracks: the major in Educational Psychology and the Program Evaluation and Research major. They describe a targeted recruitment plan that they plan to employ in order to increase enrollment. This plan includes: 1.) targeted recruitment of undergrad students in educational courses, 2.) developing a new communication plan that will engage students who are admitted before they start, 3.) hosting monthly informational sessions via Zoom for potential applicants, 4.) using social media platforms to engage potential students and new ones, 5) updating schoolwebsite, and 5) working with grad admissions on marketing efforts They also note a decreasing number of graduates and increased time to completion. The decreasing graduates are linked to decreased enrollment, which they plan to address with their recruitment plan (above). They note increased time to completion is related to beh. analysis/SPED students, who took longer to graduate. These students are now all graduated so they believe the TTC willdecrease.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The assessment plan includes holistic evaluation of student achievement of competencies (Student Learning Outcomes/SLOs). Full faculty meet annually to discuss each student's progress as evidenced by performance and behavior. They use faculty expertise to evaluate, but do not use specific rubrics. Students who do not meet competencies are notified via Degree Works and email. If progress is not made by next year they are aske to leave the program. The program review indicates that students meet their competencies, but they do not provide data on the numbers of students enrolled thatmeet the benchmarks vs. those that do not. No other assessment plan was noted.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

> The program has initiate a new major: Program Evaluation and Research and discontinued the Child and Families Study major. They have also made all their program requirements so that they can be completed online. They also have created a 12 hour certificate program in Program Evaluation, which can be a pathway to the MA. The program may benefit a more extensive and specific evaluation plan. This would include making their benchmarks more specific and utilizing rubrics to assess completion. Also, it would be helpful to track student outcomes (e.g., who is asked to leave vs. who is not). Studentevaluation data may also be helpful.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ○ Maybe
- ○ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

- ○ Continuance at the current level of activity
- ◉ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
- ○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
- ○ Identification of the program for further development
- ○ Development of a cooperative program
- ○ Discontinuance

Q8.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted.

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

1) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections orparticular prompts).
2) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections orparticular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data.
3) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan.
4) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.

In December of each of the following next three years, submit a follow-up report to the Graduate Council, that: a) establishes a target enrollment for the program that is approved by both the college and the Provost's Office as being viable long term b) demonstrates the program's progress to increasing itsenrollment to meet that target By December of 2022, provide evidence of assessment of the program's learning outcomes and of post-graduate outcomes.

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

MA Education

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes
◉ No
○ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.3. Explain why the program is not in good standing with its accrediting body. Provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to good standing.

The accurate answer to the question is "yes, with an explanation," but that choice wasn't available on the prior screen. The program's accrediting body isCouncil for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). The CAEP performed a site visit to the WVU program in March 2019. The CAEP granted accreditation with stipulation. Unfortunately, there are two documents referenced by the CAEP cover letter that I need to assess this issue that were not included in the file: 1) Accreditation Action Report and 2) Information on CAEP Accreditation with Stipulation.

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The MA in Secondary Education aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values in numerous ways. This program provides service to the state of West Virginia by requiring students to complete field placement hours in schools throughout the state. Our students have learned about diversity and inclusivityin all courses especially C&I 689 Cultural Diversity in the Classroom. As they go into the local public schools, they are utilizing this knowledge to make positive impacts in the classroom. This is shown through respect and appreciation in interactions with students and staff. There was a nationwide teachershortage prior to COVID-19. The pandemic has only increased the shortage as many teachers are taking early retirement or leaving the field due to the additional responsibilities. West Virginia University has worked closely with the public-school systems as well as the West Virginia Department of Education to help solve some issues related to the shortage. Many of our Secondary Education majors are now accepting Teacher in Residence (TIR) positions which mean they are in their own classroom during student teaching being periodically supervised by a mentor and university supervisor. (Theyare also compensated for their efforts.) Due to this, students are held accountable even more so than in the past. All these factors combined prove that the MA in Secondary Education clearly reflects West Virginia University's mission, vision, and values.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken toaddress those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The program's self-assessment did not report any infrastructure/resource issues.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The Program reports the following faculty activities: The MA in Secondary Education faculty are doing remarkable work in many different facets. Severalfaculty members have advocated for social justice university wide as well as nationwide. This has led to research and publications concerning topics such as the impact of race and ethnicity on education. Their work aligns with WVU's mission to provide a diverse and inclusive culture. Throughout this cycle, our faculty have published numerous articles in top tier journals as well as book chapters. As a society, we have faced nationwide teacher shortages as well as teacher strikes. Now, we are facing a pandemic which has drastically changed education. Faculty have utilized these situations to not only guide research but also the structure of their courses. Faculty have presented their findings at conferences throughout the nation on topics suchas those listed above. In addition, we have faculty members that have contributed to funding by obtaining grants such as Dr. Jeffrey Carver and Dr.
> Sharon Hayes who worked together on the educational programming and research being conducted at WVU as part of the NSF Research InfrastructureImprovement (RII) grant ($20,000,000 funded July 2015). This project includes a $1,500,000 task to CEHS. Dr. Carver's most recent effort was a grant from the National Science Foundation for $306,036 that includes Project Based Learning educational curriculum development in the Earth Sciences.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

- ⦿ Yes
- ○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The Secondary Education program saw a 33% decline in enrollment between 2010-2018, roughly the same as the enrollment decrease in education degrees nationwide. There was also a large decrease in enrollment in the 2014-16 period. The program responded by working with the WV DOE to use a comprehensive exam as a substitute for the completion of some courses. The Program is also exploring an entirely online option. These options are intended to make the Program more accessible and less expensive. The Program is also considering decreasing credit requirements. There are three high D/F/W courses, with % D/F/W in parentheses: C&I 585 (20%), C&I 588 (18.18%), and EDP 600 (40%). The Program attributes the high % in C&I toa decrease in the overall graduation rate of the Program, which would lead to fewer student teachers at the end of the program. I believe more information is needed to determine what is happening here with the D/F/W numbers. It is unclear whether this a long-term trend, and if so, what is causing it and what can be done about it.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

⦿ Yes
○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

⦿ Yes
○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

⦿ Yes
○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Assessment information can be found on pages 16-27 of the Program's self-study. Assessment of work in the Program follows a plan called "Signature Assessments," which includes a variety of methods: graded course work; content exams; portfolios; instructional plans; performance assessment; lessonplans; and research projects. There are 6 Signature Assessments: 1: Praxis II Content Exam 2: Signature Assessment 2: Grades 3: Signature Assessment 3: Ability to Plan Instruction 4: Signature Assessment 4: Performance Assessment #1 5: Signature Assessment 5: Effect on Student Learning 6: Signature Assessment 6: Dispositions .

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

The Program changed Key Assessment 5, "Effect on Student Learning," from requiring the Principles of Learning and Teaching Praxis exam to now requiring edTPA, which is a more in-depth performance assessment that requires student teachers to video their teaching and evaluate/discuss how theirteaching is meeting the goals required by the program and accrediting bodies. These performance assessments are evaluated by a third party and assigned a score. WVU decided upon the cut score required for a passing rate by comparing scores from other institutions/states. In an effort to better prepare students, we have embedded edTPA preparation into C&I 588. The last couple of semesters, we have combined C&I 588 with 680. Right now, we have this listed as a special topics course with intentions of requesting a permanent course. This course covers edTPA submission as well as the state mandated technology requirement. Because of Covid, the WV DOE gave WVU the option of substituting the Principles of Learning and Teaching Praxis exam for the required edTPA performance assessment. This is due to the erratic nature of schools going back and forth between in-person and remote learning. The Secondary Education Program accepted this option for the 2020-2021 school year. Also, the Program cut the World Languages track due to declining demand.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
○ Maybe
◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

○ Continuance at the current level of activity
◉ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
○ Identification of the program for further development
○ Development of a cooperative program
○ Discontinuance

Q8.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted.

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

1) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections orparticular prompts).
2) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections orparticular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data.
3) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan.
4) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.

By December 2021, submit a follow-up report to the Graduate Council that specifies if the program has made progress in resolving the issues raisedduring their most recent CAEP accreditation review.

