

BOG Undergraduate Program Review Spring 2025

Chairs: Evan Widders, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education
Louis Slimak, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Assessment

Members:

- Tina Antill-Keener - Health Sciences - WVU-Morgantown
- Beth Byrd - Davis - WVU-Morgantown
- Emily Corio - Media - WVU-Morgantown
- Scott Davidson - Eberly - WVU-Morgantown
- Nisan Hubbard - Eberly - WVU-Morgantown
- Presha Neidermeyer, WVU-Morgantown
- Gifty Osei-Prempeh - WVU-Beckley
- Srinivas Palanki - Statler - WVU-Morgantown
- Rhonda Reymond, WVU-Morgantown
- Shirley Robinson - Provost's Office Support Staff - WVU-Morgantown
- Amy Root, WVU-Morgantown
- Andrea Schafer - WVU-Keyser
- Robynn Shannon - Provost's Office - WVU-Morgantown
- Ashley Simmons - Health Sciences - WVU-Morgantown
- Catherine Fonseca - Libraries - WVU-Morgantown
- Amy Weaver - WVU-Keyser

This year the Undergraduate Council reviewed 13 undergraduate programs including bachelor and associate degree programs at WVU-Morgantown and Potomac State College. The following pages consist of the recommendations and rationales for the review decisions for the programs listed below.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

Arts and Sciences, AA, WVU Potomac State

Psychology, BA, BS, WVU

Integrated Marketing Communications, BA, WVU

Music, BA, WVU

Philosophy, BA, WVU

Data Science, BS, WVU

Dental Hygiene, BS, WVU*

Medical Laboratory Diagnostics, BS, WVU

Medical Laboratory Science, BS, WVU*

Music and Health, BS, WVU*

Regent's Bachelor of Arts, RBA, WVU

*Accredited Programs

Undergraduate Council Program Reviews

- 13 programs were reviewed
 - There were 6 programs that were reviewed in summer 2023 which were considered to have fulfilled this academic year's program review requirement through that process.
- 4 programs were continued at the current level of activity.
- 9 programs were continued with specific action.
 - 9 actions were assigned to assessment of student learning.
 - 1 action was assigned at the school level to address accreditation requirements.

Program	Follow-up actions recommended
AA Arts and Sciences	Assessment of learning
BA Integrated Marketing Communications	Assessment of learning
BA Music	Assessment of learning
BS Music and Health	Assessment of learning
BA Music Business and Industry	Assessment of learning
BS Medical Laboratory Science	Assessment of learning
BIS Integrated Studies	Assessment of learning
Regent's Bachelor of the Arts	Assessment of learning
MDS Multidisciplinary Studies	Assessment of learning
School of Music	Address accreditation requirements

Follow-up Actions Assigned in Previous Years

- 10 programs had follow-up actions reviewed.
- 10 programs resolved their issues.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 24 - 25

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU.

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

See Q 1.2 of the program review.

AA in Arts and Sciences

Q1.3. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

See Qs 2.2, 2.5, and 2.6 of the program review.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ☐ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.6. 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.

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The program notes that they contribute and align to the mission via their commitment to education and healthcare of students and the community.

Q2.1. Is this the program's first Board of Governor's program review?

See Q4.2 of the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q2.2. Has the program achieved ALL of its stated goals for student enrollment, hiring of new faculty and staff, and research or external support?

See Qs 4.3, 4.4, and 4.7 of the program review.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q2.3. Explain why and to what degree the program has been unable to meet its initial goals.

This should be n/a. The majors in the program are not new; the organization or grouping of these majors together is new. Therefore, the comment on goals is not relevant and that information would not be accessible in CIM.

Q3.1. 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.

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

The program notes that they had significant issues in all areas (e.g., accommodations, scheduling). However, they note in 5.3 that it is "N/A because no issues were identified." It is suspected they misread the question, but follow up is needed.

Q4.1. 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.

See Qs 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6 of the program review.

The program did not note any concerns in the area of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

Q5.1. 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.

- ☒ All
☐ Some

Q5.3. 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.)

Both the primary and secondary reviewer should consult the data file provided.

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.

See Qs 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the program review.

The program notes that the data are difficult to interpret because the addition of the AS designation. That said they acknowledge that there has been a decrease in the enrollment. They note that they hope that enrollment will increase when the changes at Potomac State even out and they are able to engage in marketing/recruitment efforts. They also note program changes that they anticipate will also result in an increase in enrollment (e.g., restructuring pre-allied health majors into a single major with AOE's; adding AOE's). They note that it is common for students to transfer to another institution after 1 year and some students do not apply to graduate if they are moving to another institution after completing their associates degree requirements. They note that adding a professional advisor will help educate students about the benefit of graduating with an associates. They note that there are many courses with a high DFW rate. They note that they plan to initiate a tutoring program to assist with the courses that have a high DFW rate. They also note providing professional development resources to instructors of those courses.

Q6.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q6.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type? See

Q 8.6 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.4. 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?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.5. 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.

See Qs 8.11, 8.13, and 8.14 in the program review.

The program submitted an assessment plan and data from the first assessment data points. The assessment plan includes multiple indicators (e.g., graduation rates; continuation to a bachelor's program; course-level assessments). In the Action Plan, the program provides reflection on the data.

Q7.1. 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.

See Q 8.14 in the program review.

The program did not note any improvements given the program just reorganized.

Q8.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Q9.1. 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

Q9.2. 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.

The Undergraduate Council requires that: 1. By January 2026, submit further evidence of assessment of learning demonstrating that the practices have been sustained over time. 2. By January 2026, the Provost's Office will work with the program to discuss the benefits and drawbacks of using program- level or major-specific learning outcomes and report back to the Undergraduate Council. 2. By January 2026, the Provost's Office will review the new program review structure with Potomac State College's dean's office to determine if it is meeting the goals of the process and if further changes are yet necessary and report back to the Undergraduate Council.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 24 - 25

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU.

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BA/BS Psychology

Q1.3. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

See Qs 2.2, 2.5, and 2.6 of the program review.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ☐ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.6. 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.

