

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science) See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BA Anthropology

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 contributes to WVU's mission, vision, and values by: --Educating undergraduate and graduate students so that they are critical thinkers, who have a firm foundation in the perspectives, scientific methods, and findings that guide research in our disciplines --Conducting innovative, relevant and collaborative research on topics of broad interest that draws on and feeds back into our teaching and service --Serving the campus, local, state, national and international communities.

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 report cites adequate and accessible 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 reports adequate faculty numbers to meet the mission, no negative events this cycle that effected being productive in the three areas, and no faculty qualified by means other 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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

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.

According to the data supplied, the program held steady with an enrollment of 40 students until the pandemic when they had a slight decrease to 38 and then 37 enrollees. They report that APS data supplied for their annual report shows a slight increase in enrollment over the past three years. This discrepancy should be investigated to ascertain in which direction enrollment is trending and if any of this is related to separating Anthropology from Sociology into its own degree. The number of program graduates has steadily increased from 2 to 13 between 2016-2021. Departmental certification reports graduations in the program moving from 10 to 19 during this period. Both sets of data indicate increasing graduation rates. The most recent rates are in line with similar programs. No further action required. Time to completion for the program is better than the college rate. Continuance rates have been uneven. ANTH 254 is identified as a high DFW course, however, only 6 majors have earned DFW over the past 3-year cycle, which is not problematic. Evidence of student success is a strength with almost one-third of students participating in advanced or experiential learning and several named Outstanding Seniors as recognized by the college. The unit is working to bring in more students as second majors and their courses are being embedded in other programs, specifically Geography. No further recommendations at this time.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program provided a curriculum map aligning with the SLOs in the course catalog. It fully identifies which outcomes are associated with which courses. They provided evidence of multiple-choice batteries given to assess learning during the capstone course. They identified inconsistencies in applying to batteries and identified low participation corresponding with the height of the pandemic. They included an appendix of the questions used in testing for SLOs. They have also identified ways to raise participation across faculty implementation and potentially dividing the batteries so some are given directly after courses in which that information is learned. They are to be encouraged to implement the actions identified to obtain more complete data.

Q7.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

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

See Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The undergraduate council commends the program for developing its assessment of learning outcomes after becoming a stand-alone unit. The council strongly recommends they continue to make the improvements identified in their self-assessment to provide consistent and broad 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

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science) See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BA in Chemistry (not accredited) and BS in Chemistry (Accredited)

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 of educational preparation for students, excellence in high standards and impact to society by producing graduates who have knowledge and practical experience in chemistry for pursuing careers in the chemical industry or enroll in graduate or professional school for careers in science, healthcare or law. This program promotes economic prosperity and aligns with the strategic needs of 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.

Two of the buildings that house this program (Chemistry Research Lab building and the Clark building) have water leaks that need to be addressed. Instead of covering expensive equipment with plastic sheets and paper towels, a more permanent solution must be found.

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 faculty. Teaching in a virtual format during the Covid-19 pandemic has been a very challenging issue for laboratory experiences. However, these classes have now moved back to a regular in-class format and the issue has been resolved.

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- All  
 Some

Q5.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

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

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

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

The program has seen a decline in enrollment over the past 5 years. However, it should be noted that the fall-to-fall continuance has improved from 5 years ago. While the number of graduates has seen a decline from 23 in AY 2016-17 to 18 in AY 20-21, these numbers are higher than graduates from similar programs in the region. The department has initiated steps to improve recruiting and retention with a goal of 150 students in the program by taking the following steps: (1) new recruiting brochure that explains industry careers and graduate options, (2) improved scheduling of classes, including offering concurrent lectures and labs as well as offering the same classes in both fall and spring semesters, (3) more elective choices, and (4) career advice to students by department faculty. These steps should improve recruiting and retention in the future. Two courses with high D/F/W rates have been identified: AGBI 410: Introduction to Biochemistry and CHEM 215: Introduction to Analytical Chemistry and the department is taking adequate steps to monitor student progress in these courses and make changes to improve student learning outcomes.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

