BOG Graduate Program Review Spring 2025

Chair: Vacant

Members: Jeffery Houghton, WVU
                        Michael Vercelli, WVU
                        Geah Pressgrove, WVU
                        Kyle Hartman, WVU
                        Melissa Olfert, WVU
                        Gary Marsat, WVU
                        Carrie Rishel, WVU
                        Jason Phillips, WVU
                        Jake Follmer, WVU
                        Kim Floyd, WVU
                        Kristen Dieffenbach, WVU
                        Heather Henderson, WVU
                        Ahmad Hanif, WVU
                        Paul Chantler, WVU
                        Matthew Titolo, WVU
                        Victor Mucino, WVU
                        Kashy Aminian, WVU

This year the Graduate Council reviewed 16 graduate programs at WVU-Morgantown. The following pages consist of the recommendations and rationales for the review decisions for the programs listed below.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY
Dentistry, DDS, WVU*
Music Business and Industry, MA, WVU*
Musicology, MA, WVU*
Medicine, MD, WVU*
Physician Assistant, MHS, WVU*
Conducting, MM, DMA, WVU*
Music Performance, MM, DMA, WVU*
Music Education, MM, WVU*
Dental Specialties (Endodontics, Orthodontics, Periodontics, and Prosthodontics), MS, WVU*
Integrated Marketing Communications, MS, WVU
Biochemistry and Molecular Medicine, PhD, WVU
Cancer Cell Biology, PhD, WVU
Cellular and Integrative Physiology, PhD, WVU
Pharmaceutical and Pharmacological Sciences, PhD, WVU
Psychology, PhD, WVU*

*Accredited Programs

WVU Board of Governor's Program Review

Executive Summary – Academic Year 2024-2025

Graduate Council Program Reviews

- 16 programs were reviewed
    - There were 4 programs that were reviewed in summer 2023 which were considered to have fulfilled this academic year's program review requirement through that process.
- 9 programs were continued at the current level of activity.
- 7 programs were continued with specific action.
    - 7 actions were assigned to assessment of student learning.
    - 1 action was assigned to addressing accreditation requirements.
    - 1 action was assigned to program enrollment and viability.
    - 1 action was assigned to program learning outcomes.
    - 1 action was assigned at the school level to review workload assignment practices.

Program	Follow-up actions recommended
DDS Dentistry	Assessment of learning, accreditation
MA Music Business and Industry	Assessment of learning, student learning outcomes, program enrollment and viability
MM DMA Conducting	Assessment of learning
MM DMA Music Performance	Assessment of learning
MM Music Education	Assessment of learning
MS Integrated Marketing Communications	Assessment of learning
MS Dental Specialties	Student learning outcomes
School of Medicine	Review faculty workload policies and practices

Follow-up Actions Assigned in Previous Years

- 6 programs had follow-up actions reviewed.
- 4 programs resolved their issues.
- 2 programs require further follow-up.

Program	Follow-up action status
JD Law	Evidence of assessment of learning
MSJ Journalism	Evidence of assessment of learning

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.

DDS in Dentistry

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.

"Our Mission - Oral Health. Our Priority. Those four words simply state our mission and vision at West Virginia University School of Dentistry. The dental school fosters an exemplary learning environment that is supported by excellence in oral healthcare education, clinical experiences and research.
Ultimately, our goal is to be the dental school of choice for students, faculty, staff and patients. see: https://dentistry.wvu.edu/media/2238/sod- strategic□compass-080123.pdf The School of Dentistry aligns with WVU's mission. Its mission is to promote a diverse and dynamic learning environment that addresses the and future oral health needs of the citizens of West Virginia and beyond by providing an oral health center committed to excellence and innovation present in education, research, patient care, service and technology. The School of Dentistry is currently implementing recommendations resulting from its 2024 self-study and CODA site visit." School is not out of alignment with mission, vision or values.

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 self-study states that the DDS program has significant issues regarding access to adequate technological infrastructure. In particular, the program states that it faces obstacles to developing its digital dentistry educational offerings (which are an accreditation requirement). The self study explains that they are having difficulty in this area because of the "rigidity of the privacy and security requirements to host hardware and software on the network." The state that other schools have been able to fix these issues, but WVU IT has not been able to address these issues. This issue needs follow up with the DDS program and WVU IT to determine how to resolve these issues.

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 challenges recruiting faculty. They have retained a recruiting firm to assist in hiring an oral and maxillofacial surgeon and are attempting to recruit several others using networks and advertising. They can meet their basic educational mission, but only by increasing teaching obligations at the expense of research and service obligations. Also, they have had faculty retirements and other attrition over the last three years.

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 is performing well in student recruitment and graduation rates. The program has 100% employment of graduates. It also reports 90-100% on-time graduation rates between 2016-2024. In terms of learning outcomes & competencies, the program reports 90+% combined student scores of "very prepared" or "prepared" consistently since 2009 in core areas of scientific process, patient evaluation, diagnosis, treatment planning, prevention of disease, and other areas. (However, several categories including orthodontic therapy, implant therapy, occlusal/TMD therapy and other therapeutic areas, there were fewer "very prepared" ratings.

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.