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The psychology department supports the university’s mission by advancing education, healthcare, and research to improve social and mental well-being. West Virginia faces significant societal challenges, including an aging population, educational struggles, the opioid crisis, and mental health concerns.

The psychology department addresses these issues through expertise in lifespan development, behavior analysis, behavioral neuroscience, and clinical psychology. The BA and BS programs attract students to the university, offering education from top researchers while providing hands-on experience in research, teaching, and community service. Graduates are well-prepared for advanced studies and careers in psychology, healthcare, education, and law.

Q2.1. Is this the program's first Board of Governor's program review?

See Q4.2 of the program review.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Q3.1. 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.

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

No issues identified

Q4.1. 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.

See Qs 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6 of the program review.

The department has managed to offer all required courses through creative resource use and per-course support but faces significant faculty losses, particularly among tenure-track positions (loss of 3 faculty). Despite losing nine tenure-track faculty, two teaching faculty, and a key staff member—while hiring only five tenure-track faculty, two teaching faculty, and one service faculty—the department successfully launched a Neuroscience major and a Behavior Analysis certificate, both experiencing significant enrollment growth (130.9% 5 year growth). Graduate courses rely on external instructors to keep permanent faculty focused on undergraduates, but this is unsustainable long-term. Faculty shortages limit experiential opportunities and overburden advisors, with one faculty advisor managing 168 students in Fall 2024. Additional faculty resources are needed to maintain course access, experiential learning, and quality advising. The pandemic forced a rapid shift to online instruction, halting research and limiting field experiences. Budget cuts further reduced undergraduate research and professional development. While some field placements have resumed, faculty losses and funding constraints continue to limit research opportunities. While progress has been made, these issues have not been fully resolved, and additional faculty and financial support may be needed for long-term sustainability. Recommending support for additional faculty.

Q5.1. 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.

- ☒ All
- ☐ Some

Q5.3. 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.)

Both the primary and secondary reviewer should consult the data file provided.

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.

See Qs 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the program review.

There are no courses within the Psychology department for which the DFW rate among their majors exceeds 30%. However, there are four courses for which they closely monitor student success: PSYC 101 (Introduction to Psychology), PSYC 191 (Freshman Seminar), and the PSYC 203/204 sequence (Research Methods and Analysis). Data from ARGOS indicate that for PSYC 101, overall DFW rate for the last three years was 11.3%. A flipped classroom model was implemented, requiring students to complete readings and video mini-lectures before class, allowing in-class time for discussion and applied activities. This approach reduced DFW rates for psychology majors from 28% to 14.5% in PSYC 203 and from 15% to 6.6% in PSYC 204. The success is expected to continue in 2024/25. During the review period, over 350 faculty-undergraduate research mentorships led to 39 journal articles with 52 undergraduate authorships, including 12 first-author credits. Students contributed to 177 conference abstracts, with 65 serving as presenting authors. More than 150 students presented at WVU Undergraduate Research Symposia, earning 13 best presentation awards and 8 runner-up recognitions. Psychology majors secured prestigious scholarships and research funding, with graduates admitted to top doctoral programs, medical schools, and law schools. Some alumni have secured notable positions, including managing research labs and interning for U.S. senators. Tracking alumni success remains a challenge.

Q6.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Q6.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q 8.6 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Q6.4. 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?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.5. 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.

See Qs 8.11, 8.13, and 8.14 in the program review.

WVU psychology majors consistently outperform national averages on the P-ACAT, with 2023/24 scores averaging in the 74th percentile, showing strong knowledge in core areas. Critical thinking skills also improved, with 91.3% of seniors reporting at least moderate growth. Communication skills were assessed through capstone presentations, with students scoring an average of 18.97/20, and survey data indicating significant gains in written and oral communication. While 85% of students can articulate a career path, many lack deep knowledge of options, making career education and readiness a priority for future program development. During the review period, the BA/BS psychology programs maintained consistency while addressing challenges from the pandemic. Key improvements included expanding the advising team, offering individualized advising sessions, and introducing new courses such as Health Psychology and Clinical Neuropsychology to enhance content knowledge. The department also launched a Certificate in Behavior Analysis, which has grown significantly, providing professional direction for students. Additionally, the Undergraduate Training Committee expanded to include diverse faculty and student representatives, ensuring multiple perspectives inform program development.

Q7.1. 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.

See Q 8.14 in the program review.

During the review period, the BA/BS psychology programs maintained consistency while addressing challenges from the pandemic. Key improvements included expanding the advising team, offering individualized advising sessions, and introducing new courses such as Health Psychology and Clinical Neuropsychology to enhance content knowledge. The department also launched a Certificate in Behavior Analysis, which has grown significantly, providing professional direction for students. Additionally, the Undergraduate Training Committee expanded to include diverse faculty and student representatives, ensuring multiple perspectives inform program development. Proposed Goals for 2024/25 • Continue current assessments: o Analysis of student learning using ACAT; factors associated with ACAT performance. o Assessment of perceived achievement and experiences through student surveys. o Applications of SpeakWrite on achievement (assessment of Capstone presentations). • Initiate direct assessment of core courses, through collection of pretest/posttest data. • Update psychology program to: o Distinguish BA/BS program learning goals and curricula. o Incorporate professional development into required curricula. • Address updates to APA psychology program guidelines. o Revise course offerings to align curriculum with updated program learning outcomes No recommendations at this time.

Q8.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q8.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded?

☒ Yes

☐ Maybe

☐ No

Q8.3. 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

Distinction

Faculty

Graduates

Curriculum and Assessment

Q8.4. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "distinction" as follows:

The WVU Psychology BA/BS program are distinguished through state and national recognition. Students consistently outperform peers on the Psychology Area Concentration Achievement Test, scoring in the 74th percentile in 2023/24 (national). During the review period, the students co-authored 39 journal articles, presented 177 conference abstracts, and earned prestigious awards including the WVU Foundation Scholar and Order of Augusta honors. The program offers one of only two ABAI-accredited undergraduate Behavior Analysis Certificates worldwide, preparing students for high-demand jobs. Regional impact includes addressing workforce needs through the WVU Field Experience program and community partnerships. These achievements align with WVU's mission, solidifying the program's reputation among peer institutions.