Program assessment of student learning outcomes is based the results of pre-testing and post-testing of students in course content. Furthermore, student learning is assessed via standardized ACS exams. There are 5 learning outcomes (LO) and two of these (LO 1 and one of the remaining 4 LOs) are assessed every year for the next five years. Evidence in pre-/post- testing in CHEM 115 show student improvement in course content. Standardized ACS exam used for final exam in CHEM 116 show that students in the program are performing slightly better than the national average. Plans have been developed to incorporate the pre-/post-test assessment method in several core chemistry courses for LO1.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

Based on survey feedback, the program has made the following improvements: 1. Offering CHEM 401 and CHEM 341 in both the fall as well as the spring semester 2. Offering more elective course choices to students 3. Provide academic advising to students by identifying a departmental academic coordinator with dedicated advising time 4. Organizing an alumni career panel in CHEM 191, seminars on STEM careers, annual Bennett Careers for Chemists program 5. Publicizing jobs and career fairs The department has made thoughtful changes to improve retention and job placement by the above steps.

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

- Yes
- No

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

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



Q9.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted.

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Undergraduate Council requires that: 1) By January 2024, the program submit a follow-up report with the approval of its dean's office that presents a five-year plan to address the issues with program facilities and infrastructure.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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.

Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Arts Economics

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. The five goals of the strategic plan are well articulated and detailed.

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.

N/A

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.

Inadequate numbers of faculty are noted to run current programs. Discussions have led to Department endeavoring to hire more adjuncts to cover classes. Department notes the difficulty of the COVID pandemic on the teaching, research and service of the 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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

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.

Provost level data indicates that enrollment is up over the past 5 years with a total of 128 students in the fall of 2021. Program had 35 graduates in 20-21 with a continuation of 59% during that same time period. This continuance was down substantially from all other years during the 5 year period shown. The program shows a 91.2% 4 year graduation rate exceeding the College's rate of 70.9%. Finally, DFW's were noted in Econ 301 (major 31% DFW) and BCOR 121 (26%). Self study report bifurcates the BS and BA degree to report differing trends. Self study indicates pathways being investigated to increase enrollments.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

AOL used for program assessment include developed and mapped questions in each of the six statement learning outcomes published on the Economics website. These questions are closed with a minimum of 70% assessment in each area as indicated for the external reviewer AACSB. Issues were noted particularly with the student research component and a plan for future improvement was noted.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

Program notes that it has developed a program with the WVU College of Law to offer a 3+3 (BS and BA in Economics and a JD in Law). They have also developed programming to increase economics educations in high schools; offer ECON 201 to high school students; and recruiting and endeavoring to retain WV students in the state post graduation. All the later initiatives will involve the Kendrick Center.

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 22 - 23

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

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science) See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BA BS Physics

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 aligned 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 BA BS Physics program is properly aligned with 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 BA BS Physics program reports adequate infrastructure and 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 Physics program has adequate faculty. Excluding emeritus professors, the physics programs reports having 31 active faculty members. The faculty are very productive in terms of generating peer-reviewed scholarship, grant funding (e.g., NSF Career), and garnering achievements and awards with their professional societies.

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- 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.



From Fall 2017 – Fall 2021, enrollment has ranged from 62-73 students (average of 69 students). Excluding research assistant professors and 4 emeritus professors, the physics programs reports having 28 faculty members. The undergraduate student to faculty ratio is approximately 2.5 which is low. From AY 16-17 to AY 20-21, the number of graduates by year ranged from 11-14 students (annual average of 12.6 students). The program indicates this annual average is similar to the regional and national level trends. The data for program continuance is low and ranges from 59.70-68.30%.

Furthermore, the number of students graduating within 4 years of getting 60 credits is low compared to the college average. This is combined with a number of courses (PHYS 341, PHYS 331, PHYS 301, PHYS 451) with high DFW rates. In response to these concerns, the program has updated its curriculum to reduce the complexity of its BS program. The program uses assessment data to track important physics-relevant math skill development. The program has made improvements in advising, mentoring and guidance. The Physics program needs to develop a stronger strategy to improve student retention (i.e., increase program continuance rates): e.g., tutoring 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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program's assessment plan is in place and relies primarily on surveys of graduating seniors.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The physics program has an Alumni Visiting Committee (AVC) composed of former alumni that provides program feedback. Several of these alumni have prominent government (e.g., NASA) and industry positions which helps ensure that the program can create students ready for the job market. The program has updated its curriculum to reduce the complexity of its BS Physics program with the expectation that this will provide students flexibility in completing program requirements. The physics program should strongly consider offering undergraduate students tutoring sessions (either through the Physics department or connected with the college) which could help improve retention and therefore program continuance rates.