Student assessment is conducted via post-graduate outcome data, on-time graduation rates, and National Board passage rates (measured by first-time passage and students who pass upon retaking the exam) of 90%+. Their senior survey of curriculum reports high % of seniors who believe that they are "very prepared" or "prepared" in the core competencies, with the exception of a few areas such as "implant therapy." However, their CODA/accreditation site visit report from '24 noted several issues related to assessment that need improvement: the program needs an outcomes assessment process for student success (not just a survey), and the report lists several specific methods for achieving this. At a minimum the program should develop these plans for student assessment as outlined in the CODA report

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 several improvements, including an innovation center with expanded student access to technology. The program continues to evaluate its curriculum with an eye to modernizing and updating it. It has added residencies in periodontics and pediatric dentistry. It has also remodeled and upgraded its urgent care and radiology clinics. Future improvement should focus on developing student assessment in line with the CODA recommendations and resolving its IT challenges making it difficult at present adequately to provide its digital dentistry curriculum.

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 Graduate Council requires that: 1) By January 2026, the program will submit an assessment plan to the Graduate Council that will, at a minimum, meet CODA accreditation requirements. 2) By January 2026, the Provost's Office will work with the School of Dentistry and ITS to resolve their problems with establishing their digital dentistry curriculum and provide a report back to the Graduate Council on that issue.

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.

> MA in Music Business and Industry

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 aligns very well with WVU's mission as evidenced by supplementary documentation provided by the program that maps various characteristics of the program onto specific Goals and Objectives as outlined in the West Virginia University 2020 Strategic Plan.

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 no significant issues regarding accessibility and adequacy of infrastructure and resources during the 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 adequate faculty to meet the mission of the program. Presently, the music business industry programs have three full time faculty, Darko Velichkovski, Teaching Professor and Director of Music Business and Industry, Joshua Swiger, Teaching Assistant Professor, and Ross Justice, Instructor. The program also uses qualified adjunct online instructors for the MA program, as needed. The program reports that no faculty are qualified by any other means than their academic 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

Q5.3. 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.

During the 5-year review period, the program reports a total 36 students enrolled in the program, which equates to an average of approximately 7 students per annual cohort (the program does not report annual enrollment figures). Of the 36 students, 27 have graduated, 7 are currently in the program, and 2 students dropped out after their first semester - one for financial reasons, and one for family/private situation reasons. The program sees no negative trends in either enrollment or completion rate and considers the program size to be not only viable, but also advantageous, because it allows for one-on-one faculty-student connection, communication and interaction. The program expects enrollment numbers to increase as the BA in Music Business and Industry grows and feeds more students into the MA program, and as more MA graduates establish themselves professionally thus enhancing the program's reputation. The program reports the time to graduation of the students who graduated within this cycle as follows: 56% - 19months 26% - 16-17 months 14% - 24 months 4% - 29 months. Most program graduates within this cycle are actively professionally participating in the music business and industry field, with many accomplishing laudable achievements. Specific examples are provided.

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 utilizes a number of direct and indirect assessments throughout its structure, aligned with and relevant to its outcomes. Direct Assessments: Students are assessed on a weekly basis in all the above listed courses to determine their development and proficiency related to this outcome, through the following types of assignments: discussion board, journals, blogs, projects, and quizzes. Indirect Assessments: Course level student evaluation surveys for all the courses (SEI). Post-program student survey. Data show all the assessment findings in this cycle are positive, showing that the program and its courses are effective and delivering as planned, meeting all the objectives, and the program identifies no negative trends.

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 reports eliminating the Music Production Methods and Technology module from the program's curriculum and keeping MUSC 624 (Live Music Production) from that module as one of the electives in the Music Commerce, Management, and Operations module of the program. This change improved and strengthened the focus of the program on the business structures, methods, and practices in the music industry, which is the main professional interest of students, rather than the technological aspects of the industry. This change also lowered the program's total number of required credits to 30 credits, from 33 credits, which aids students in their time to completion. Additional examples of curriculum updates and modifications include the regulatory provisions and business implications of the new Music Modernization Act, applications of blockchain technology in the music industry, new digital music marketing, analytics, and promotion platforms and methods, etc.

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 Graduate Council requires that: 1) By January 2026, the program, in collaboration with the College of Creative Arts and Media's dean's office and WVU Online, submit a plan to the Graduate Council that addresses how it will improve recruitment and marketing for the program. 2) The Provost's Office will monitor program enrollment during annual academic unit review each of the next three academic years (through AY 27-28) to determine if the program needs to undergo further review for its viability as a revenue generating online program.

.

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.

MA Musicology

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 demonstrates alignment with WVU's mission, vision, and values, in part through programmatic commitment to community and land-grant values, developing ethical performers and educators, and public-oriented scholarship.

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 does not indicate significant experienced issues with infrastructure-based resources.

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 indicates adequate faculty and capacity to support its mission. The program does note experiencing challenge with enrollment since the most recent BOG program review. This challenge is attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic. The program also indicates complexity associated with recurring changes in leadership at departmental and programmatic levels.

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 consistency in its completion and persistence-based/continuance metrics, though the self-study does not explicitly discuss these metrics or trends in these metrics since the prior BOG program review. Challenges with D/F/W rates are not present. As markers of student success, the program notes students' admittance into doctoral programs and success in securing leadership-type positions in the field (e.g., Interim Director of the WVU Community Music Program). Broadly, the self-study does not provide a deep contextualization of enrollment trends or completion rate information.