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

MA Instructional Design and Technology

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes
○ No
◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The program does not specifically state how the program aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values, however, the program does provide program objectives that support WVU's mission, vision, and values. The program objectives particularly aim to develop programs that train students in best practice in the design of instructional delivery environments from the classroom to the boardroom, develop working relationships with other WVU units aswell as corporate and non-profit organizations, and develop a national reputation for the Instructional Design and Technology program in the areas of instructional design and online teaching as well as faculty specializations.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken toaddress those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources. The program did not experience any significant issues in adequate and accessibleinfrastructure resources.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Though the number of tenure track faculties has declined over the five-year period, the total number of instructional staff has remained constant. The average faculty grant monies reported for this time period are approximately $12,205 per tenure track faculty member per year. Similarly, an average of
1.73 journal articles, conference proceedings, or book chapters per year was reported by tenure-track faculty members during this time period. Eachfaculty member teaches either three or four sections per year.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

There is a steep decline in student enrollment, from 43 in AY 15-16 to a low of 17 in AY 19-20. The reason for the decline in students is due to no active recruiting programs in place during this time period, and the program relied simply on word-of-mouth advertising. The program faculty have been aware of the recent declining enrollments and initiated a recruitment campaign beginning in February 2020 with an increased presence at relevant professional conferences, including a recruiting table staffed by current students in the program. In August 2020 we began working with the new CEHS recruitment officer to roll out an aggressive phase in the recruitment campaign that includes outreach via email and social media as well as monthly "ask me anything" live sessions monthly for potential students with program faculty. These efforts have already begun to pay off; during Fall 2020 we admitted eight new students to the program, as compared to a maximum of three during a comparable time period in previous years. The time to complete has averaged slightly over three years. The program continuance rate has hovered around 78%, with the exception of AY 19-20, which saw the program continuance rate drop to 69.2% due to COVID-19-related program withdrawals. Students from the IDT M.A. program have been active co-authors with WVU faculty. They have contributed to conference presentations, co-authored peer-reviewed publications, secure successful positions in the instructionaldesign field

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The program has created a set of assessment objectives and is working towards achieving those objectives. The learning outcomes have been operationalized based on five standards for initial IDT programs from the Association for Educational Communication and Technology (AECT). Student grades in these classes are used as the basis for assessing these standards. All 70 graduates of this program have earned grades of either "A" or "B" in these classes, indicating that they are successfully meeting these standards. The program lost 4 full-time faculty members due to retirement, leaving WVU employment, or death. The program has also secured final approval on 12/8/2020 for a 15-credit Certificate in Online Teaching, both to attract additional students to the IDT M.A. program and provide an additional credential to assist IDT M.A. students in their career progression.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

> The program has seen a steep decline in Students. The program has also lost tenured faculty members. However, the program has identified the reasons for the decline in the number of students and is making amends to increase student numbers. The program has also been able to keep the number of instructional staff constant. The program also created a 15-credit Certificate in Online Teaching, which comprises coursework from both the IDT program and the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. This is an impressive program improvement initiative that will attract additional students into the IDT M.A. program and provide an additional professional credential to assist IDT Master's students in their career progression.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ○ Maybe
- ◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

- ◉ Continuance at the current level of activity
- ○ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
- ○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
- ○ Identification of the program for further development
- ○ Development of a cooperative program
- ○ Discontinuance

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

MA Literacy Education

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The program aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values, as described below: Vision: To prepare specialized literacy professionals to serve as practitioners, interventionists, and literacy leaders who will work collaboratively to provide all children access to instruction and equitable access to rich learning environments. Mission: To offer sound, accessible, and advanced professional preparation for PK-12 teachers at the graduate level to positively impact PK-12 learning for all students. SERVICE: The interventionist role is the focus of this advanced certification, preparing candidates to serve as leaders to meet the service mission of the land grant institution by providing the state with high-quality educators. CURIOSITY: This program's instructional design is grounded in the WVU Online Conceptual Model. RESPECT: The program providers engage in partnerships with PK-12 schools and other approved educational settings to provide candidates multiple opportunities to participate in school-wide experiences. The program faculty is committed to creating reciprocal, positive relationships with partners. ACCOUNTABILITY: This is a 100% online program and faculty agreed to have course content evaluated using a modification of the Quality Matters (QM) 21 essential standards recommendations, overseen by WVU Online.
APPRECIATION: Adopted a social constructivist orientation based on on vision, mission, and learning outcomes.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken toaddress those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program does not report any issues in this area.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

There is a shortage of faculty: only two full-time faculty members to teach 50 students online. An issue that existed before (the use of adjuncts instructors) has been discontinued. The change of teaching load from 3-3 to 2-2 at the departmental level affected the faculty availability for the program.See below: Until Spring 2020, the LE program used practicing Reading Specialists and Graduate Assistants to serve as adjuncts instructors under the mentorship of two tenured faculty. As such, the adjuncts were at the same degree level and the coursework they were instructing and we were told to discontinue this practice. Since then, the program has relied on one high-quality literacy educator (Ph.D. level with Reading Specialist certification) who has served as the primary adjunct. Additionally, one new assistant professor (Ph.D. level with Reading Specialist certification) started in fall 2020 and this will help when she assumes a full teaching load (2nd year). Also, conflating the faculty resource issue, the C&I/LS department has recently moved from a 3-3 teaching load to a 2-2 teaching load requirement (19-20). This shift lessens the number of courses the program's two dedicated and one new tenured faculty can teach. ILA reviewers noted concerns that the LE program lost 4 faculty over an 8-year period; relative to other programs, 50 online students is a high number of candidates for two full-time faculty to lead, support and manage.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

- ◉ Yes
- ◯ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

There was a positive trend in enrollment until last year, when there was a slight retraction. The graduation trend is very positive. Time to completion hasbeen uneven, but since there is no cohort system, and most students are full-time teachers with many commitments and financial distress, it is understandable that time to completions varies. The main measure of success is the high pass rate (around 90%) of the PRAXIS 5301 test. Most graduates continue in their classroom teaching positions, while others bid on interventionist or Title 1 position in their counties/districts

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> Very comprehensive and thorough assessment plan. Details are below: The assessment plan is built around learning outcomes derived from the International Literacy Association's Standards for Literacy Professionals 2017. From 2015-2019, LE candidates (classroom and school professionals) complete 8 key assessment (including certifying praxis); this number of key assessments was reduced to 6 in 2020. These assessments are submitted inLiveText. The data collected in Live Text is analyzed annually by faculty, areas where candidates score unacceptable and acceptable. In the five years since the LE program submitted the last BOG program report, program faculty have completed a curriculum review and revision, transitioned to 100%online, and submitted and were awarded a distinction award from the professional organization (ILA). • Change from Reading Education to LiteracyEducation • New LE Program Coordinator selected (Dagen) • Closure of required on-campus Reading Clinic. • Program faculty awarded an external grant to work with PK teachers statewide, focus on emergent literacy and National Board Certification, carried out statewide,100% online • Program shifted from a blended model to fully online • Quality Matters reviews applied to online courses One of the largest changes was with the online, technology-supported practicum. The LE candidates are required to participate in two intervention sessions where the focus is struggling readers in a school-based setting.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

The program has been improving following the recommendations of the ILA accreditation body. The main change has been the transition to 100% online, working closely with WVU Online, and to 8- week content courses. There was a complete curriculum review and updates. No new changes are expected unless something emerges from hte accrediting body or University policy.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

◉ Yes
○ Maybe
○ No

Q7.3.
Provide a brief summary for why the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction.

In your summary make sure to address why the program meets the requirements for each of the following categories (see the description of those requirements at the Program Review website):

Distinction

Faculty

Graduates

Curriculum and Assessment

Q7.4. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "distinction" as follows:

The accrediting body awarded the program National Recognition with Certificate of Distinction (COD) for the Preparation of Literacy Professionals, thetop recognition, one of two programs in the country to receive this award.

Q7.5. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "faculty" as follows:

Both faculty members have a strong record of publications, several awards, and a significant grant to support PreK teachers' efforts in early literacy.

Q7.6. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "graduates" as follows:

High pass rates of PRAXIS 5301 test. Leadership of graduates in their work environments.

Q7.7. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "curriculum and assessment" as follows:

The curriculum was fully updated following the accrediting body guidelines, and since the move online, courses comply with Quality Mattersrequirements.

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

- ⦿ Continuance at the current level of activity
- ○ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
- ○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
- ○ Identification of the program for further development
- ○ Development of a cooperative program
- ○ Discontinuance

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

MA Special Education

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

This program aims to produce quality teachers in an effort to address the teacher shortage in WV and it is offered online in an effort to increase access and diversify its pool of graduates. Program representatives are also actively working with the WV DOE to get input on areas they would like to see targeted for training. In this way, it appears to meet the land grant mission of WVU that aims to provide services and education to consumers and constituents of the larger WV area.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

No issues were identified related to infrastructure or resources.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

They note that they do not have adequate instructional staff. Currently they have only 1 tenured associate professor and 1 service professor. Other faculty have been redistributed to other units- and so excess courses are staffed by adjuncts. In 2018, the Dept of SPED was eliminated, which is the reason for this distribution. They do not report any plan to address this issue. They report that the two faculty that remain are 1.) 60% admin/40% teaching (tenured prof) and 2.) 40% teaching/60% service (service AP) Despite not having formal research requirements, they are still active in various projects, have presented at conferences and provide university level service at multiple levels.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areas of emphasis, etc.

○ Yes
◉ No

Q4.2. What was inaccurate?

The catalog pages currently say the program is closed to enrollment, however this was because they have not been able to update. They had temporarily closed to admission while they were doing program revisions, but have re-opened due to needs during COVID. They plan to update the page when the catalog opens. Also the Link provided to the Learning Outcomes does not go to that page. However, LO's are accurate and appropriate.