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 Physics program needs to develop a stronger strategy to improve student retention (i.e., increase program continuance rates): e.g., tutoring center.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science) See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BA Criminology

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 Criminology Program at WVU supports the university's mission, vision, and values by providing undergraduate and graduate students with a strong foundation in the perspectives, scientific methods, and research findings that guide their disciplines. The program emphasizes the development of critical thinking skills and encourages innovative, collaborative, and relevant research on topics of broad interest, which in turn informs their teaching and service. Additionally, the program is committed to serving the campus, local, state, national, and international communities.

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 did not identify any areas that impede the delivery of the program to students or hinder students from completing the program within a reasonable timeframe.

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 is facing a faculty shortage that impedes its ability to fulfill its mission. The department experienced a loss of several faculty members during the review period, including a Full professor and two teaching associate professors. In response, the department is actively seeking to address this issue by hiring two new faculty members for the Criminology program, one for a tenure-track position and one for a teaching-track position. Additionally, they anticipate the return of a tenure-track faculty member who has been on leave. These new hires and the return of the faculty member will greatly improve the program's capacity to expand its elective offerings. The department is also working to reduce the advising burden on the faculty and staff by providing better service to their students. Currently, the advising responsibilities for three undergraduate programs are shared by a full-time staff advisor and four faculty members who handle advisee loads ranging from 50 to 150 students each. It is important to note that one of these faculty members will depart from WVU by the end of Spring 2023.

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- All  
 Some

Q5.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

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

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

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

As evidenced from the BOG form, over the review period, the number of graduates per year in the program varied in line with enrollment trends but generally decreased from 195 in AY 2016-17 to 134 in AY 20-21. Nevertheless, these graduation figures remain considerably higher than the mean (46) and median (17) of 56 comparable programs in the same recruiting region. Additionally, of the students who attained 60 or more credit hours between AY 2015-16 and AY 2018-19, an average of 85.5% per year achieved graduation within three academic years. While this rate experienced some slight fluctuations over the review period, it consistently remained higher than the average Eberly College rate of 72.1% per year. Based on the provided data, three courses have been identified as having high DFW rates over the past three academic years. Overall, it seems that some of the issues affecting the program are beyond its control, such as the DFW rate of a course that some students take as non-majors. However, it is worth noting that one specific course was flagged for its high DFW rate, which was partly due to students not attending class or completing required coursework. During the review period, some students in the Criminology program at WVU engaged in research experiences such as independent studies, special research programs, and internships. 12% of seniors reported participating in research, and 28% reported participating in internships, often with government or non-profit organizations

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The student attainment of lower-order learning outcomes is strong but variable. The program needs to target needs for improvement, which requires fuller faculty engagement and incentivizing students to do their best work. The variability in attainment of core concepts related to the justice system lends support to the potential efficacy of a program change. Ongoing senior surveys reveal that students desire more variety in elective offerings and experiential learning opportunities. The program will build elective offerings as they increase staffing and encourage experiential opportunities outside the classroom. The feasibility of requiring students to complete an experiential learning experience is a question for the Undergraduate Committee to pursue.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The program improvements made in the review period for the Criminology major were not based on feedback from direct measures of learning but were made in response to other inputs. The improvements include making SOC 361 a permanent course, implementing minor program changes, creating a course crosswalk, and initiating discussions about separating upper-level CRIM electives into two clusters. Additionally, the program expanded course offerings to non-majors by creating a Criminology minor and allowing other programs to utilize certain major courses. The changes increased clarity for students, provided more structure to the major, and catered to student demands for more career guidance. If the program plans to deliver an experiential learning course to its considerable enrollment of near 600 students, the Undergraduate Council recommends that it ensures that it has both the personnel capacity to do so (whether in the program itself or through partnership with other college or institutional offices) and that there are enough meaningful placement opportunities for its students.