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 summarizes aggregate assessment of program learning outcomes across enrollment in as many as eight degree programs. There is some question about the appropriateness of the program learning outcomes in framing students' skills and experiences as well as actionable assessment. The assessment work that is summarized generally indicates attainment of learning outcomes based on alignment with course-based assessments. It is at times a bit unclear what those course-based assessments were and the ways in which they were linked with specific program learning outcomes. On the whole, there is clear evidence of effort toward refining assessment of student learning and experiences in the program as well as students meeting major programmatic outcomes and milestones through the document assessment evidence.

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.

As indicated in the prior response, on the whole, there is clear evidence of effort toward refining assessment of student learning and experiences in the program as well as students meeting major programmatic outcomes and milestones through the document assessment evidence. The program notes the need for further refinement to its learning outcomes as well as efforts to further support student success initiatives.

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.

> MD Doctor of Medicine

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 MD program contributes to the WVU mission, vision, and values by providing a premium education to qualified students. Learning outcomes promote health and wellness. Students participate in engaging classroom presentations, clinical and problem-based learning groups, self-directed didactics and experiential learning in world class facilities. The program also contributes to the School of Medicine's mission, to "improve the health and wellbeing of everyone we serve."

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.

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.

No issues.

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.

Enrollment has been steady and graduation rate is stable over the past five years. The four-year graduation rate is approximately 78%. Students who are delayed for academic or personal reasons receive help from a number of resources, including the Committee on Academic and Professional Standards, faculty advising, learning specialists, and peer tutors. There are no high DFW courses reported. Student success is demonstrated by strong match rates for graduates. All 2024 graduates matched to a residency program across 22 states.

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 Continuous Quality Improvement Committee (CQIC) conducts assessment for the program and prepares for accreditation visits. The program exceeded national expectations for medical schools in all four factors monitored by accreditation: pass rate on Step 1 boards above 85%, pass rate on Step 2 boards above 89%, withdrawal and dismissal rates from the program below 5%, and an initial residency match rate above 83%.

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 improved student responses to teaching in courses that rated below national averages, including immunology and clinical clerkships. The program also responded to student feedback from an accreditation survey by addressing student dissatisfaction with unscheduled time and self-directed learning. Finally, the program increased the frequency of its curriculum reviews as recommended by the most recent accreditation visit.

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.

> SOM Physician's Assistant MHS

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 aligns with the WVU Institutional mission, vision and values. The West Virginia University Division of Physician Assistant Studies is committed to partnering with communities to improve the health and quality of life for individuals within and beyond the state of West Virginia. The Division is dedicated to addressing health care needs by offering a high-quality academic program that strives for excellence in education and clinical practice. The Division, through promotion of quality improvement and evidence-based practice, contributes to scholarship in the field. The program provides a model for addressing health disparity through an understanding of health and health policy, as well as awareness of social drivers of health and quality of life locally and globally. Division of Physician Assistant Studies Goals The goals of the program are to prepare physician assistants who: Contribute as members of an interprofessional team to deliver health care across multiple healthcare settings. Address issues of prevention and chronic disease management in rural and underserved areas, especially in West Virginia. Pursue and apply evidence-based practice. Demonstrate professional integrity through practice in an ethical and legal manner. Commit to professional development and lifelong learning.

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 report states there are no signficant infrastructure issues for resources. Students are able to have accommodations, classrooms, technology support, and physical space as needed to run this program.

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.

> First student enrollment was Jan 2020 two months before COVID pandemic resulting in online learning shift. This remote work put stress on the talent and structure of the newly hired faculty. New "green" faculty were encouraged to enroll in the HSC Teaching Scholars Program to assist in mentoring and guiding. Post-pandemic the program was awarded the 5-yr HRSA Primary Care and Training Enhancement-Physician Assistant Rural Training Grant. No notation of how this has impacted the composition and productivity of 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.

> Enrollment trends have become steady and full over the past three years resulting in 100% retention, pass rate for discipline specific exams from 96% to now 100% pass rate, student success has increased with scholarships and IPE recognitions from students. There are no concerns of this program currently. Corrections have been made appropriately to reach full capacity and full graduation rates.

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.

From analysis of the curriculum map and competencies adjustments were made after program data were collected. New curriculum adjustments were made as of Jan. 2024 when a risk stratification tool was created to follow students along in their process. Program scores were improved from this process. Both student performance and perception scores were impacted positively by this implementation process with the result hitting above the target benchmark.

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.

A risk stratification process was put in place, data collected and reviewed regularly to refine and improve the process impacting curriculum adjustments in a dynamic process, followed by exit interview review with both data including student perceptions and actual curriculum competency review. The curriculum program mapping and objectives were adjusted based on data collected.

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.

MM Conducting DMA Conducting

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 Master of Music (MM) in conducting and the Doctor of Musical Arts (DMA) in conducting degrees are in alignment with WVU's mission, vision, and values through the WVU School of Music's mission "to create an innovative and inclusive musical community that prepares informed, ethical students for meaningful lives as performers, educators, composers, conductors, music therapists, entrepreneurs, and scholars." The vision in the WVU School of Music is "to cultivate a vibrant community of musicians and scholars who engage in research and creative activity in the fields of music performance and improvisation, composition, music teacher education, theory, musicology, music therapy, technology, and industry," to directly support WVU's vision of supporting the "pillars of education, healthcare and prosperity." Music Education, then, is fully integrated into the School's long-term plans, and, as the information presented below will demonstrate, the students and faculty alike are contributing to the field through preparing and supporting music education in and throughout the region.