Q8.5. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "faculty" as follows:

All full-time faculty hold Ph.D.s, with many also holding BCBA or BCBA-D credentials (Industry recognized credentials). During the review period, they produced 429 publications, secured nearly \$17 million in external funding, and frequently collaborated with undergraduates. Faculty employ evidence-based teaching methods, such as flipped classrooms and interactive course materials, improving student outcomes. Inclusive initiatives like the Psychology Undergraduate Mentorship Program for Underrepresented Populations (PUMP-UP) mentorship program further enhance student engagement. Faculty have received multiple prestigious awards for research, teaching, and advising, reinforcing their commitment to academic excellence - (Including the Association for Behavior Analysis International Mentorship Award, the Travis Stimeling Award for Mentoring Undergraduates in Research, and the Nick Evans Award for Excellence in Advising).

Q8.6. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "graduates" as follows:

The WVU Psychology BA/BS program excel in graduate and career placement. Graduates have been admitted to top Ph.D. programs (e.g., UNC Chapel Hill, Penn State) and professional schools in medicine, law, and health. Many secure paid positions through field experiences and work in clinical, forensic, and research settings. Alumni have taken leadership roles at institutions like Northwestern and Boston's Children's Hospital and contributed to policy through U.S. Senate internships. Nationally recognized, graduates have earned prestigious honors like the Order of Augusta and WVU Foundation Scholar awards, showcasing their strong competencies in data literacy, critical thinking, and communication.

Q8.7. This program meets the Program of Excellence criteria for "curriculum and assessment" as follows:

The WVU Psychology BA/BS program outcomes align with the 2023 APA Guidelines, focusing on core knowledge, critical thinking, communication, and career readiness. Student learning is assessed through multimodal methods, including P-ACAT scores (74th percentile average in 2023/24), capstone evaluations (18.97/20), and senior surveys (90% reporting critical thinking gains). These assessments drive improvements, such as new pedagogical strategies, a required professional development course, and a cohort model. As evidenced from the self study, the site visitors' report noted, "... the undergraduate certificate in behavior analysis is exemplary of the standards put forth by ABAI for accreditation... The certificate has a robust sequence of coursework, dedicated faculty, and a great group of students.

Q9.1. What is the recommendation for this program?

- ☒ Continuation at the current level of activity
- ☐ Continuation at the current level of activity with specific action
- ☐ Continuation at a reduced level of activity
- ☐ Identification of the program for further development
- ☐ Development of a cooperative program
- ☐ Discontinuation

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 24 - 25

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU.

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BA Integrated Marketing Communications

Q1.3. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

See Qs 2.2, 2.5, and 2.6 of the program review.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ☐ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.6. 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.

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The WVU Bachelor of Arts in Integrated Marketing Communications supports the vision and mission of the University system by providing ease of access to marketing/business and communications education to areas of Appalachia, thus allowing this region to benefit in economic growth that can be brought from digital media and marketing with a focus of social responsiveness. The program is designed to help students capitalize on opportunities to engage stakeholders and consumers. Additionally, students focus on working with diverse audiences using inclusive practices. This program offers opportunity to develop leadership skills that will empower residents of this state and region and, in turn, impact the region, as a whole.

Q2.1. Is this the program's first Board of Governor's program review?

See Q4.2 of the program review.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Q2.2. Has the program achieved ALL of its stated goals for student enrollment, hiring of new faculty and staff, and research or external support?

See Qs 4.3, 4.4, and 4.7 of the program review.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Q3.1. 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.

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

The program reports no concerns with infrastructure or resources. Additionally, there have been no events or situations that have negatively impacted the program's ability to deliver curriculum and produce graduates during this review period.

Q4.1. 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.

See Qs 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6 of the program review.

The program reports no new faculty or staff being needed to carry out this program.

Q5.1. 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.

- ☒ All
- ☐ Some

Q5.3. 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.)

Both the primary and secondary reviewer should consult the data file provided.

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.

See Qs 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the program review.

At its inception in 2019, the program was designed as a collaborative effort between the College of Media and the College of Business and Economics. Although the initial target enrollment was 12 students, the enrollment number at the launch of the program in 2020 was three students. The number grew significantly to 10 in the second year of the program and doubled to 20 in the third year. The most current data shows an enrollment of 35. Enrollment is steady. Growth in enrollment from year 2 to 3 is attributed to the decision to change the program from being delivered collaboratively between two colleges to being delivered primarily through the College of Media since this College provides most resources in the program. Program growth continues in a positive direction. The program recorded 100% retention in its first to second year, with only 3 students. Recent data shows a 53% retention rate 2023-2024 and 61% in 2024-2025, comparable to the College in 2024-25 (64%). Because the program is at the point of a five-year review, not having yet completed a six-year cycle, graduation numbers are low. Enrollment varies due to the nature of the online program and concerns of its students ("nontraditional" with consecutive semester enrollment largely being determined by personal situations and financial considerations). The only high DFW courses are now eliminated as the program is now delivered through the Reed School of Media and Communications, without collaboration of B&E.

Q6.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog? See

Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Q6.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type? See

Q 8.6 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.4. 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?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.5. 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.

See Qs 8.11, 8.13, and 8.14 in the program review.

Again, the program is fairly new, and one of the important measures in the assessment plan, the capstone course, has only been taught one semester thus far. At the next point of collecting assessment data, spring 2026, the capstone course will be taught enough times to gain a true picture of assessment. Currently, the program has created a detailed curriculum map, showing the introduction and reinforcement of all learning outcomes across core courses of the program. The curriculum map details the expected point of mastery for each outcome. Additionally, the program uses graduate surveys and alumni surveys in its assessment plan. Due to the new nature of the program, only a handful of graduates have completed the survey thus far; graduates have reported satisfaction in the program.