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 22 - 23

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

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science) See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BA in Game Design and Interactive Media

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 creates a diverse and inclusive community of students interested in game design and digital, interactive storytelling. Digital interactive storytelling has the opportunity to impact and transform West Virginia and the world through local, state and global engagement.

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

See Q4.2 of the program review.

- Yes
- No

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

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

Yes

No

Q3.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

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

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

The program report cites adequate and accessible 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 reports having adequate number 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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

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 very favorable enrollment and program continuance trends. The first program enrollment in 2018 reports five students. Growth is evident in subsequent years. The program enrolled 39 in the fall of 2019, 69 in the fall of 2020, and 94 in the fall of 2021. Likewise, the program's continuance has improved from 40% during the fall 2018 to fall 2019, 83% during the fall 2019 to fall 2020, and 86% during the fall 2020 to fall 2021 period to 86%. Two students graduated during the 2020-2021 year and 15 during the 2021-2022 academic year. No courses report high D/F/W. Examples of reported student successes include an awarded internship in California, securing permanent employment, and a recent graduate working as a Digital Content Producer for a local television studio.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program's assessment plan includes a curriculum map that denotes the alignment of courses, levels (introductory, transitional, and advanced), and major learning outcomes. The curriculum map indicates three "snapshots" used to assess learning, audio portfolio (introductory), coding portfolio review (transitional), and capstone review (advanced). The assessment for the review involved the collection of judges' scores and peer evaluations for the capstone course. The major learning objectives were not formally used to evaluate learning, but judges' scores and responses demonstrate that the students have achieved the program objectives. The program acknowledged that coordinating between two colleges (College of Creative Arts and the Reed College of Media) evolving program focus, the name change, and the Coronavirus pandemic challenged issues related to the curriculum, learning outcomes, assessment plans, and program goals. The program is revising the major learning objectives to be more measurable and align with the evolution of the program. The curriculum challenges are also being addressed but will go into effect in the 2023-2024 academic year. The undergraduate council commends the program for addressing the issues related to curriculum and learning outcomes but encourages the program to continue to develop a systematic assessment plan.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The undergraduate council commends the program for its sustained growth and for addressing issues related to curriculum, learning, and program outcomes. The Undergraduate Council recommends that the program develop a systematic assessment plan to align with updated outcomes and curricular changes. Additionally, consider a formal community of interest, including students, alums, and stakeholders, to include in the systematic plan.

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

Yes

No

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

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted.

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Undergraduate Council requires that: 1) By January 2024, the program submits a follow-up report that presents an assessment plan, including progress towards making a curriculum map. 2) By January 2025, the program submits a follow-up report that presents evidence of assessment of learning aligned with its assessment plan. 3) By January 2024, the program works with the Associate Provost for Curriculum and Assessment to complete the new MOU for Intercollegiate Programs.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science) See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BA History

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 is in alignment with the mission, vision, and values. They mark multiple ways in which they prepare students to meet these pillars including instilling them with critical thinking skills, in depth analytical capabilities, effective communication strategies, and leadership abilities. The program also provides avenues for experience with diverse learning experiences as part of the course load and in extra-curricular opportunities.

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 adequate and accessible 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 states that it does not have adequate faculty composition due to retirement and resignations. The current faculty has been productive in its scholarship and have been the benefactor of awards (both internally and externally). Additionally, the program has been the recipient of \$800,000 in grants, and faculty members have been awarded fellowships from prestigious centers. The program notes that COVID had an impact on its research productivity by restricting necessary travel for study and presentation.