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Enrollment has decreased by 65%. This is partly b/c the program was downsized. The department of SPED was eliminated, and this is the only remaining MA program. A policy change that allowed teachers to get certified by passing a praxis exam has impacted the need for individuals to obtain a MA in SPED. Some ways they are trying to address enrollment is by decreasing the number of credit hours required from 36 to 30 and to create a pathway where the last year of the BA has shared courses. This would decrease the amount of time required to complete the degree. The declining enrollment has also impacted the # of graduates. Regarding student success, 71-100% of students have pursued a WV Teaching certificate.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

- ⊙ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

- ⊙ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

- ⊙ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> They have a multidimensional assessment plan that is identified in their self-study, and which follows the guidelines of their accrediting body. They assess student success on multiple dimensions (core knowledge, grades, ability to plan instruction, success in internship, and a professional portfolio).Most recent outcomes (2017) indicate that the majority of students are passing the benchmarks for all of these. No issues re: assessment were identified.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

> They have changed one of their assessment elements from the praxis exam to edTPA, which requires students and teachers to video their teaching andevaluate how it meets goals of the accrediting body. They redesigned one of their courses (SPED 668) to include a pre-edTPA component to help prepare students. They also offer a special topics course related to this assessment.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
○ Maybe
○ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

○ Continuance at the current level of activity
◉ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
○ Identification of the program for further development
○ Development of a cooperative program
○ Discontinuance

Q8.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted.

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

1) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections orparticular prompts).
2) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections orparticular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data.
3) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan.
4) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.

By December 2022, provide a follow-up report to the Graduate Council that: 1) Details the change to program enrollment that has occurred since the restructuring of the college's master's level offerings in Special Education. AND 2) Examines the number and adequacy of faculty in this program relativeto the number of students enrolled in the program at that time.

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

MAgr Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Design

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes
○ No
◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The WVU mission, vision, and values all emphasize the foundational land grant mission of education, research, and service in focus areas that directly impact the state and beyond. Our M. Agr. program is consistent with this as it is an interdisciplinary program in the areas of agriculture, natural resources, and design. All of these are foundational areas of land grant institutions, that directly connect our students to communities - both near and far. This program provides the opportunity for advanced education for students not interested in, or prepared for, more traditional research-focused programs. Many of these students opt to complete problem reports focused on real-life problems involving education, healthcare, and prosperity.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Generally, the program reports no significant problem with infrastructure resources. The report indicates that the program have access to all needed resources.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The program reports sufficient faculty for the needed teaching responsibilities as well as needed research and service. This program is a college widedegree without dedicated faculty for this specific degree.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> In the data provided, the average enrollment for years 17-18, 18-19, and 19-20 (11.67) is less than in years 15-16 and 16-17 (19). However, students thatgraduated in 16-17 had a much higher time to completion (2.84) as compared to the average for the other four years (1.7), so the increased number of students in years 15-16 and 16-17 may relate to a few students that took longer than normal to complete the program, rather than indicate that student numbers are actually declining. The average enrollment over the past 8 years is 14. The program continuance was in the range of 70-75% in the earlier years in this data, which is as anticipated. Some students enter this program while working to improve their transcript for professional school and when it works they don't always complete the program. Alternatively, some students will begin in this non-thesis degree program and then opt to change to one of the thesis-MS programs in the college. The drastic drop in continuance in 17-18 is related to the launching of a new non-thesis program, MS Energy Environments, in the college and several students changed from the M Ag program changed to the MS EE. This is still noted to a lesser degree in the
> 18-19 continuance data. AGEE 642 was identified as a high DFW course for students in this program. The course has recently underwent a revision incontent, to make it more consistent with the course description, and had a change in the instructor.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The assessment plan seems to be lost with the previous Associate Dean. The new Associate Dean will be working with the oversight committee to develop and assessment plan, primarily focused on post graduate information. As of now, summer 2020, the new Associate Dean was provided no data on students in this program, current or past. It was indicated that there was some personal knowledge of a few graduates acceptance to dental school and several job positions in extension were noted. There has been a reactivation of the program oversight committee this semester (Spring, 2021) with a primary task being to establish an assessment plan to collect time to completion, job placement, professional school admittance, and other data identifiedas useful to the program. A process has been outlined. The new assessment plan, once developed, should be presented to the Graduate Council for feedback.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

There was a change in this cycle was the reduction of total required credit hours from 36 to 30, which went into effect for the 2019-2020 catalog. The requirement of half of these credits to be focused in 2 divisions within the college, with no fewer than 6 credits in each division, remain to ensure a broadinterdisciplinary aspect to the program. This was done to ensure consistency between this program and the new MS Energy Environments and is viewedpositively. There is an oversight committee for the program, including one representative from each division in the college. Reportedly, this committee has been largely underutilized and all decisions related to the program were made in the Associate Dean's office. They are currently in the process of reactivating the oversight committee and identifying a faculty point of contact for the program. This committee will be involved in curriculum and admissions decisions and assessment of the program. As these discussions and decisions evolve, it is recommended that the Graduate Council review such decisions to provided feedback and guidance as needed.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
○ Maybe
◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

○ Continuance at the current level of activity
◉ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
○ Identification of the program for further development
○ Development of a cooperative program
○ Discontinuance

Q8.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted.

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

1) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections orparticular prompts).
2) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections orparticular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data.
3) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan.
4) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.

> The program should submit the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program changeand/or improvement related to assessment to the graduate council by the end of Spring, 2021.

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

MLA Landscape Architecture

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The MLA's mission is consistent with WVU's mission in delivering high quality education, excelling in discovery and innovation, modeling a culture of diversity and inclusion, promoting health and vitality and building pathways for the exchange of knowledge and opportunity. Students are prepared to become effective professionals and citizens by emphasizing a philosophy of responsibility and commitment to ethical standards regarding the natural environment and community, building professional practice and personal relationships. It is this umbrella of values that provides the foundation on which the goals and objectives of the program are built and implemented. Using innovative teaching methods, the Program provides students with knowledge, skills, and abilities in design theory, problem-solving, site construction, land use planning, landscape management, and planting design. These are pivotal for graduates' effectiveness and success in the workforce and are responsive to the unique qualities of the state and the region. The MLA Program is uniquely situated in a Research 1 institution within the SDCD in the Davis College of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Design. This promotes interaction and collaboration within the community and with other disciplines such as interior architecture, horticulture, design studies, fashion design, sustainable design, geographic information sciences, forestry, and resource management to name just a few.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Program has adequate resources including student accommodations, classroom space, technological infrastructure and support, lab space, equipment, library resources and library personnel support.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The program has 1 Professor, 5 Associate Professors, 2 Assistant Professors, 2 Teaching Assistant Professors and 1 extension professor. Of these, 7 are tenured 2 are in tenure-track and 2 are in non-tenure track. The program has sufficient faculty members to maintain the program in good standing. Credentials of faculty members are top quality, commensurate with their positions in accordance to the Faculty Qualifications Accreditation Policy.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> Enrollments in the MLA program are closely tied to assistantship availability. In a resource constrained environment assistantships become more difficultto fund and therefore student numbers have not grown. Initial planning and enrollment targets for the MLA Program envisioned a graduate student population of between 15 and 25 students. The Program has had between 12 and 15 students between the three cohorts with student numbers now slightly down. Informal recruitment efforts continue by all faculty. Obtaining additional research funding to support graduate research assistantships is also regarded as a critical step in recruiting high quality graduate students. No concerns exist with D/F/W courses.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

⦿ Yes
◯ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

⦿ Yes
◯ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Given the fact that this Program is Accredited by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board and this Program was recently accredited. The program has an ongoing self-assessment process based on student learning outcomes evaluation, and also an indirect assessment element through surveys conducted with alumni. The program has not had significant change over the cycle. The renewed accreditation of the program in 2020 demonstrates meeting the needs of the LAAB in delivering a high quality academic program in preparing students for professional practice in landscape architecture

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

There are currently no changes planned for the MLA program. The Program continues to seek external funding to support graduate research assistantships to increase student population. The program accepted 7 students for fall 2020 and were only able to offer two partial assistantships. Mostof the applicants were international and without a contract for an assistantship they were unable to attend. Two concerns are the lack of funding sourcesexacerbated by the pandemic, which are necessary to offer more assistantships to students to increase enrollment, and the challenges brought by the demand for distance or on-line teaching.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ○ Maybe
- ◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

- ◉ Continuance at the current level of activity
- ○ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
- ○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
- ○ Identification of the program for further development
- ○ Development of a cooperative program
- ○ Discontinuance

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

M.S. Forestry

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes
○ No
○ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
◉ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.4. Is the program seeking specialized accreditation? Why or why not?