Q7.1. 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.

See Q 8.14 in the program review.

The program has undergone changes in home college and delivery, making it more focused on media and communications, with a clearer purpose. Students complete an IMC track within their major, which adds specific digital and media skills to the foundation provide in the program. The program has entered into a partnership with U.S. Defense Information School (DINFOS) to train U.S. Military, DoD civilian, international military and interagency students in media and communications and expects enrollment growth from this effort. The program also is assigned a professional advisor who provides academic and other support and guidance for this often-considered nontraditional student population. Success oriented support services are valued by students as evidenced by satisfactory ratings (mentioned in program review document) in the senior exit survey.

Q8.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Q9.1. 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

Q9.2. 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.

The Undergraduate Council requires that: 1) By January 2026, the program will submit an assessment plan and curriculum map to the Undergraduate Council. The Undergraduate Council will also expect to see evidence of assessment of learning and how the program is using that evidence to inform program change and support student success in its next BOG program review.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 24 - 25

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU.

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BA Music

Q1.3. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

See Qs 2.2, 2.5, and 2.6 of the program review.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ☐ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.4. 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 answer is yes, but no was answered in order to specify the following: As noted in the Self-Study and attested to by the inclusion of a letter from NASAM, all issues have been addressed except for a facilities issue schedule for summer 2025.

Q1.6. 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.

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The School of Music’s Mission and Vision aligns with WVU’s mission, vision, and values by in creating an innovative and inclusive environment where students engage in research and creative activity as it prepares them to become leaders in the musical arts.

Q2.1. Is this the program's first Board of Governor's program review? See

Q4.2 of the program review.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Q3.1. 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.

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

Yes. the program indicates they have adequate and accessible infrastructure.

Q4.1. 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.

See Qs 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6 of the program review.

The Self-Study indicated that the program had an adequate number of faculty and nothing has impacted their productivity. They do have faculty qualified by means other than academic credentials. The attached document indicates that they follow HLC and NASAM standards for alternate credentials.

Q5.1. 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.

- ☐ All
- ☒ Some

Q5.2. What was inaccurate?

Yes, this information is in the current undergraduate catalog. Please note--The revised version (120 CR HRS; capstone 491; adjusted curriculum) is currently in CIM.

Q5.3. 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.)

Both the primary and secondary reviewer should consult the data file provided.

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.

See Qs 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the program review.

Student enrollment trends during the past five years are relatively steady with 7 students in 2019 and between 9-12 students in the interim with 12 as the current enrollment. The completion rate was -33.3% in 2019 and has risen to +50%. Musc263: Aural Theory 4 had a DFW rate of 50%. MUSC264: Written Theory had a DFW rate of 100%. MUSC270: Hist WestnM had a DFW rate of 50%. Besides the 189, the only other course to have a DFW rate lower than 30% is, MUSC 271,. All the others (18 courses) have over a 30% DFW. This needs to be addressed with an updated response. There is no information in the Self-Study pertaining to specific student successes. It is stated that the program is being reconfigured, which should yield student successes. CIM reveals that there are changes entered dating from 1/25, including the new capstone course noted in the Study. The Self-Study notes they are aware they need to develop and implement a tracking plan but this has not been done yet. This needs to be revisited.

Q6.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q 8.6 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.4. 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?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.5. 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.

See Qs 8.11, 8.13, and 8.14 in the program review.

The Learning Outcomes are currently being updated in CIM (1/25). Note there are major changes but there is not enough room here to include them in this review. The new Learning Outcomes are clear and appropriate to the degree. The unit was supposed to submit an assessment plan and curriculum map by 12/15/21. The Self-Study indicates that there is no formal assessment plan and that developing one will happen now that the new Learning Outcomes have been formulated. A Curriculum map was included but a new one is being developed. These items be submitted for review to the UC.

Q7.1. 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.

See Q 8.14 in the program review.

Improvements include updating the Learning Outcomes, reducing CR HRS from 125 to 120, and changing the capstone course to better serve students for the future and achieve more successful outcomes that can be assessed.

Q8.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Q9.1. 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

Q9.2. 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.

The Undergraduate Council requires that: 1. By January 2026, the School of Music will provide a report to the Undergraduate Council addressing how it has resolved its NASM deferred accreditation status. 2. By January 2026, the program will submit an assessment plan and curriculum map to the Undergraduate Council. That plan should include methods to monitor and address student success in the program. 3. By January 2027, the program will submit evidence that demonstrates the implementation of the assessment plan.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 24 - 25

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU.

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BA Philosophy

Q1.3. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

See Qs 2.2, 2.5, and 2.6 of the program review.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ☐ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.6. 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.

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The program report outlines how the Philosophy program aligns to the WVU mission and Mountaineer Values. - The program encourages student inquiry (curiosity) through coursework, mentored research, and interactions with fellow students and faculty members. - The program notes that the philosophy community encourages "open and respectful exchange of ideas" (respect). - The program encourages students to engage in reflection about themselves and their community (service). - The program trains students to "engage in careful and respectful dialogue about difficult ethical, social, and political issues (accountability; appreciation).

Q2.1. Is this the program's first Board of Governor's program review?

See Q4.2 of the program review.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q3.1. 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.

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

The Philosophy department did not report any challenges under 5.2 and 5.3.

Q4.1. 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.

See Qs 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6 of the program review.

The program did not note any concerns with faculty adequacy, credentials, or composition. They did note that the move from Arnold Hall to Hodges Hall has greatly improved the experiences of students and the faculty. Specifically, the move has provided more accessible and hospitable options for faculty- student engagement. The program reports that the move to Hodges will likely result in recruitment and retention of faculty and students. The program also notes that the push to online instruction during COVID19 negatively impacted the program as it disrupted the typical methods in philosophy. Specifically, the program noted: "Both the skill set developed, and the joys experienced when studying philosophy, are ideally delivered in an on-campus, in-person setting."

Q5.1. 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.

☒ All

☐ Some

Q5.3. 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.)

Both the primary and secondary reviewer should consult the data file provided.

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.