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 significant issues are 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.

> Since the last BOG 5-year review in 2019, the MM and DMA in Music Conducting did not have growth in enrollment during the COVID pandemic but demonstrate recent growth. During this time the School of Music has also had dramatic changes in leadership (three directors and two directors of graduate studies in five years). All of the graduate programs will undergo revisions within the next five-year period, including refining the program learning outcomes. The school expects to maintain their current level enrollment dependent upon continued funding for graduate assistantships.

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 target enrollment for the MM Conducting and DMA Conducting programs is designed to be small. The current funding supports FOUR GTAs for the music conducting area. The funding assists in all of the large, public-performing ensembles. These ensembles include WVU Orchestra, WVU Choirs, WVU Bands, WVU Marching Band. Despite the pandemic, APS data show an increase in enrollment since 2021 and the Program expects to maintain the current trend. Continuous GTA support is also vital to the undergraduate programs and will ensure continuity in the music education degree. The completion rate has been consistent despite the variability of enrollment this reporting period. The school does not see any issues with their program's continuance or completion rates. Only MUSC 695 Independent Study was reported with a high DFW percentage. This course is not seen as a significant trend in this report. Alumni Success: school band directors, auditions with the US Army Band, and Assistant Professor of Choral Music, are among the examples mentioned. The Creative Consultant and Media Mentors program is open to sophomores through graduate students and currently matches 60 students with 60 mentors. Also, the program partners with the WVU Purpose Center to provide coaching in professionalism and career development.

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.

> The program's learning outcomes are overly broad and not specific. They are also difficult to measure. However, it is noted that they were accepted by the NASM accrediting body.

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 provided curriculum map is very simplistic and the program states that they are in the process of revising the graduate programs learning outcomes. A review of the NASM self-study provides a three-page summary of evaluation and planning that includes all programs in the School of Music (SOM).
> Details and evidence are not clear. However, no problems are noted for the MM and DMA in Music Conducting.

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.

Despite the challenges of the recent pandemic and Academic Transformation, the program's enrollment has continued to grow exceeding its pre- pandemic numbers. The program anticipates a revision in the Program Learning Outcomes over the next reporting cycle to reflect more measurable results. The school is aware that they need more effective tracking of students' successes by soliciting feedback from their recent graduates to continue to shape their program for the future. The program needs to fix the facilities' air handler as part of NASM requirement.

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 Graduate Council requires that: 1. By January 2026, the program will submit evidence of its direct assessment of student learning in the program and of its student learning outcomes and an explanation of how that evidence is used to inform possible program change. The Graduate Council also recommends extending the current curriculum map to be more robust and to better support the current 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.

MM DMA Music Performance

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 provides the School of Music's mission and vision statements, and notes that these directly align with WVU's vision of supporting the "pillars of education, healthcare and prosperity" and that students and faculty contribute to the university's mission through public performances, conference presentations, and peer-reviewed publications.

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 no significant issues regarding accessibility and adequacy of infrastructure and resources during the 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 an adequate number of faculty, none of whom are qualified by means other than their academic credentials. Despite the challenges of the COVID pandemic, Academic Transformation, and leadership changes in the School of Music, the program faculty have been able to maintain program enrollments and teaching, research, and service activities at a consistent level during the review period. The program notes that all of their graduate programs will undergo revisions within the next five-year period, including refining program learning outcomes.

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 reports enrollments ranging between 55-60 during the review period, with continuance and completion rates remaining steady. Although completion time increased slightly in the wake of the pandemic, the program notes that the average completion time is returning to historic levels. The program notes student graduate, performance, and teaching placements at major universities and conservatories, arts organizations, and secondary schools, providing several examples across these categories. The program also comments that graduates are active participants in a variety of professional organizations. The program touts the School of Music's Creative Consultant and Media Mentors that through a competitive application process matches outstanding students with accomplished arts professionals.

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

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

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 assessment plan provides an overview of assessment methods for each learning objective. Assessment methods include an entrance performance audition and an entrance music theory exam, jury performances and degree recitals, as well as comprehensive exams. However, the program provides very little in terms of assessment data, presenting only comprehensive exam pass rates over recent semesters. The program also provides little information regarding program changes or improvements stemming from assessment findings.

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.

As noted above, the program provides scant information regarding improvements resulting from the assessment process. However, the program admits a need to revise its learning objectives to be more measurable, which could facilitate a more effective assessment process. Consequently, the program anticipates revising program learning objectives and associated assessment methods. The Council concurs and recommends that the program revise its learning objectives to be more specific and measurable, and create a revised comprehensive assessment plan to more effectively document student learning and developmental outcomes and to identify areas for future program changes and improvements.

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 Graduate Council requires that: 1. By January 2026, the program will submit evidence of its direct assessment of student learning in the program and of its student learning outcomes and an explanation of how that evidence is used to inform possible program change. The Graduate Council also recommends that the program extend the curriculum map to be more robust and to better support the current 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.

MM Music Education

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.