In BOG review questionnaire, the response to Q2.2 "Is the program accredited?", the response was No. The response to Q2.3 "Is there a national accrediting body for programs of this type?", the answer was No. However, it appears to the reviewer that such a body does exist. The Society for American Foresters (SAF) provides accredits Master and B.S. degrees in forestry and related topics. The SAF lists an accredited Master of Forestry degree at Yale University, University of Maine, Michigan Technological University, State University of New York - College of Environmental Sciences, Duke University, and North Carolina State University. Although the reviewer is not an expert in this area, given the small number of accredited Master programs, it seems likely that some strong Master of Forestry programs are not accredited by the SAF. Reference: https://www.eforester.org/Main/Certification_Education/Accreditation/Main/Accreditation/Accreditation_Home.aspx

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

West Virginia has extensive forests and aligns with WVU's service mission to the state. The study of forests is important to consideration of resource management. The unit's faculty also contributes to the scholarly mission of the university by publishing papers and securing grants.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The unit reports no significant issues with program resources.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in thisarea, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issueshave been adequately resolved.

The program reports an adequate level of faculty to sustain its programs. The unit reports that all of its faculty are qualified on the basis of traditional academic credentials, and that the unit's each faculty member, on average, gave 7 presentations and authored 2.7 papers per year during the reporting period. The unit reports more than $4 million in grant funding on the BOG program review questionnaire, although the program review materials indicateas much as $39.1 million in grant money reported in Digital Measures over the 5.5 year reporting period. The number of tenured, tenure track, and non- tenure track faculty have been relatively stable throughout the reporting period: between 20 and 24 tenure/tenure track faculty, and between 7 and 13 non-tenure track faculty. The number of Graduate Assistants has varied significantly, with a high of 11 in 2017-2018 to a low of 3 in 2018-2019, followedby 5 in 2019-2020.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

○ Yes
◉ No

Q4.2. What was inaccurate?

The admissions criteria for the M.S. Forestry degree on the M.S. Forestry webpage (https://forestry.wvu.edu/graduate/master-s-programs/forestry) arediffer at points from the admissions criteria in the Catalog (http://catalog.wvu.edu/graduate/daviscollegeofagriculturenaturalresourcesanddesign/divisionofforestryandnaturalresources/forestry/#admissionstext).

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program is stable with respect to enrollment (16 to 19 students), number of graduates (5 to 8 per year), and time to completion. The program has nohigh D/F/W courses. The unit reports that a critical metric for student success is scholarly productivity (presentations, publications, grants). The unit reports 241 student presentations, 112 peer-reviewed journal articles with student authors (29 of which had student first authors).

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program has not previously conducted a formal assessment. The program plans to introduce a "MSF Defense Assessment" form, on which faculty will rate students in the program's two official learning objectives and in three additional learning objectives that the form describes as "auxiliary". The program plans to begin such assessment in Spring 2021. I note two areas of potential concern: 1. The rating categories with respect to Learning Objective 2 references "thesis research" and "thesis". However, the program also has a non-thesis option. It is unclear how the proposed assessment applies to students who pursue the non-thesis option. 2. Exclusive reliance on this form is probably insufficient to get a full picture of the state of the program. For example, according to the program's BOG review questionnaire, student scholarly activity (presentations, papers, grants) is a critical metricfor success. It would be natural to include such activity as a part of the program assessment.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

> The program has begun to develop its assessment procedures, although improvements in this area are likely needed. The program should also address the inconsistencies between the admissions requirements listed in the catalog and on the WVU Forestry webpage. If appropriate, the program may wish to consider seeking accreditation from the Society of American Forestry (SAF). On the whole, the available evidence is indicative of a stable, healthy program with productive faculty and students.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ○ Maybe
- ◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

- ○ Continuance at the current level of activity
- ◉ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
- ○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
- ○ Identification of the program for further development
- ○ Development of a cooperative program
- ○ Discontinuance

Q8.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted.

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

1) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts).
2) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data.
3) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan.
4) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.

By December 2021, submit a follow-up report to the Graduate Council demonstrating that the program has resolved the published admissions inconsistencies between what is in the Catalog and on the WVU Forestry page. Ideally, admissions information should be removed entirely from the Forestry page and linked to in the Catalog. By December 2022, submit a follow-up report to the Graduate Council demonstrating the program's implementation of a plan for assessment of learning, including direct evidence of the program learning outcomes as well as post-graduate outcomes.

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

MS Genetics and Developmental Biology

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes
○ No
◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The program provides a mission statement that is consistent with the mission of West Virginia University.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program appears to have adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program has adequate faculty and provides sufficient data for faculty credentials, composition and productivity.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The program has a relatively low enrollment (3-4 students each year). However, this is not a major concern since the MS program is run in conjunctionwith the PhD program. Therefore, the MS program does not require additional resources above the PhD program, and does provide opportunities for those students wanting an MS. The time to completion data are hard to interpret: program lists the average time to degree as 3 years while the data graph lists yearly averages as between 1.4-1.8. The program should attempt to better track time to degree of these students.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The program provides a link to the Learning Outcomes, which are clear and measurable. However, there are not separate learning outcomes for the MSprogram and the PhD program. The program provided an approved Assessment Plan, which stated that for this review cycle, assessment of student's ability to read and interpret primary literature and student success in obtaining employment post-graduation. A faculty completed survey showed that thefaculty evaluated student's ability to evaluate primary literature as "Exemplary." The program also provides a list of 6 graduates since 2017, and the employment for each student. Program states that no changes have been implemented "at this early stage of the assessment cycle." A suggestion is to incorporate an Exit Survey for the program graduates, as a primary method to gather this information.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

> Recommend the development and utilization of an Exit Survey, to be completed by all students at the completion of the degree. This survey would allowthe program to gain student feedback on the program, to consider adjustments to the program, and to better track time to degree and student success.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
○ Maybe
◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

○   Continuance at the current level of activity
◉   Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
○   Continuance at a reduced level of activity
○   Identification of the program for further development
○   Development of a cooperative program
○   Discontinuance

Q8.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted.

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

1) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections orparticular prompts).
2) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections orparticular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data.
3) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan.
4) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.

The Program should work to create a plan to better track time to degree, with clear quantitative data. Also, while the program states that an AssessmentPlan was approved, it is not clear why each of the 4 Objectives are only assessed once every 5 years. Recommend that each Objective be assessed every 5 years to better track program and student success.

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

> MS Animal Nutritional Sciences; PHD in Animal and Food Sciences

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

> The program is aligned with the university mission. Faculty report that there are international student opportunities and that the research carried outaddresses disparity by studying topics like food production and delivery as well as the environment.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken toaddress those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> NONE

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The program has adequate faculty who are qualified. The report indicates that the faculty have been funded by 50 sources external to WVU. With over
> 4.3 million in funding. The source of these numbers is DM. Faculty are serving at high levels such as on editorial boards and on average, faculty arehaving 2 research publications per year. The students are engaged with faculty in research opportunities as well.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

◉ Yes
○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The student enrollment has remained rather consistent. The MS program did see a dip in enrollment that was temporary and related to faculty loss but this has been adequately addressed. The PHD program maintains a relatively constant number of students with approximately 14 current students and18 graduating in the 5 year review period.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The entire assessment plan is as follows: "Our division does not currently have an active assessment protocol but recognize the need for this information. To this end we have addressed the issue at a recent faculty meeting and decided to establish an exit interview and survey of each graduating student, which will address the topics listed in the University Assessment Council. The tools to be used to provide evidence of assessment have not yet been established but will be in place for the next program review. " This plan is not specific and not adequate to assess outcomes of a masters and PhD program

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

none noted

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
○ Maybe
○ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

○ Continuance at the current level of activity
◉ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
○ Identification of the program for further development
○ Development of a cooperative program
○ Discontinuance

Q8.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted.

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

1) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections orparticular prompts).
2) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections orparticular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data.
3) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan.
4) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.

By December 2021, submit a follow-up report to the Graduate Council that demonstrates differentiation of the program learning outcomes between the Master's and PhD levels. This should also be submitted in CIM by that time. By December 2022, submit a follow-up report to the Graduate Council that demonstrates implementation of assessment of learning for the program's student learning outcomes as well as post-graduate outcomes.

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

MS Plant and Soil Sciences

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

While the MS program in Plant and Soil Sciences states consistency with the mission of West Virginia University, it seems like this program is most aligned with the mission to "advance education" and conduct "high-impact research." The MS program in Plant and Soil Sciences is consistent with the WVU vision in that its faculty and students work toward "needed and valued solutions to real-life problems."

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

According to the report, the program sees no shortage is resources or student accommodations.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

According to the numbers, there is an average of 18/19 tenured/tenure track faculty in the program. 3 to 4 Non-tenure track, 2 GA's then bumps up to 6 GA's in the last reporting year, and roughly 4 to 5 "Not Assigned" faculty. The report listed research funding in excess of 6 million dollars over 51 grants, while the spreadsheet provided reported $8,660,057.00 over 71 awarded grants. The report stated that faculty are averaging 18 publications during the reporting period, while the spreadsheet reported an average of just over 16 publications per faculty. Faculty at all ranks are involved in teaching. Faculty are active in service activities and assessment activities.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areas of emphasis, etc.