See Qs 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the program review.

The enrollment trends for the philosophy per the APS data indicate that the number of majors has declined since 2019-2020, but increased by 10% from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024. The program notes in their report that this does not account for double majors. Per the ARGOS report attached to the self study that there are 78 majors, when double majors are included. It is not clear, however, if these are registered or active students as of Fall 2024.

Regardless, the enrollment trends for the philosophy BA is below that of the ECAS. The program completion data indicate a decline in program completion. The program notes that if both majors and double majors were included in the computation that it would not be an area of concern. That said, the program might consider migration data. If a significant number of students were migrating out of the major, the program might examine to what extent those students influence the completion data. With the new major structure online, this data might be helpful to track. The program addressed concerns re the courses with a high DFW report. They note that they are addressing concerns with plans to hold teaching workshops, engaging in peer reviews of faculty teaching, and re-engaging in holding tutoring sessions for students. The program provides evidence of student success (e.g., honors society; graduate employment/pursuit of graduate studies).

Q6.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog? See

Q 8.2 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q 8.6 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.4. 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?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Q6.5. 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.
See Qs 8.11, 8.13, and 8.14 in the program review.

The assessment plan seems appropriate and comprehensive. They collect a variety of assessments, including reflection on data; student feedback; and data from student performance in relevant coursework. They provide the latest assessment report where they report data and outline their responses to feedback. The curriculum map, assessment plan, and assessment report are commendable.

Q7.1. 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.

See Q 8.14 in the program review.

The program noted that there have been "drastic" changes since the last report. Three faculty members were added to the program; development and implementation of an assessment plan for the major; developed new courses; and updated courses. They also note that they've updated their major, which launched in fall 2024. There are no specific recommendations for improvement, but the program is encouraged to track student enrollment and retention since the launch of the new curriculum in fall 2024. In addition, we would like to note that the recruitment efforts by the faculty (e.g., contacting top performers in courses) are commendable.

Q8.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q9.1. 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 Review - Reviewers Form AY 24 - 25

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU.

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

See Q 1.2 of the program review.

DSCI, BS in Data Science)

Q1.3. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body? See Qs 2.2, 2.5, and 2.6 of the program review.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ☐ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.6. 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.

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The program aligns well with WVU's mission, vision, and values. The availability of automated data collection systems in every aspect of modern life makes it important to develop a framework for systematic analysis, visualization and mining of data for making decisions that impact applications in science, engineering, humanities and healthcare. There is a current shortage of trained data scientists and so there is a significant potential for employment immediately upon graduation. Furthermore, since the field is relatively new, there are significant opportunities to conduct research and advanced training at the graduate level.

Q2.1. Is this the program's first Board of Governor's program review?

See Q4.2 of the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q2.2. Has the program achieved ALL of its stated goals for student enrollment, hiring of new faculty and staff, and research or external support?

See Qs 4.3, 4.4, and 4.7 of the program review.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q2.3. Explain why and to what degree the program has been unable to meet its initial goals.

The program currently has 34 students and is on track to meet its goal of 40-60 students in the near future. Students are able to get internships in well-known firms. While the first cohort of students has not graduated yet, the market appears to be excellent for this field. The loss of a senior faculty member (Dr. Huzurbazar) in 2023 implies that there are only two full time assistant professor and one part-time associate professor in the program. The program needs more faculty (two junior or one senior) to meet its goals.

Q3.1. 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.

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

The program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources in terms of classrooms, technology, equipment and support.

Q4.1. 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.

See Qs 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6 of the program review.

The program does not have adequate faculty. It is difficult to run a quality program with only two assistant professors and one part-time associate professor. The loss of senior faculty member Dr. Huzurbazar in 2023 is significant and a replacement is needed soon. The lack of a graduate program in data science makes it difficult to conduct research internally and so it is necessary to find collaborators in other programs (math and statistics, engineering, medical school, business school etc.). The lack of start-up funding for new faculty needs to be corrected.

Q5.1. 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.

- ☒ All
☐ Some

Q5.3. 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.)

Both the primary and secondary reviewer should consult the data file provided.

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.

See Qs 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the program review.

This is a new program that started in Fall 2022. Fall Enrollment has increased from 9 in 2022-2023 to 19 in 2023-2024, a net gain of 111.1%. Program Continuation for AY 2023-2024 was 87.5%. There are currently 34 students in the program. The first cohort of students will graduate this year and so there is no data on student placement. However, students have done well in securing internships in well-known firms. Furthermore, students have been successful in conducting research with faculty and presenting these results in conferences.

Q6.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Q6.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q 8.6 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Q6.4. 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?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Q6.5. 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.

See Qs 8.11, 8.13, and 8.14 in the program review.

Since the program is relatively new and the first cohort of students has not graduated, the program has not been assessed. The assessment plan provided in the self-study is reasonable. I see that the three outcomes will be assessed via final exams, course projects as well as the capstone project. A rubric is provided for assessing the projects but not the exams. I would like to caution the faculty that they should not use the final grade in the final as a means of assessing whether the outcomes were met. For example, a student could theoretically pass a final exam while doing poorly in one of the outcomes and so using only the final score would not indicate this deficiency. Performance in individual questions in the exam or parts of the capstone report should be used to assess the outcomes.

Q7.1. 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.

See Q 8.14 in the program review.

This is a new program and so this question is not applicable.

Q8.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Q9.1. 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 Review - Reviewers Form AY 24 - 25

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU.

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BS Dental Hygiene

Q1.3. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

See Qs 2.2, 2.5, and 2.6 of the program review.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ☐ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.6. 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.

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The dental hygiene program aligns with the WVU's mission, vision, and values. The program creates a positive, stimulating, evidence-based learning environment to advance education and healthcare and provides service and outreach to the state and surrounding areas.

Q2.1. Is this the program's first Board of Governor's program review? See

Q4.2 of the program review.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q3.1. 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.

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

Providing students with accommodations- this is resolved. An HSC testing center is now in place. Access to adequate technological support- This issue is unresolved. The program reports decreases in reliable IT support, specifically related to SOLE (testing support in particular) and other HSC systems. The program reports this is directly impacting students and patient care.