MM in Music Education in direct alignment with WVU's mission, vision, and values through the WVU School of Music's mission "to create an innovative and inclusive musical community that prepares informed, ethical students for meaningful lives as performers, educators, composers, conductors, music therapists, entrepreneurs, and scholars." The vision in the WVU School of Music is "to cultivate a vibrant community of musicians and scholars who engage in research and creative activity in the fields of music performance and improvisation, composition, music teacher education, theory, musicology, music therapy, technology, and industry," to directly support WVU's vision of supporting the "pillars of education, healthcare and prosperity." Music Education, then, is fully integrated into the School's long-term plans, and, as the information presented below will demonstrate, the students and faculty alike are contributing to the field through preparing and supporting music education in and throughout the region.

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 were 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.

> Since the last BOG 5-year review, the MM in Education has had a dip in enrollment during the COVID pandemic, but demonstrates recent growth. During this time the School of Music has also had dramatic changes in leadership (three directors and two directors of graduate studies in five years). All of the graduate programs will undergo revisions within the next five-year period, including refining the program learning outcomes. The School expects to maintain their current level enrollment dependent upon continued funding for graduate assistantships.

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 target enrollment for the MM in Music Education program is designed to be small. The current funding supports three GTAs for the music education area which supports all aspects of the undergraduate program in music education, which is the largest undergraduate degree. Despite the pandemic, APS data show a steady increase in MM student enrollment since 2021 and the Program expects to maintain the current trend. Continuous GTA support is vital to the undergraduate programs and will ensure continuity in the music education degree. The MM Music Education completion rate has been consistent despite the variability of enrollment this reporting period. The Program does not see any issues with their program's continuance or completion rates. Of the courses with a high DFW rate this reporting only one (ED600) was a graduate level course. This course also falls outside of the School of Music and is not seen as a significant trend in this report. Recent Alumni Success: Several students are teaching in K-12 schools, others are pursuing graduate programs, a student is touring the country with a nationally known country music artist, and others presented research at the state and national levels. The Creative Consultant and Media Mentors program is open to sophomores through graduate students and currently matches 60 students with 60 mentors. Also, the program partners with the WVU Purpose Center to provide coaching in professionalism and career development.

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.

> The program's learning outcomes are overly broad and not specific. They are also difficult to measure. However, it is noted that they were accepted by the NASM accrediting body.

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 provided curriculum map is very simplistic and the program states that they are in the process of revising the graduate programs learning outcomes. A review of the NASM self-study provides a three-page summary of evaluation and planning that includes all programs in the School of Music (SOM).
> Details and evidence are not clear. However, no problems are noted for the MM in Music Education.

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.

> Despite the challenges of the recent pandemic and Academic Transformation, the program's enrollment has continued to grow exceeding its pre- pandemic numbers. The program anticipates a revision in the Program Learning Outcomes over the next reporting cycle to reflect more measurable results. The program is aware that they need more effective tracking of students' successes by soliciting feedback from their recent graduates to continue to shape their program for the future. The program needs to fix the facilities' air handler as part of NASM requirement.

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 Graduate Council requires that: 1. By January 2026, the program will submit evidence of direct assessment of learning that aligns with program's student learning outcomes. 2. By January 2026, the program should review its CIM / Catalog program requirements to ensure that it is clearly communicating what the program requirements are and how / if they prepare students to be certified teachers in the state of West Virginia. The Graduate Council also recommends that the program extend its curriculum map to make its current assessment plan more robust.

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.

EDON_MS; ORTH_MS; PERI_MS; PRSTHDON_MS

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.

Program not out of alignment with mission, vision or values. The Mission, Vision and Values Statement of the Program is consistent with WVU's Mission Statement.

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.

Does not report negative issues in these areas.

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.

Program reports no issues regarding adequacy of 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

Q5.2. What was inaccurate?

Only the "Endodontics" page lists the course requirements for that specialty. Course requirements are not listed for Orthodontics, Periodontics or Prosthodontics. The webpages for these programs list 9 courses for Endodontics, 6 courses for Orthodontics and Periodontics (the same 6 courses) and 6 (different) courses for Prosthodontics.

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 data for enrollment trends is not presented in tabular form Endodontics, Orthodontics, Periodontics, and Prosthodontics programs enroll. Enrollment reflects the patient pool and in general these programs have enrollment of 1 or 3 students per year, maintaining a total enrollment between 6 to 9 per year.

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.

Each Program lists the Degree Requirements clearly and all four programs offer exactly the same Learning Outcomes, mainly: 1. Provide the education and training necessary for graduate dentists to practice in their specialty. 2. Provide the education and training necessary for a specialist to achieve Board Certification. Perhaps these LO are rather too general and do not reflect the different nature of each program. Maybe a redefinition is in order.

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.

Most likely, YES... but since Learning Outcomes are not clearly differentiated between programs, the assessment is most likely based on specific degree requirements, program completion reports, success rate of graduates etc.

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.

Based on the most recent CODA Accreditation for Endodontics, Orthodontics and Prosthodontics review (April of 2024) and the Periodontics (April of 2021) There were no significant changes. However, Periodontics on 02/21/2022 and Prosthodontics on 05/21/2022 added the course PROS 693A to curriculum requirements as a lecture-based class to fulfill degree requirements.

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 Graduate Council requires that: 1. By January 2026, each specialty submit in CIM program student learning outcomes that are distinct from the learning outcomes in the other specialties.

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.