◉ Yes
○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Report indicates a consistent level of students enrolled, roughly 10-15 students a year. A dip in students in 2016-18, but student enrollment has gone up since. Program continuance also is pretty level, 85%-100% continuance levels with a dip in 2017-18. Most drastic change is the time to completion, which averaged 4 years in 2014-15 and is now down to a more standard 2 years for the MS degree. The report indicates no major D/F/W trend.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Outcomes outline that students will demonstrate a fundamental knowledge of other areas relevant to environmental soil and water sciences, gain an ability to read and understand, peer-reviewed scientific literature, employ technical skills and interpret data, effectively communicate concepts, and be able to design, conduct, and interpret the results of experiments. In response to a specific action requirement from the previous BOG review cycle, an assessment plan was written and approved, and the program is currently in the third year of performing annual assessment of learning outcomes. The assessment document lists outcomes, how these outcomes are assessed (Course grades, Committee meeting report form/annual evaluation, Direct communication with student as facilitated through advisor) and the assessment cycle for each outcome. The assessment document listed that a majority of students (11 of 15) were deemed competent by faculty for the learning outcome related to their ability to read and interpret primary literature (deemed to be an important outcome that needed focus). The report focused on faculty better encouraging and training students to access and understand primary scientific literature through seminar courses. The assessment document also shows that graduates have been successful in obtaining jobs in their field within one year of graduating.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

Other than small changes in the curriculum to address more attention to better encourage and train students to access and understand primary scientific literature through seminar courses, there were no other major improvements mentioned in the report.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ○ Maybe
- ◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

- ◉ Continuance at the current level of activity
- ○ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
- ○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
- ○ Identification of the program for further development
- ○ Development of a cooperative program
- ○ Discontinuance

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

MS Resource Economics and Management

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes
○ No
◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The primary objective of this program is to prepare students for further graduate study or a variety of careers in business and government. This degreeprepares students to directly addresses WVU's mission by enhancing the well-being of the people of West Virginia through promoting sustainable economic development of agricultural and natural resource use within local, state, and nation economies.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken toaddress those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program has issues with access to technological infrastructure. PhD students do not have access to software like STATA . Accoriding to WVU ITdeparment computers are too old to support this software application.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

To address lack of necessary faculty, the division postponed development of MS focus areas in Energy Economics and Agribusiness Management. Theyhave not pursued the "4+1" non-thesis option as was planned in the previous five year cycle. They are offereing a online hybrid version of the existing MS program

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

◉ Yes
○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Enrollment is an a pattern of decline fromm 11 in AY15-16 to 3 in AY 19-20. The main factor influencing enrollment in this graduate program is the availability of funding to financially support M.S. Revised non-thesis option to inlcude fewer credit hours to be more competitive with other institutions.Proposed an online version of our MS program to attract applicants.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q5.3. Provide a specific critique of the program's learning outcomes.

There only three. The wording is awkward and incomplete. Current:Can apply microeconomic theories to analyze resource economics and managementissues. Suggested: Apply economic reasoning to the analysis of selected contemporary economic problems. Current: Demonstrates the use of quantitative tools in the analysis of applied issues in resource economics and management. Suggested: Demonstrate proficiency the use of quantitative tools in the analysis of applied issues in resource economics and management. Current: Is proficient in oral and written communication. Suggested: Recognize and formulate effective written and oral communication, giving appropriate consideration to audience, context and format.

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

◉ Yes
◯ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

It's not clear that the program assessment plan is align with the program outcomes. Assesment is based on comprehensive written and oral exam butperformance data is not provided.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

Program improvements involve a name change. Reduction in credit hours for the non-thesis pathway from 36 to 30. Core courses have been updated tobetter serve the dual purpose of providing training to MS as well as PhD students who lack necessary training in empirical modeling and theoretical foundations. Core courses have been updated to better serve the dual purpose of providing training to MS as well as PhD students who lack necessary training in empirical modeling and theoretical foundations. ARE 621 (Quantitative Methods) was updated to include targeted training in linear programming and modeling. The course now includes hands-on exercises using General Algebraic Modeling System (GAMS) that is widely used by natural resource economists. The course covers fundamental methodologies and algorithms as well as applied modeling contexts like resource allocation, sequencing, blending, risk analysis, and partial equilibrium modeling. ARE 601(Applied Micro Economics) was updated to include material necessary or both MS and PhD students.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
○ Maybe
◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

○ Continuance at the current level of activity
◉ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
○ Identification of the program for further development
○ Development of a cooperative program
○ Discontinuance

Q8.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted.

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

1) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts).
2) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data.
3) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan.
4) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.

> By December of each of the next three years, submit a follow-up report that: a) establishes a target enrollment for the program that is approved by both the college and the Provost's Office as being viable long-term; b) provides an annual up-date on the progress that the program is making towards meeting that target. By December 2022, submit a follow-up report to the Graduate Council providing evidence of assessment of learning for the program's student learning outcomes and for post-graduate outcomes.

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

MS Wildlife and Fisheries Resources

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes
○ No
◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The mission of WVU is to advance education and impactful research to bring needed and valued solutions to real-life problems within the pillars of education and prosperity for all. The Masters of Science degree in Wildlife and Fisheries (MS-WFR) is integral to these values and in its support of the mission of the Division of Forestry and Natural Resources to further the understanding, stewardship and sustainable use of renewable natural resources by educating students to become knowledgeable professionals and citizens, advancing and communicating research knowledge, and providing technical information and professional service to society. Further supporting WVU's commitment to create a diverse and inclusive culture, our faculty is comprised of a diversity of experience, educational backgrounds and gender.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Generally, the program reports no significant problem with infrastructure resources.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The WFR faculty is currently comprised of 3 tenured Professors, 1 tenured Associate Professor, and 4 tenure-track Assistant Professors, 2 of which started in August 2020. They also have 3 faculty in the USGS Fish and Wildlife Cooperative Research Unit and one Research Assistant Professor, who is a 50:50 split position between the US Forest Service and our Division. Overall there appear to adequate number of faculty to maintain the program and these faculty members maintain a high level of productivity as evidenced by a sizeable number of books, book chapters, journal articles, and grant awards.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc

◉ Yes
○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

WFR MS enrollment has doubled during the cycle from 15 in AY15-16 to 30 students in AY19-20. The year-over-year persistence of MS students (Program Continuance) also increased during the cycle from 73% in AY14-15 to 94% in AY18-19. Enrollment, graduation, continuance and time tocompletion indicators have been stable over the last 5 years and with additional faculty, should continue.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The program has a detailed written assessment plan and provides an overview of assessment outcomes over the previous review period. Results suggest that students are generally on track and demonstrating the program's learning outcomes. Their Assessment Plan was adopted in January 2018. The first step in their assessment was to develop rubrics for use in student evaluation during their comprehensive exam and thesis defense. To date, said rubrics have not been developed or implemented. Therefore, the program has not progressed in their year one implementation of rubrics for use in comprehensive and thesis defense exams. The revised plan is to move year one assessments to year three.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

> The WFR MS program remains a strong and productive program. Based on newly adopted program goals and learning outcomes, our students are broadly trained, conducting independent research, and disseminating their findings in oral and written formats. Their trajectory in both outputs are consistent with the R1 mission of the university. Upon graduation, 90% of students are assuming profession positions in wildlife and fisheries resources management.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
○ Maybe
◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

- ◉ Continuance at the current level of activity
- ○ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
- ○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
- ○ Identification of the program for further development
- ○ Development of a cooperative program
- ○ Discontinuance

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

MSW- Master in Social Work

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The larger mission of WVU, as a land-grant institution, is to improve the lives of communities and constituents of West Virginia through education, research, and service. The MSW program trains graduate students to become professional social workers who have the skills to engage in practice at multiple levels and with multiple constituencies. Their mission to train graduates who will be prepared to provide social work services to individuals, families, groups, and communities, with an emphasis on interdisciplinary practice in rural areas aligns well with the mission of the university. The programemphasizes the values of social justice, empowerment, racial equality, and empowerment throughout the curriculum, all of which are important values that support the mission of a land grant institution. Their mission aligns well with that of the university, as their focus is on preparing graduates who can provide service directly back to under-privileged members in the rural communities of the state. The program aims to train graduates that will be able to contribute to the West Virginia community through the provision direct service, the coordination and administration of future service enterprises, and the empowerment of individuals within the West Virginia community.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken toaddress those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program reports no significant problem with infrastructure resources.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Much work over the past several years was devoted to a significant amount of course development related to the launch of the new curriculum, the online program, and the design of the new PhD program. Even with such time focused on course development, there appear to be adequate number of faculty to maintain the program and these faculty members maintain a high level of productivity as evidenced by a sizeable number of books, book chapters, journal articles, and grant awards. Additionally, there is a sizeable contribution of service to the community through the effort of their faculty.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areas of emphasis, etc.