Q4.1. 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.

See Qs 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6 of the program review.

The program reports an inadequate number of faculty to allow proper time for research and service. The increasing demands on faculty are negatively impacting faculty well-being. However, the number of faculty members has not affected the delivery of all required courses or the student's ability to progress through the program. Resolution of the issue is in progress. A search for a 1.0 FTE, a 12-month faculty member, was scheduled to begin in January 2025.

Q5.1. 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.

☒ All

☐ Some

Q5.3. 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.)

Both the primary and secondary reviewer should consult the data file provided.

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.

See Qs 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the program review.

The program has consistently high application rates, averaging 287 during the academic years 2019-2020 and 2023-2024. The program's enrollment has remained consistent and reported a 0.6% increase in the 2024 fall semester. The program outlined that the continuance rate decreased by 1.6% [86.8%] due to the error of 27 students being admitted in 2022 due to a miscommunication between the University and HSC on incoming mat and science requirements. Trends through 24-25 have increased to 89.4 %. Attrition rates were greater than 91% in all years except for 2024. In 2024, a 79% attrition rate was a result of a repeating student, three changing majors, and one relocating to another school. The Dental Hygiene program's time to completion during the academic years 2019-2020 and 2023-2024 was 3.64 years, and the program graduated an average of 21 students each year. No dental hygiene course yields a high D/F/W. Many students have presented their research locally at HSC conferences [49 students] and regionally [26] at the state capitol. Four students participated in Dental Hygiene Advocacy Day at the Capitol, providing students the opportunity to speak with state representatives. WVU is the first dental school in the USA to integrate coursework for students to become Certified Tobacco Specialists. Students use this knowledge and serve WVU by offering tobacco cessation presentations.

Q6.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog? See

Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Q6.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q 8.6 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Q6.4. 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?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.5. 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.

See Qs 8.11, 8.13, and 8.14 in the program review.

The program has three overarching goals. The program performs a systematic evaluation of the three overarching program goals as demonstrated by the Outcomes Assessment Working plan included in the self-study. Each goal has clear objective/outcome measures; data collected from students, alums (in year 2023), patients, faculty, and advisory boards are included in an outcomes assessment table.

Q7.1. 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.

See Q 8.14 in the program review.

The program uses the outcome assessment data to revise and improve the program. For example, an outcome measure (90% of students achieving a 'B' in a particular course) was not being met [82%]; the program increased hands-on activities and the number of assessments and improved specific guidelines in the clinical manual. The change resulted in 90% of students meeting the indicator. The program has demonstrated consistent admission and graduation rates. The program has a robust evaluation plan and positive outcomes. The students of this program positively contribute to the health of fellow West Virginians and beyond. One consideration would be incorporating employee data with the assessment plan to assist in identifying opportunities for program enhancement and improving readiness for practice.

Q8.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Q9.1. 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 Review - Reviewers Form AY 24 - 25

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU.

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

See Q 1.2 of the program review.

Medical Laboratory Science

Q1.3. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

See Qs 2.2, 2.5, and 2.6 of the program review.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ☐ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.6. 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.

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The program aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values by creating an inclusive learning environment and preparing laboratory professionals to serve WV communities and beyond.

Q2.1. Is this the program's first Board of Governor's program review? See

Q4.2 of the program review.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q3.1. 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.

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

The program reports having adequate infrastructure

Q4.1. 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.

See Qs 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6 of the program review.

The program reports a sufficient number of qualified faculty members to meet student needs, and the ability to progress through the program. Yet, the program describes lacking sufficient faculty, leading to increased teaching workloads and decreased time for scholarship and service. The self-study outlines relocation, retirements, and other opportunities that contributed to the faculty leaving over the years and often leaving a one-person vacancy. Currently, they are searching for a new program director.

Q5.1. 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.

☒ All

☐ Some

Q5.3. 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.)

Both the primary and secondary reviewer should consult the data file provided.

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.

See Qs 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the program review.

The program's continuance is -4.8% over five years. May 2024 was noted as a significant down year with six graduates. As a 2+2 program, the program continuance number reflects students who changed majors or did not complete the program prerequisites. The program prerequisites are taught outside the School of Medicine and BLD Program. The program engages with the students during the first two years through PALM 100, PALM 101, and PALM 201 courses, meetings, open Q&A sessions, and opportunities for activities. The program completion changes for the BLD program have dropped significantly in the past two years (-47.6% in 2022 to 2023 and -45.5% in 2023 to 2024). This drop is contributed to the 2+2 design of the major. Most students who leave or are lost do so before entering the professional phase of the program in their junior year. The rate of students graduating within 4 years of earning 60 institutional credits reflects the students who are retained and enter the professional phase of the program in the junior year. Percentages of program completion using this data are: 2021-2022 (85.7%), 2020-2021 (96.2%), 2019-2020 (76%), 2018-2019 (96%), and 2017-2018 (86.2%). All years meet the 75% benchmark established by our accrediting body, and all exceed the SOM comparison, except for the academic year 2019-2020. CHEM 115 is noted as a course that prevents students from meeting program requirements. A new course, 293A Basic Science Applications, is anticipated to support student

Q6.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q 8.6 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.4. 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?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.5. 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.

See Qs 8.11, 8.13, and 8.14 in the program review.

The program's curriculum was revised in May 2020. Changes included renaming the program to Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics and Medical Laboratory Science, identifying prerequisites that better prepare students for the professional part of the program, resequencing courses, and offering additional laboratory experiences. Data driving these changes were not given. Evidence of meeting benchmark standards (indirect assessments) is included, but direct assessment of student meeting program outcomes (only course number) is not provided.

Q7.1. 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.

See Q 8.14 in the program review.