MS 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 Integrated Marketing Communications Program prepares students to excel as professional communicators, scholars and innovators in a rapidly changing global media environment. The program is aligned with the WVU's mission, vision and values.

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 has not experienced significant issues with inadequate or inaccessible infrastructure resources.

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 has adequate number of faculty necessary to meet the mission of the 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.

The enrollment, number of graduates, and time to completion has been relatively stable with the exception of 2024-25 enrollment (-74%). D/F/W percentages were below 30%. However, the program has implemented changes in some the courses (DMC 680, DMC 571) to increase student resources. These changes appeared to have improved student completion in subsequent terms. Program's graduates are employed by numerous Fortune 500 companies as well as nonprofits.

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 of program-level learning outcomes is conducted through the regular collection of direct (Pre/ Post Test Assessment) and indirect (Alumni Surveys) measures. However, no data has been provided. The IMC program conducts an alumni success survey every two years in the fall. The most recent alumni survey was conducted in December 2024. Alumni were asked to help assess curriculum, program relevance to the current marketplace and other significant aspects of the program. Of those that responded to the 2024 survey: 98.6% of respondents said they had or would recommend the program to a friend or colleague. 96.6% reported that their degree led to a better position and/or promotion. 60.7% report an increase in income of more than 25% since completing the program an increase from 58.9% in 2022.

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 made the following improvements: Curriculum Improvements: Addressing Foundational Content Missing in Core Courses, Course Enhancements, Supplemental Learning Technologies to Improve Instructor-Student Engagement The overall program curriculum: New Major (Digital Marketing Communication, 2020), Improved Student Resources (Student Dashboard, Student Orientation Course, The WVU Marketing Communications Today Podcast, WVU eCampus Overview YouTube Video, Interactive Learning Modules). However, it is not clear how the improvements are related to the learning outcome assessment results.

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 Graduate Council requires that: 1) By January 2026, the program will submit evidence of its direct assessment of student learning in the program and of its student learning outcomes and an explanation of how that evidence is used to inform possible program change.

.

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.

> Ph.D. Biochemistry and Molecular Medicine

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 to advance education, health care, and prosperity by training future research leaders who study issues critical to West Virginia, including diabetes and cancer. The program teaches students to address the societal and economic implications of their work to improve health care in West Virginia and beyond the state.

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.

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 COVID-19 pandemic hindered bench-based science in the department, however the program adapted, supported student research, and contributed to the state's COVID Rapid Response Laboratory.

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.

> Enrollment has grown in recent years from incoming cohorts of 2 to 3 students to groups of 5 to 6. Graduated students have also increased over the past five years, from 7 during the previous five-year review period to 12. Time to degree peaked at 7.17 years in 2018 and improved to 5.6 years in 2024. No high DFW courses were reported. To demonstrate student success, the program reports that students publish 2 to 4 times as lead or contributing authors. Students have received NIH and NSF grants and fellowships in recent years and presented their work at national conferences. Recent graduates have secured postdocs at prestigious universities, government agencies, and industries.

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 reports that most faculty train graduate students and maintain active research agendas with external funding. Efforts to improve the diversity of the program's student body have succeeded: 18% of students are ethnically diverse, 66% are women.

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 improved its time-to-degree metrics by restructuring its qualifying exam to accelerate student progress and identify individual student needs. The program also expanded its definition of acceptable publications and allows student to graduate before final paper acceptance when circumstances are beyond their control.

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.

> PhD SOM Cancer Cell Biology

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.

> Yes, this program aligns with the mission, vision and values of WVU. Students in the doctoral program in Cancer Cell Biology receive comprehensive in- depth training in modern areas of cancer biology, with a strong emphasis on cellular and molecular aspects of cancer origin, progression and treatment and a focus on cancer types and issues relevant to international, national and West Virginia populations. The program is designed to produce scholarly researchers with aptitude in public speaking, community service, clinical engagement, and critical thinking. Completion of the Ph.D. degree is realized when the student successfully presents the research results to faculty of the graduate dissertation committee and program, and publishes original peer- reviewed research as the primary author. Typically, five years are required to realize this goal. The doctor of philosophy program in cancer cell biology is designed to expose Ph.D. and M.D./Ph.D. level graduate students to a wide spectrum of opportunities available in basic and translational cancer research. In addition to mechanistic and therapeutic approaches to studying problems in cancer at the bench, students have the opportunity for exposure to more clinical elements of cancer practice, including participation in tumor boards, shadowing clinicians, and participation in the design and approval of clinical trials. The cancer cell biology program at WVU is a member of the Cancer Biology Training Consortium (CABTRAC), a national o

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 report states adequate resources with accessible infrastructure continue to be present for this PhD program in Cancer Cell Biology which spans across many basic science department setting it in a very unique position to serve students enrolled in specific unique approached to research.

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.

> With a recent new director hired that was new and more focused determination as to how to recruit with more intention to the focus and specialty of faculty here at WVU Cancer Center and Basic Science focus researchers. Enrollment has shifted over the years due to Covid Pandemic, change in leadership in the director and shift in faculty recruitment and hiring. Currently the program is where the director and other faculty have set a goal. It appears to be stable with enrollment and support allowing unique flexibility of 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.