◉ Yes
○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The overall enrollment in the MSW program between 2016-2020 demonstrates a slight downward trend. However, this is most likely due to the sun- setting of extended campuses, which started closing in 2017-2018. The enrollment in the Morgantown campus, has been steady across all five years, with a slight uptick from 2019 on. This uptick is likely a result of the increasing enrollment in the online program, which launched in 2019. They expect to be at full capacity 2021-2022. In 2017, an admissions and recruitment coordinator was hired who increased their outreach to local BSW programs, other undergraduate programs at local universities, as well as other undergraduate departments at WVU. The number of graduates per year has been fairly consistent between academic years 2014/2015 – 2018-2019. Typically between 60-90 MSW students graduate yearly. The average time to completion has decreased from 2.5 years to 1.5 years. This is likely reflective of the introduction of a new one-year full-time Advanced Standing degree option in 2018, which allows students with a BSW degree to earn their MSW degree in one year. In 2019, 27% of the graduates who completed the survey had secured employment in the social work field at the time of graduation and 92% of those who completed the survey had secured employment by the 6-month follow up. In 2020, 70% of those who completed the exit survey at graduation reported they had obtained employment in the social work field by the time of graduation.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The assessment plan is very thorough. The thresholds outlined include at least two measures assess each competency, explanation of how the assessment plan measures multiple dimensions of each competency, benchmarks for each competency, a rationale for each benchmark, and a description of how it is determined that students' performance meets the benchmark, explanation of how the program determines the percentage of students achieving the benchmark and copies of all assessment measures used to assess all identified competencies. Student driven data indicated above 80%, with primarily high 90% successfully reaching benchmarks across all competency based assessment data. Open ended survey responses clearly highlighted positive comments regarding faculty and their own learning in on campus instruction with similar findings from the online program. Theprogram identified areas they were to focus which were to monitor the implicit curriculum to see if a pattern emerges over time and to include adjunct online faculty in efforts to improve mentorship of adjunct faculty across all programs.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

Since 2014/2015, the MSW program has undergone some substantial changes/revisions. These include 1.) a complete revision to the curriculum, 2.) the closure of the extended campuses, and 3.) the launch of the online program. Curricular decisions focused on alignment within new educational standards of their accrediting body. Further, the program, wanted to streamline course structure in order to maximize efficiencies and improve time to completion.
They created a one-year full-time Advanced Standing option to improve competitiveness with other institutions and decrease time to completion. The closure of extended campuses and movement to online delivery was a result of reduction in enrollment at those campuses. The movement to online delivery modality would allow more students enroll in the program rather than those living in specific geographic areas where the extended campuses were located.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
○ Maybe
◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

◉ Continuance at the current level of activity
○ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
○ Identification of the program for further development
○ Development of a cooperative program
○ Discontinuance

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

PHARMD Professional Degree Pharmacy

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

◉ Yes
○ No
○ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The mission of the School of Pharmacy, updated in conjunction with the creation of a 2019 - 2024 strategic plan, is "to improve the health and well-being of West Virginians and our global community by developing exemplary pharmacists and scientists; conducting meaningful research; and advancing pharmacy practice", which aligns with WVUs mission. This reflects commitment to creating a healthier West Virginia, in keeping with the philosophy and mission of a land-grant institution and in alignment with the HSC/WVU strategic priorities. The overall mission and departmental missions express the school's commitment to improving the lives of West Virginia citizens, which ties our educational programs to state needs. The undertaking of translationalresearch to advance pharmacy knowledge and economic development and to provide direct patient care services is in alignment with the priorities of theHSC as pharmacists, pharmacy researchers and educators provide services that improve patients' health, particularly those of West Virginians.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken toaddress those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Based on the report and the no responses to the seven questions, the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The faculty appears to be adequate as all faculty have the appropriate academic credentials with either a PhD or PharmD degree and 10 faculty have postdoctoral training. Twenty-five are nontenure track, 4 are clinical (2) or tenure-track (2), and 17 are tenured. The student (n=312) to faculty(n=46) ratiois 6.8:1, which allows individual attention to provide deeper learning for a challenging academic environment. The number of publications (n=102 peer- reviewed), books (n=10 over a 5 year period), book chapters (n=93 over a 5 year period), presentations (n=22 over a 5 year period)), and faculty with grant funding is impressive. The School of Pharmacy is ranked 37 out of 142 other schools and colleges of pharmacy nationwide with regards to the totalamount of funding awards it receives from the NIH. Between October 1, 2017 and September 30, 2018, the School received $3,714,990.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

◉ Yes
○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

On the national level, applications to PharmD programs have declined approximately 33% since 2015 due to an increase in new programs, decline in employment opportunities, increase in tuition, and declining first-year enrollments. WVU School of Pharmacy latest (2020 P1 enrollment) ratio of completed applications to matriculation is 1.5:1 which is down from 3:1 just 5 yrs ago. To combat the impact of the decline, the school has increased recruitment programs, created more scholarships to assist qualified resident and non-resident applicants in their pursuit of a Doctor of Pharmacy degreeat WVU, and in 2015 began a Direct Admit Pharmacy School program for qualified and interested students entering their 1st year of college. These initiatives maintained a 5-yr average of 74 new students/year which is within 10% of goal of 80 students/yr. The program continuance rate is high (97- 99%). Students complete the program in 3.75 yrs with graduation rates ranging from 91-95%. In terms of courses with high D/F/W rates, most are due tostudent withdrawals or a student failing a course with a relatively low enrollment. Student success is high as residency match rates from the program is at 74% with a high of 87% in 2019. 27 students in 2019 and 28 in 2020 presented research at the American Society of Health-System Pharmacists. Graduates have consistently performed at or above the national average on the national licensing exam (NAPLEX) with 94.2% in 2020 passing on 1stattempt.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

◉ Yes
◯ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

◉ Yes
◯ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

◉ Yes
◯ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> Throughout assessment curriculum is evaluated at the introductory level or collectively throughout the program (new/current courses) for inconsistent coverage of learning/educational outcomes (EOs). If any noted, changes are made. Newly revised curriculum changes improved the 1st time passing rate on the NAPLEX to above the national passing rate, while MPJE and PCOA are at or below the national average. Continue to review if content needs improvement in law component, med chemistry or pharmacology/toxicology. Surveys are conducted by graduating students, faculty, alumni and preceptors. Student surveys and faculty are strong but return rate is low from alumni and preceptors. All 6 broad competencies are evaluated in terms of achievement based on grading and preceptor evaluation on a 1-5 scale. Competencies appear to be high. Syllabi are a also evaluated in terms of written assignments and assessment data. Practicum case scores (system-based therapy) are evaluated with variable scores noted for 2nd and 3rd year. It wasdetermined to monitor poor performance in certain courses with changes made in critical thinking/problem solving skills Exam question tagging occurs in all coursework and evaluated for higher order thinking skills. Capstone performance is new with a need for further assessment. Finally, a portfolio self- assessment of longitudinal outcomes was used to assess whether self-awareness should be strengthened in courses. Service entries were fewer.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

The new curriculum was designed to better integrate content and progressively build upon prior knowledge/skills. Courses were redesigned, content re- sequenced, and new courses developed. Over the past two years, several additional course changes were made within the new curriculum in response to student and instructor feedback and a review of the previous curriculum EOs map. Medicinal chemistry content was recently added to the SBT courses to further enhance that content area (based upon PCOA findings of lower scores in that area) along with greater integration of pharmaceutical and clinical sciences concepts to improve students' problem solving skills (based upon exam question tagging analyses). A pharmacy law review was added to year 4 of the curriculum based upon lower than desired MPJE scores. Objective structured clinical examinations were increased throughout the curriculum to further develop students' practice skills in preparation for APPEs. More information was added on diversity/inclusion and co-curriculum and service-related activity documentation was improved by modifying the questions students completed to record work. Future improvement is based on assessment data and suggestions the Office of Student Services will provide. Other concerns are providing assistance for those that obtain a C grade in early coursework and evaluation of course delivery for online or hybrid instruction format.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

◉ Yes
◯ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

◉ Yes
◯ Maybe
◯ No

Q7.3. Provide a brief summary for why the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction.

In your summary make sure to address why the program meets the requirements for each of the following categories (see the description of those requirements at the [Program Review website](#)):

Distinction
Faculty
Graduates
Curriculum and Assessment

Q7.4. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "distinction" as follows:

This is dependent on the organization that provides this distinction: US News and World Report, which is why maybe was selected. It was not disclosed how NIH funding awards was ranked or by whom. These could be the factors to prevent distinction. "The WVU School of Pharmacy was ranked #31 in the Best Health Schools-Pharmacy category of the U.S. News and World Report's 2020 edition of "America's Best Graduate Schools". This places the program among the top 25 percent of pharmacy school programs nationwide. The School of Pharmacy is ranked 37 out of 142 other schools and colleges of pharmacy nationwide with regards to the total amount of funding awards it receives from the NIH. Between October 1, 2017, and September 30, 2018, the School received $3,714,990. There were 102 peer-reviewed publications in 2019 (including adjunct faculty)."