The curriculum was revised in 2020, which included changing the name of the program, identifying prerequisites that better prepare students for the professional part of the program, resequencing courses, and offering additional laboratory experiences to prepare students better for practice. Accreditation benchmark standards were met, but program continuance and graduation rates decreased when using first-year student data (before students entered the professional program in the third year). Total number of graduates was 16 in 2021-2022, 8 in 2022-2023, and 9 in 2023-2024. Council recommendations: Update the evaluation plan to include direct assessments of student meeting program outcomes. Identify and include exemplary student work or accomplishments. Continue to focus on ways to engage and retain students during the first and second years. A peer mentoring or coaching program may assist in keeping students invested and interested.

Q8.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Q9.1. 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

Q9.2. 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.

Resubmit evaluation plan outcomes to include direct assessments of student meeting program/learning outcomes.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 24 - 25

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU.

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

See Q 1.2 of the program review.

Medical Laboratory Science

Q1.3. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

See Qs 2.2, 2.5, and 2.6 of the program review.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ☐ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.6. 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.

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The program aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values by creating an inclusive learning environment and preparing laboratory professionals to serve WV communities and beyond.

Q2.1. Is this the program's first Board of Governor's program review?

See Q4.2 of the program review.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q3.1. 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.

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

The program reports having adequate infrastructure

Q4.1. 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.

See Qs 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6 of the program review.

The program reports a sufficient number of qualified faculty members to meet student needs, and the ability to progress through the program. Yet, the program describes lacking sufficient faculty, leading to increased teaching workloads and decreased time for scholarship and service. The self-study outlines relocation, retirements, and other opportunities that contributed to the faculty leaving over the years and often leaving a one-person vacancy. Currently, they are searching for a new program director.

Q5.1. 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.

☒ All

☐ Some

Q5.3. 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.)

Both the primary and secondary reviewer should consult the data file provided.

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.

See Qs 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the program review.

The program's continuance is -4.8% over five years. May 2024 was noted as a significant down year with six graduates. As a 2+2 program, the program continuance number reflects students who changed majors or did not complete the program prerequisites. The program prerequisites are taught outside the School of Medicine and BLD Program. The program engages with the students during the first two years through PALM 100, PALM 101, and PALM 201 courses, meetings, open Q&A sessions, and opportunities for activities. The program completion changes for the BLD program have dropped significantly in the past two years (-47.6% in 2022 to 2023 and -45.5% in 2023 to 2024). This drop is contributed to the 2+2 design of the major. Most students who leave or are lost do so before entering the professional phase of the program in their junior year. The rate of students graduating within 4 years of earning 60 institutional credits reflects the students who are retained and enter the professional phase of the program in the junior year.

Percentages of program completion using this data are: 2021-2022 (85.7%), 2020-2021 (96.2%), 2019-2020 (76%), 2018-2019 (96%), and 2017-2018 (86.2%). All years meet the 75% benchmark established by our accrediting body, and all exceed the SOM comparison, except for the academic year 2019-2020. CHEM 115 is noted as a course that prevents students from meeting program requirements. A new course, 293A Basic Science Applications, is anticipated to support student

Q6.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q 8.6 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.4. 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?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Q6.5. 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.

See Qs 8.11, 8.13, and 8.14 in the program review.

The program's curriculum was revised in May 2020. Changes included renaming the program to Biomedical Laboratory Diagnostics and Medical Laboratory Science, identifying prerequisites that better prepare students for the professional part of the program, resequencing courses, and offering additional laboratory experiences. Data driving these changes were not given. Evidence of meeting benchmark standards (indirect assessments) is included, but direct assessment of student meeting program outcomes (only course number) is not provided.

Q7.1. 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.

See Q 8.14 in the program review

The curriculum was revised in 2020, which included changing the name of the program, identifying prerequisites that better prepare students for the professional part of the program, resequencing courses, and offering additional laboratory experiences to prepare students better for practice. Accreditation benchmark standards were met, but program continuance and graduation rates decreased when using first-year student data (before students entered the professional program in the third year). Total number of graduates was 16 in 2021-2022, 8 in 2022-2023, and 9 in 2023-2024. Council recommendations: Update the evaluation plan to include direct assessments of student meeting program outcomes. Identify and include exemplary student work or accomplishments. Continue to focus on ways to engage and retain students during the first and second years. A peer mentoring or coaching program may assist in keeping students invested and interested.

Q8.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q9.1. 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

Q9.2. 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.

The Undergraduate Council requires that: 1. By January 2026, the program will submit evidence of assessment of learning, including evidence of direct assessment aligned with the program's student learning outcomes.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 24 - 25

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU.

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BS Music & Health

Q1.3. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

See Qs 2.2, 2.5, and 2.6 of the program review.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ☐ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.6. 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.

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The BS in Music and Health is an inclusive program blending music education with a liberal arts foundation while incorporating undergraduate science courses for students pursuing professional health fields. As a leader in Appalachian arts education, the School of Music fosters appreciation for regional culture. The program emphasizes hands-on learning through performances, faculty collaborations, mentorships, and personalized career paths, equipping students with communication, teamwork, analytical, and self-management skills.

Q2.1. Is this the program's first Board of Governor's program review?

See Q4.2 of the program review.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Q2.2. Has the program achieved ALL of its stated goals for student enrollment, hiring of new faculty and staff, and research or external support?

See Qs 4.3, 4.4, and 4.7 of the program review.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Q3.1. 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.

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

No concerns noted

Q4.1. 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.

See Qs 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6 of the program review.

The program and the School of Music follow the guidelines established by the HLC in its Institutional Policies and Procedures for Determining Faculty Qualifications: HLC’s Criteria for Accreditation and Assumed Practices – Equivalent Experience. Additionally, the School of Music, as an accredited member of NASM adheres to Standard II.E.1.a.(1-5) and 1.b.(1-4) No evidence of faculty credentials, composition, or productivity.

Q5.1. 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.

- ☒ All
- ☐ Some

Q5.3. 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.)

Both the primary and secondary reviewer should consult the data file provided.

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.

See Qs 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the program review.