Enrollment has remained consistent in the last 5 years with shifts most current from the hiring of a new leadership of the Cancer Institute and realignment with priorities of the institution. Currently there are three students 1 MD/PhD in spring 2023 and 2 PhD student in spring 2024, although this is less/smaller than back in 2021 during the Covid Pandemic there were no enrollments in 2022-23 due to changes made in program, leadership and re- centering of the Cancer Center.

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.

> With the unique and vast expance of faculty mentors involved in this type of program that is spread over many departments the best way to determine impact and evidence of assessment is through outputs or products from the students enrolled. Peer-review publications were at 40 published during this 5 year review. That is substantial with the issues of the global pandemic shutting down labs. Further where these individuals go for job placement after graduation is another area of focus.

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 in the form of re-alignment with shifts of leadership in the HSC and the Cancer Center to offer a unique and varied program based on multiple different basic science department faculty engaged in this student training program. Flexibility has been a necessary ingredient over the past 5 years to allow this program to be more focused and specialized based on leadership and resources.

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.

P.h.D Cellular and Integrative Physiology

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 mission of the CIP Graduate Program is to engage students in developing a creative approach to the life sciences and to explain how the higher- level properties of complex systems arise from the interactions amongst their parts. Students specifically develop skills with problem-solving applying quantitative and theoretical approaches. Further, CIP promotes a diverse and inclusive learning environment by providing opportunities for students of any gender or race. CIP through its educational material helps to educate students on the underpinnings of various diseases that are directly relevant to West Virginians As such, CIP contributed to the mission, vision, and values of WVU

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.

For the most part, CIP does have adequate and accessible infrastructure resources. The program dierctor states issues with access to scheduling of classrooms, technical infrastructure, and technological support. the concerns are a reflection of the movement to Live25 which allows all programs/departments to schedule rooms that were typically in the footprint of CIP. secondly, the issues with technological reflects updates and security software that impacts with the running of the various PCs used for resaerch and teaching. Also, several of the PCs in the lecture rooms are old and need replaced. No steps have been taken to address these concerns.

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 director indicates they have enough faculty with the required credentials and composition to ensure the running of the program. Based on their website, they have ~ 15 faculty who are actively involved in the research and teaching of the graduate students in their 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

Q5.2. What was inaccurate?

CIP has recently updated its Chair to Dr. Hollander; this change was not reflected on the websites. Given that CIP is an umbrella program with the HSC BMS, the metrics for enrollment and graduation were not found, but i am not sure if this is a CIP or BMS issue.

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.

Enrollment is dependent on several factors,including grant funding, number of faculty eligible to take a student into their laboratory, and student interest. Since ~2022, CIP have had a steady enrollment of 10-11 students, that compares favorably to the college comparison which is a -5.8%, with a course completion rate is 100%. The 3-year trend for graduation in our program is +41.4%, whichcompares favorably to the college value of -9.2%. Examination of the JobEq report shows that CIP are similar to institutionslike Stanford, Cincinatti, and Loyola in numbers of degrees awarded within a year. the student success is exemplary with several students receiving NIH/AHA fellowships, numerous publications, invited oral and poster presentations at national and regional 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.

Programmatic review by faculty: All students are reviewed annually by the graduate program that insures that students are completing curricular requirements on time and are maintaining the academic and professional standards published in their handbook. Advisory committee evaluation: Research Grade of Satisfactory or unsatisfactory are determined by the students research committee. Students are required to have a meeting at least once a year with the dissertation advisory committee and the results of this meeting are documented on an evaluation form that becomes part of the student's permanent file. Self-assessment: Students are required to complete an individual development plan yearly Student satisfaction survey: This survey is sponsored by the Office of Research and Graduate Education and is sent out each January to all graduate students at the HSC. The survey identifies deficiencies in resources and support and importantly any issues with sexual harassment and misconduct, inappropriate requests for services outside of graduate education, discrimination and harassment based on gender, sexual minority status, ethnicity, and religion. CIP also provides specific information on the various courses they teach and how those courses target the various learning outcomes. for example, advanced Physiology (PSIO 750) acheives all learning outcomes, while PSOP 744 seminar only meetings 5 of the 8 learning outcomes. No issues are reported

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.

CIP program has improved the number of course choices to address the specific needs of students in the program. A student satisfaction survey has been added that helps us learn and address student perspectives and needs. Students have been given access to programs that help them make figures for talks and papers and analyze their data on laptops provided to them by the program. We have added faculty to the department since the last review, which has allowed CIP to expand its expertise into cardiac and mitochondrial physiology

---

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.

> Pharmaceutical and Pharmacological 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 PPS Program is an interdisciplinary program that prepares students for a future in a variety of employment settings, ranging from academic research and industry to federal positions. The PPS Graduate Program is committed to improving the health and well- being of West Virginians and society at large by conducting innovative research that advances scientific knowledge, pharmacy practice, and by educating students and practitioners.

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 lists no significant issues related to existing resources

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 lists no issues related to adequate faculty, productivity, and lists no faculty qualified by other means than academic 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

Q5.3. 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 lists no issues with enrollment, graduation rates, D/F/W courses and provides an attached list of recent student accomplishments including publications and grants. The program reports a graduation rate of ~4 students per year.

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 provides an assessment of student learning, curriculum map, and list of student support services, and student satisfaction survey. The program assessment includes how each program learning outcome is assessed, but does not provide data indicating how many students within the program are meeting the assigned benchmarks. While the materials presented are adequate at this point, the Council recommends that the program look to develop and implement more direct assessment of student learning prior to its next Board of Governors program review.