Q7.5. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "faculty" as follows:

Eleven faculty have been named fellows of national organizations. The fellow designation is a national recognition of faculty excellence in the practice of pharmacy or research. Of those 11 faculty, they share a total of 19 fellow designations as several faculty have multiple designations. Three faculty and the dean hold Distinguished Professor, Chair or Deanship designations. Twenty faculty members in the Department of Clinical Pharmacy are board certified in practice areas such as Ambulatory Care, Anticoagulation Care, Asthma Education, Advanced Diabetes Management, Geriatrics, Pain Education, and Pharmacotherapy. National faculty recognition was noted for seven faculty. Between October 1, 2017, and September 30, 2018, the School received $3,714,990. There were 102 peer-reviewed publications in 2019 (including adjunct faculty)."

Q7.6. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "graduates" as follows:

The graduation rate from the program in 2020 was 98.5%. The graduation rate has been consistently more than 91% for the past 5 years. A growing number of graduates are being accepted in competitive post-graduate residency training programs. In 2019, the WVU School of Pharmacy was in the topfive schools of pharmacy for residency match rates — pairing 87 percent of graduates with residencies. In 2020, the match rate from the program was 74% and exceeded the national average of 63%. Graduates of the program have consistently performed at or above the national average on the national licensing examination (NAPLEX) for pharmacy for the past five years. In summer 2020, 94.92% of graduates passed the NAPLEX exam on the first attempt. The first time test taker pass rate was 91.3% in 2019. Pass rates are higher following the curricular revision. Students present research at the national conference.

Q7.7. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "curriculum and assessment" as follows:

The curriculum revision was driven by: 1) changes in expected outcomes for graduates (i.e., national healthcare and health profession education changes); 2) aspects of the curriculum the faculty wished to enhance (e.g., integration of content, reinforcement of learning, interprofessional education, active learning/problem solving); 3) desire to enhance existing areas of emphasis and create new tracks focusing on areas of professional interest; and
4) assessment data that identified areas of student difficulty or that needed improvement. The detailed assessment plan, and evidence of using assessment data to make curricular improvements, was evident in the 5-year program review data. In addition, a yearly course review process is conducted by members of the Curriculum Committee. Requested changes are made to each course coordinator with a request to respond and provide aplan for addressing changes. A component of the reviews is to ensure the course outcomes and objectives are appropriate for a given course, are addressed at an appropriate level, and are assessed using a variety of assessment methods. Curricular focus groups are also conducted by the Office ofAcademic Affairs on a yearly basis to gain student insight into coursework.

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

- ⦿ Continuance at the current level of activity
- ◯ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
- ◯ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
- ◯ Identification of the program for further development
- ◯ Development of a cooperative program
- ◯ Discontinuance

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

PhD Forensic and Investigative Science

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes
○ No
◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

In alignment.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken toaddress those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program has access to adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The Department needed a Tenure Track position in the field of Forensic DNA and Biological evidence. A position was acquired from the Dean of Eberlyof Arts and Sciences and was recently funded by the college.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

◉ Yes
○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> Enrollment continues to increase from 4 students in Fall 2016 to 16 students in Fall 2020 When capacity is reached 20 students the graduation number will increase to 4 to 5 graduates per year. Faculty have to balance the number of MS and PhD students to ensure a successful graduation rate in a timelymanner. The number of applicants continue to increase, but more rejections were send out due to a full faculty/student workload the past year. With the addition of another Tenure Track faculty in Fall 2021, student enrollment capacity will increase.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program followed two direct measures to assess the students. No issues reported 1. The Capstone course "Casework practicum" allow the studentto demonstrate the value of physical evidence from the crime scene to the courthouse. Forensic student testified in front of a judge and jury on their physical evidence. Feedback provided to both councilors and forensic students. 2. Oral defense of students. Committee members asked up to 6 questions (three related to the students' research and three general criminalistics questions). The student need to pass with a 70% grade rate. One problematic aspect seen during this cycle was a deeper understanding of statistical data interpretation and research design. Theprogram is currently working with CSAFE at Iowa State University in developing an online statistical course for PhD students.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

1. Students from the FIS undergraduate program performs better on the crime scene aspect of the capstone experience and it required more attention given to the students coming from external undergraduate programs. Case files and video recordings are kept each year to better prepare incoming students. 2. PhD students face challenges in their research. Changes inlcude a new course for PhD students. This course still needs some attention forimprovement or replaced by the external statistical course from Iowa State University through CSAFE. The next assessment cycle will provide enough data on the success of the changes made. The graduate committee will also establish a more comprehensive assessment plan for the next cycle.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
○ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
○ Maybe
◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

◉ Continuance at the current level of activity
○ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
○ Identification of the program for further development
○ Development of a cooperative program
○ Discontinuance

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

PhD in Genetics and Developmental Biology

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes
○ No
◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether ornot the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The program provided a mission statement that is consistent with the mission statement of West Virginia University.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken toaddress those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program appears to have adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program appears to have adequate faculty to deliver the program, with sufficient credentials and productivity. A new faculty member has beenrecruited to begin in the spring 2021 semester.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areas of emphasis, etc.

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> There do not appear to be any issues in this area. The program data suggest good numbers for overall student enrollment, program continuance, number of graduates per year and the time to degree completion.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> I think this section is fine. The program has an approved Assessment Plan and are in the third year of that annual assessment plan. Program has provided data to support the objectives related to the students' abilities to evaluate primary literature and student employment after graduation. An additional report provided employment information for 9 graduates of the program, which are consistent with PhDs in this field. Program states that at this early stage in the assessment cycle, no changes have been implemented.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

> A suggestion would be to generate and conduct an Exit Survey of program graduates. The acquired data could be used to gain additional information and feedback for consideration of future program revisions.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
○ Maybe
○ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

◉ Continuance at the current level of activity
○ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action‘
○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
○ Identification of the program for further development
○ Development of a cooperative program
○ Discontinuance

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

Ph.D in Health Services and Outcomes Research

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes
○ No
◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

The PhD Program in Health Services and Outcomes Research (HSOR) in the School of Pharmacy is aligned with the mission, vision and values of WVUvia its focus on population-based, health service outcomes and policy research, mission of improving human health, and advancing health outcomes research and scholarship, and preparing post-graduate students. The program has also a strong international focus with over 80% of its students being of foreign decent.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken toaddress those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Housing and material infrastructure is adequate.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Recent faculty turnover (2 Professors retired, 1 Assistant Professor left for industry) has rendered the program lacking necessary faculty at this time butsearches for positions are presently being conducted and one recently filled (July 2020). The current lack faculty is being appropriately dealt with.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

◉ Yes
○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Since its inception in 1989 the program has graduated 54 students with a PhD. The program enrolls 3-4 students each year and currently there are 14 students enrolled in the program. Only 8.5% of applicants are admitted to the program and retention rate is 100% with only 1 student leaving the programthroughout its lifetime, in 2010, for personal reasons. Graduation rates are from 1-4 annually with an average of 4 years time to completion. Those numbers have been consistent over the past 5 year review cycle.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> Unfortunately the program is not nationally or internationally accredited so comparison assessment is not available. Based in US Today's ranking systemthe School of Pharmacy ranks 31/134 among Pharmacy Schools nationally but such comparison is not provided for the HSOR PhD Program. On the other hand, a collective assessment of peer reviewed output, extramural funding, student involvement in research and peer-reviewed output, and WV and national awards suggests the program to be very strong and competitive. The program is stable in its retention and outcome rates.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plansthe program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, includethose here.

> No improvements are needed at this time apart from current plans to recruit new faculty which are underway.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ○ Maybe
- ◉ No

Q7.4. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "distinction" as follows:

> The evidence of external distinction -namely the US News ranking of the School of Pharmacy and the NIH productivity of its faculty - are not clearly tiedto the sub-set of school faculty who teach in this program and thus the program cannot qualify for Program of Excellence.

Q7.5. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "faculty" as follows:

> While no official ranking is available for the HSOR program to share, the program ranks among the top five graduate programs in terms of size and productivity of the program among the 30-35 relevant PhD programs in the nation. Faculty productivity is very high: 50 grants/extramural lines of funding,and 146 peer-reviewed publications in the last 5 years.

Q7.6. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "graduates" as follows:

> Student retention rate is 100%. All of the students have found placements in relevant fields such as in pharmacy academia, the pharmaceutical industry,government, health systems, and in clinical research organizations.