As evidenced from APS, the 5 year college enrollment trend is +1.5%. As this is a newer program, the results are difficult to interpret at this time in terms of number of graduates. However, it appears in APS that in the 2023-2024 year, 3 students graduated from this program. This program adds no extra burden to the faculty in the School of Music and contributes to enrollment in several science programs. No patterns in the data suggest a DFW issue. The data do suggest that some of these students struggle with the introductory science courses. The School of Music plans to investigate the suggested four-year plan to see if there are any potential issues with the sequence of courses. The self study provided evidence of 1 student research endeavor which included a capstone project titled: (2024) Disparities in Rural Healthcare in West Virginia However, I was unable to locate the specific project and how it contributed to creative research endeavors (Published? etc.)

Q6.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Q6.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q 8.6 in the program review.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Q6.3. Provide a specific critique of the program's learning outcomes.

"Excel through challenging, methodical, and innovative practical training towards a career in a health profession while achieving creative music experiences" How is this measured?

Q6.4. 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?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Q6.5. 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.

See Qs 8.11, 8.13, and 8.14 in the program review.

N/A

Q7.1. 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.

See Q 8.14 in the program review.

N/A Self study states the following: As previously mentioned, this program was not being offered during our most recent external accreditation review. It is noted the the current curriculum is being reviewed and revised and a new capstone course was approved through all levels of curriculum review.

Request the program to summarize the improvements made over the past five years and outline any future enhancement plans. This could also be an opportunity to highlight strategies for increasing enrollment and establish specific targets.

Q8.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q9.1. 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

Q9.2. 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.

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 Undergraduate Council requires that: 1. By January 2026, the School of Music will provide a report to the Undergraduate Council addressing how it has resolved its NASM deferred accreditation status. 2. By January 2026, submit in CIM revisions to program student learning outcomes 2 and 4; these are closer to mission statements than student learning outcomes. 3. By January 2026, the program will submit a curriculum map and assessment plan to the Undergraduate Council. 4. By January 2027, the program will submit evidence that demonstrates the implementation of the assessment plan.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 24 - 25

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU.

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science)

See Q 1.2 of the program review.

Regent's Bachelor of the Arts

Q1.3. If the program is specially accredited, is it in good standing with its accrediting body?

See Qs 2.2, 2.5, and 2.6 of the program review.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body
- ☐ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.6. 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.

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

This program is in alignment with WVU's mission, vision, and values as its purpose is providing accessible education to increase access and opportunity for learners who may not be able to participate in face-to-face, synchronous learning experiences. This program provides credit for work experiences, thus supporting partnership in communities and placing value on service, curiosity, and accountability.

Q2.1. Is this the program's first Board of Governor's program review?

See Q4.2 of the program review.

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q3.1. 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.

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

The program reports having been housed in a physically isolated location for years, making student engagement, especially with the population that may need additional support, difficult. It's possible that any decrease in head count could have been slightly influenced by this. The program has relocated to a new space and expects to see increased student engagement with ease of location. Program faculty and staff are also exploring online engagement opportunities, so this issue has been adequately addressed.

Q4.1. 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.

See Qs 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6 of the program review.

The program does not report any issues regarding faculty adequacy, credentialing, or productivity.

Q5.1. 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.

☒ All

☐ Some

Q5.3. 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.)

Both the primary and secondary reviewer should consult the data file provided.

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.

See Qs 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the program review.

Unique nature of the program carries an expectation of fluctuating enrollment as students exit the program through graduation sooner because of entering the program with large numbers of credits from other institutions or earning credits through work and life experience through portfolio.

Additionally, this program's students, often considered "nontraditional," may enroll and unenroll based on financial and life circumstances, as noted in the program's review narrative. However, the five-year enrollment data shows steady enrollment with 162 as a minimum and 208 as a maximum headcount in fall semesters. The most recent three-year data trend is an increase of 4.8%. Even considering the often difficult to predict nature of this type of program due to the truly unique situation of each student, this program has maintained consistent enrollment. There are no trends of note regarding DFW concerns. Most recent graduation data available shows graduation rate of 58%, higher than the average for other majors. The program reports 120 graduates from fall 23 through spring 24.

Q6.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Q6.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q 8.6 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Q6.4. 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?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Q6.5. 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. See Qs 8.11, 8.13, and 8.14 in the program review.

It is necessary to acknowledge the difficult nature of collecting measures of direct assessment in a program like this, where each student's degree plan is customizable and may be based on markers of assessment beyond letter grades. However, the program should provide some direct assessment against specified learning outcomes. The program narrative indicates that learning outcomes have been set at the state level. Outcomes published are based on AACU LEAP learning outcomes. The program reports interest in adding additional clear, measurable outcomes created at the college or program level. This is recommended in order to collect meaningful measures of assessment. Notably, although program of study is customized for each student, there appear to be common discipline courses completed by many students- BCOR, MDS, and some others. It may be possible to draw from these courses to engage in direct assessment.

Q7.1. 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.

See Q 8.14 in the program review.

WVU Bachelor of Arts degree provides a flexible and accessible degree opportunity for students in a variety of nontraditional circumstances. During the program review period, the RBA program has moved to a new physical location in Hodges Hall and continues to graduate a higher number of graduates than the college average. Enrollment has been steady despite the fluctuations within the college. This program has used its resources to make holistic advising a priority in this program. Through the Navigate system, advisors recorded 2400 meetings in one academic year. The nature of the population enrolled in this program requires advising to be much more than basic academic concerns. Clearly, the program is meeting those student needs as evidenced by the survey results in the program narrative. The RBA program reports plans to create RBA-specific initiatives to support a sense of connectedness among students in the major. Although program learning outcomes are governed at the state level, there is interest in creating additional outcomes that would guide assessment efforts at the program level.

Q8.1. Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q9.1. 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

Q9.2. 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.

The Undergraduate Council requires that: 1) By January 2026, the program will submit an assessment plan to the Undergraduate Council. 2) By January 2027, the program will submit evidence that demonstrates the implementation of the assessment plan. The Undergraduate Council also strongly recommends that the program consider methods to create community among the program's students, including exploring some form of in-person orientation or other on-campus activity, even if it was not required of all students for program completion.