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 reports improvement over this reporting cycle by creating a mandatory grant writing course based on student feedback and advisor recommendations. As noted elsewhere, the Council recommends that the program look to develop and implement more direct assessment of student learning prior to its next Board of Governors program review.

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.

> PhD 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 mission of the PhD program in Psychology at West Virginia University aligns with our land-grant institution's commitment to education, healthcare, and societal progress. We aim to produce scientists who push the boundaries of psychological research, educators who effectively communicate and disseminate psychological principles, and clinicians who apply psychological approaches to address individual and societal challenges. Our commitment also includes a focus on diversity and inclusion, and an engagement with our community, to lead transformation within West Virginia 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.

No issues

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 lost 9 TT (4 full, 4 associate, 1 assistant) and 2 TAPs. They hired 5 TT at assistant level, 1 SAP, and 2 TAPs. 5 of lost faculty were from the Clinical Psychology program and have replaced only one. Three were from the Behavioral Neuroscience (BN) program. Although we hired two behavioral neuroscientists in 2020, this program remains understaffed relative to previous years and relative to all other programs. Losses have affected their ability to cover graduate-level courses, resulting in reduced course offerings and hiring outside the department on a per-course basis. They lost key leadership roles: Director of Clinical Training (CT) (required for APA accreditation) and Director of the on-campus mental health clinic. This program has made temporary compensations by dividing the role of Director of CT among remaining faculty, seeking affiliate mentors for graduate students, and hiring from outside of the department to cover courses required for licensure as a clinical psychologist. For BN, the hiring of a TAP for the undergraduate neuroscience major, allowed coverage of graduate courses by BN faculty. The losses and reductions in funding, has affected the size of graduate cohorts, and their ability to meet the minimum enrollment requirements for some courses. They identified affiliate faculty from other program areas or departments to serve as research mentors to our graduate students. The SAP covered some administrative and teaching duties.

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.

Student headcounts from fall 201 to fall 2024 remained consistent from the previous reporting cycle. Average new enrollees declined slightly from 17.3 to 15.8 over the reporting period. This decline can be attributed to reduced departmental budget and to the loss of several faculty. Average percentage of students continuing the program each year of this reporting cycle was 78.7% Overall continuance for this reporting period is consistent with the previous reporting period. Graduate students were highly prolific in creative and research endeavors having co-authored 54.7% of the 400 scientific articles produced by the program during the 2019-2024 reporting cycle. Graduate students also co-authored 34 books, book chapters, or white papers and technical reports. Forty-three students were awarded prestigious fellowships, scholarships, and awards. Post-graduate employment has been successful for students. Students who left the program with the MS degree have 75% placement in clinical practice or other health-related fields. For those who earned their doctorate, 88% are places in a faculty position, clinical practice, or a post-doctoral fellowship. 8.6% are working in other research-oriented positions. 3.5% have an unknown placement status. For the PhD, the average number of students earning a doctorate was 12.2 and 11.4 for 2014-2019 and 2019-2024 periods, respectively. The total number of students earning a doctorate was 61 and 57, respectively, for these same reporting period.

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 is accredited by the APA (clinical) and the ABAI (Behavior Analysis). Both accrediting bodies re-accredited the program in 2020 (Clinical) and 2024 (Behavioral Analysis). Using requirements set by each programmatic accreditor, curriculum mapping addresses specific learning outcomes across the curriculum are in CIM. Curricular changes for this reporting cycle included removing the 1-credit course PSYC 701 from the degree requirements. The information presented in this course was incorporated into the PD series for incoming students. Other curriculum changes were made for individual program areas. For Lifespan Developmental students, PSYC 612, 711 & 745 were made required. These changes did not affect the total credits required for students in the LSD program. For Behavior Analysis, 2 elective courses were added to align with requirements per accrediting body: PSYC 729 & 738. These changes did not affect the total credits required for students in the BA program. For Clinical, changes were made to meet new accreditation standards of the APA. Courses removed were PSYC 721 & 531; courses added were PSYC 762, 726 & 780. These changes reduced the number of required credits from 85 to 79. In 2022, PSYC: Clinical Child program was deactivated, as it was a duplicate of the PSYC: Clinical 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.

They created annual assessment data based on our program learning outcomes that they gather yearly. That approach allows for a more standardized evaluation across all students, regardless of their program area. They hired a faculty member to serve in the role of Assistant Director of Graduate. In their last report, they noted that ratings of satisfaction with assistantship funding had been notably low, and that they had begun efforts to increase stipend levels. Specifically, the department began supplementing the 9-month stipend level. For 2019-2024, they continued those efforts. Median ratings increased initially, but decreased again over the last two years, likely influenced by rising inflation rates coupled with reduced funds to the department to support activities like student travel. They increased the stipend in 2024 to address concerns. There were students' lower ratings on items pertaining to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), which they felt impacted the recruitment and retention of exceptional students. They responded by developing a Diversity Committee and incorporating diversity-focused speakers into departmental colloquium series. Ratings for some DEI items improved but remain relatively low overall. During 2019-2024, the committee continued to identify speakers and promote DEI-related events & resources. They also began PUMP-UP (Psychology Undergraduate Mentorship Program for Underrepresented Populations).

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