Q7.7. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "curriculum and assessment" as follows:

> While no official ranking is available for the HSOR program to share, the program ranks among the top five graduate programs in terms of size and productivity of the program among the 30-35 relevant PhD programs in the nation. The critical concern here is that no formal accreditation is available forthe program. Based on the reviewers experience however, the metrics provided for competitive enrollment (8.5% acceptance rate), student and faculty outputs (grants, peer-reviewed outlets), student retention and professional post-graduate placements, all appear of very high caliber and quality.

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

- ◉ Continuance at the current level of activity
- ○ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
- ○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
- ○ Identification of the program for further development
- ○ Development of a cooperative program
- ○ Discontinuance

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

PhD Natural Resources Science

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes
◉ No
○ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.3. Explain why the program is not in good standing with its accrediting body. Provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to good standing.

NA

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

Although a statement is made there is room for intentional improvement to make it resonate with the WVU mission, vision and values. Further thisstatement should align with the College wide mission, vision and values identified.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Inadequate infrastructure in the physica space of laps, performance and equipment has been identified. This Division within Davis is in an older facility. Most Division of Forestry and Natural Resources facilities are located in Percival Hall. Percival Hall was constructed in 1964 and the building is showingthe effects of age and inadequate maintenance. Physical laboratory spaces are very dated and some have inoperable fume hoods which limits theactivities that can take place therein. Although, much of this work/research may be done in the natural lab/field work there is a need for this Division tohave consideration for expansion and updating of physical space.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Adequate faculty with active research programs including peer-review publications and successful grant attainment.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

◉ Yes
○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

With a decline in number of PhD students in the past 5 years, there is explaination of fluctuation and projection of increasing enrollment due to hire ofnew faculty recently. All other components are present.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> Although all links in the document were broken and did not work. The website for Davis College was difficult to find the catalogue component. What isstated in this program review was what was reviewed.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

> Assessment of achieving graduate career goals. "Perhaps the best metrics of success ofthe program is reporting of employment and productivity of the graduates. Between 2014-15AY and December 2020, 41 students have graduated with aPh.D. in the program. Of these 40 are currently employed in thefield (one student who recently graduated is currently interviewing). Graduates arecurrently split (46.3% each) between working in academia and workingin a federal or state conservation agency. Two graduates are working inconsulting or with a conservation non-profit (4.9%). On average, the graduates have produced 2.44 published journal articles (1.46 as lead author) and5.15 professional presentations of work stemming from their time in the program."

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
○ Maybe
◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

- ⦿ Continuance at the current level of activity
- ○ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
- ○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
- ○ Identification of the program for further development
- ○ Development of a cooperative program
- ○ Discontinuance

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

> PhD Plant and Soil Sciences

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

> While the PhD program in Plant and Soil Sciences states consistency with the mission of West Virginia University, it seems like this program is most aligned with the mission to "advance education" and conduct "high-impact research" in the areas of environmental microbiology, environmental soil andwater sciences, horticulture, plant pathology, and entomology The PhD program in Plant and Soil Sciences is consistent with the WVU vision in that its faculty and students work toward "needed and valued solutions to real-life problems." Faculty and students conduct research on soil and water quality, plant growth and nutrient quality, microbial toxicity, microbial pathogenesis of plants and animals, and insect pollinators and pests, all of which impact health and prosperity.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken toaddress those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> According to the report, the program sees no shortage is resources or student accommodations.

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

According to the numbers, there is an average of 18/19 tenured/tenure track faculty in the program. 3 to 4 Non-tenure track, 2 GA's then bumps up to 6 GA's in the last reporting year, and roughly 4 to 5 "Not Assigned" faculty. The report listed research funding in excess of 6 million dollars over 51 grants, while the spreadsheet provided reported $8,660,057.00 over 71 awarded grants. The report stated that faculty are averaging 18 publications during the reporting period, while the spreadsheet reported an average of just over 16 publications per faculty. Faculty at all ranks are involved in teaching. Facultyare active in service activities and assessment activities.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areasof emphasis, etc.

◉ Yes
○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Report indicates growth in enrollment from 7 students in 2015-16 to 14 in 2019-20. Program continuance has fluctuated over the reporting periods from alow of only 62.5% in 2014-15 to 100% in 2018-19. Graduates also has small fluctuations between 1 and 3 students. Most dramatic is the time to completion which hovered around 9 years with a dramatic drop to 3 in the last reporting period. No D/F/W concerns reported. The report indicates that faculty are aware of the program's shortcomings. One stated factor in the low enrollment and graduation rate was faculty turnover. Seven full professors retired in the past decade. The report indicates that increasing enrollment is evidence that new faculty replacements have established programs capable of attracting PhD students. The report states that 5 PhD students graduated from the program in academic year 2019-2020. The program also indicates acknowledgement that time to completion in the early part of the review cycle was too long. Faculty is aware and making efforts to not let students linger in the program.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

◉ Yes
○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

⦿ Yes
◯ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

⦿ Yes
◯ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

There are five learning outcomes, and the assessment report indicates how they are used for assessment, so it stands to believe that these outcomes are also clear and measurable. Outcomes outline that students will demonstrate a fundamental knowledge of their area of emphasis and associated fields in plant and soil science, acquire technical skills in the field or laboratory, and develop the ability to design, conduct, and interpret the results of experiments. In response to a specific action requirement from the previous BOG review cycle, an assessment plan was written and approved, and the program is currently in the third year of performing annual assessment of learning outcomes. Attached assessment documents show that faculty believe Ph.D. students have demonstrated fundamental knowledge of their fields and are deemed competent in their ability to read and interpret primary literature. A point made in these documents was the difference in assessments of MS students and Ph.D. students, an indicator of faculty awareness of student strength and weakness. Student employment data was listed in an attached file which also shows student access in gaining employment.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

The report notes a continuation to refine methods of acquiring data to assess learning objectives and to respond to any observed issues.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

○ Yes
○ Maybe
◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

◉ Continuance at the current level of activity
○ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
○ Identification of the program for further development
○ Development of a cooperative program
○ Discontinuance

Q1.1. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

Ph.D. Resource Management and Sustainable Development

Q1.2. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

○ Yes
○ No
◉ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
○ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.5. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to alignment with the mission and/or values.

Each of the various majors in the program align effectively with WVU's mission, vision and values. The Natural Resource Economics major enhances theeducation, healthcare, and prosperity of the people of West Virginia through promoting high impact research pertaining to sustainable economic development of natural resources use within local, state, and/or national economies. The Resource Management major emphasizes interdisciplinary activities in research and scholarship that supports sustainable economic development of natural resources use within local, state, and/or national economies to improve education, healthcare, and prosperity of the people of West Virginia. Finally, the Human and Community Development major aims to improve the environmental, social, cultural, and/or economic conditions of communities while preparing students for careers at the highest level of the profession as a faculty member, staff in a research organization or governmental and non-governmental agencies, or as a consultant.

Q2.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain those issues, what steps have been taken toaddress those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

Generally, the program reports no significant problem with infrastructure resources. However, the program notes that it would be helpful for students tohave access to software like STATA and have new PCs in graduate offices

Q3.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> The Natural Resource Economics and Resource Management majors have recently lost a number of faculty through retirement and departures, and these faculty lines have not been replaced. Existing faculty take on extensive PhD student advising responsibilities with some faculty advising as many as 5 or 6 graduate students at one time, a significant time commitment that limits the availability of faculty to pursue other efforts. Despite these concerns, overall there appear to adequate number of faculty to maintain the program and these faculty members maintain a high level of productivity as evidenced by a sizeable number of books, book chapters, journal articles, and grant awards.

Q4.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areas of emphasis, etc.

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q4.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

> Enrollment, graduation, continuance and time to completion indicators have been stable over the last 5 years. Twenty-eight students have graduated with this PhD degree between 2015 and 2019. On average, PhD students in this area have delivered 14 conference presentations per year, and published 5 scholarly publications per year. Upward trajectory in both outputs are consistent with the R1 mission of the university.

Q5.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.2. Are the program's learning outcomes appropriate to the degree level and type, reasonable in number, and clear and measurable?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Q5.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

If the program has had issues in any of these areas, briefly explain the issues the program has had in this area, what steps have been taken to address those issues, and provide a judgment on whether the issues have been adequately resolved.

The program has a detailed written assessment plan and provides an overview of assessment outcomes over the previous review period. Results suggest that students are generally on track and demonstrating the program's learning outcomes. The program also provides a detailed summary of changes to the assessment process and curriculum resulting from findings from assessment cycles.

Q6.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

A number of changes and improvements have been made by the program Highlights include: Natural Resource Economics major replaced the second-year preliminary exam with the second-year mentored research paper requirement. Key courses were significantly revised or added. The Human & Community Development major clarified course requirements for students in the early stages of the program and now only admits students in the fall semester in order to facilitate a cohort experience.

Q7.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

Q7.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ○ Yes
- ○ Maybe
- ◉ No

Q8.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

- ⦿ Continuance at the current level of activity
- ○ Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action
- ○ Continuance at a reduced level of activity
- ○ Identification of the program for further development
- ○ Development of a cooperative program
- ○ Discontinuance