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- All
- Some



Q5.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

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

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

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

The program has had a notable downward trend in headcount and graduates by year. It notes in their review that it is about in line with the overall decrease that the university has seen over that timespan. The program makes note that this data collection does not account for double major students for which history is not their primary major. It also notes that in 2022, enrollment is up (not included in data). It also attributes the decline to the creation of the social studies/secondary education major that has crossover with history for students. Despite declining enrollment, program continuance remained relatively stable and the percentage of graduates finishing the program within 4 years is well above the university average. Additionally the number of graduates is above the region's mean and median. The program notes recruitment activities it has historically participated in as well as local school presentations. It has developed recruitment pamphlets and established a social media presence. It notes a visiting committee, but last met in 2018. The program has an extremely high DFW for ECON 201 which is not addressed. It also has relatively high DFWs for HIST 302 and 209. Looking at the plan of study, 302 is suggested as a first semester course. The program says it is looking at advising to correct the issue. The program notes student successes through placement data.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program has an assessment plan that studies the learning objectives on three levels (introduced, reinforced, mastered) over all four levels of courses and with specific focuses on HIST 302 and 484. The program notes minor decreases in scores for learning objectives, much of which they attribute to COVID and students enrolling in courses they are not ready for. Additionally, student satisfaction is assessed using exist surveys. Student note a high satisfaction with the program.

Q7.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

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

See Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The program notes through their assessment, areas where student improvement could increase, but seems to be in the monitor phase of assessment at this point. The program attributes most of the issues to be students in course they are not yet ready for and COVID. They note that they are looking for more opportunities to increase collaboration and critical thinking skill in their students. The program has noted how this would be accomplished though. The Council recognizes the improvements the program has made in its assessment of learning and commends the program for those improvements but it also wants to note that it expects those practices to continue to be improved and, more importantly, used to improve the areas of student performance it recognizes in the self-study.

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

Yes

No

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

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted.

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Undergraduate Council requires that: 1) By January 2024, the program provides an follow-up report with its dean's office's approval on a plan to address faculty composition and adequacy. 2) In each of the next three years, the program will use the annual reporting process to provide an update on program enrollment and continuance as well as use that process to present the program's plans for improving program enrollment. 3) By January 2024, provide a follow-up report on how the program will address high DFW rates for ECON 201, HIST 302, HIST 209 as well as updated data on DFW rates in those courses for AY 22-23.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science) See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BA in Political Science

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

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

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

Q1.6. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

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

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The program notes that the coursework and research within the unit advance understanding of political systems and policy that impact the state, region, and country. The program notes in their report that the impact of the program's work (both via teaching and research) is at multiple levels (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, faculty) and in a variety of contexts (locally, regionally, national, and international).

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 did not report any issues with 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 reports that they have the adequate number of faculty to meet the program mission.

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- All  
 Some

Q5.2. What was inaccurate?

The program does not note the information re: program persistence, student performance, completion, and post-graduate placement in the report. However, these elements appear to be in place in the WVU catalog.

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.

From fall 2017 to fall 2021, the program headcount was stable (with slight increase), and the program continuance increased over the reporting period. The number of graduates decreased and the program noted the impact of the pandemic. Per the program the courses with a high D/F/W vary across semesters, and the program notes that the chair reviews high DFW courses each term and works with faculty to see if any corrective action needs to be take place. The program notes that students in the program are recipients of undergraduate scholarships and it is reported that their graduates move on to post-graduate study (e.g., law school).

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program provided evidence of a pre/post test measure of student performance of a political knowledge test; the results provided by the program indicate a higher percent correct on the test in the senior year when compared to performance in the first year. These results are not presented with tests of statistical significance. The program also noted they made adjustments to courses to account for the results from the political knowledge test. The curriculum map included provided a information about how the learning outcomes were met; however, the program should consider mapping the individual courses in POLS rather than linking the level of the courses to the learning outcomes (e.g., map POLS 210 to the LOs, rather than all 200- level courses).

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The program noted three improvements: changes in advising; creating freshmen-only sections that are taught by faculty focused on student success; and a system where advisors are alerted when students receive a D or F at midterm.

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 program should develop a more specific assessment plan.



Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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.

B.A. in Sociology

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

Q1.5. Is the program seeking specialized accreditation? Why or why not?

n/a

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 sociology program is in alignment with the mission, vision, or values of the university. The program prepares students with the skills of critical thinking, research, and collaboration at a campus, local, national, and state level that can be applied to a diverse range of careers. The program also provides innovative, relevant, and collaborative research on a broad areas of interest.

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 adequate and accessible 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 states that it has no issues of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, or productivity.

Q5.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areas of emphasis, etc.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

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 prefaces much of the data collection in this section with the caveat that the program was previously Sociology & Anthropology was decoupled in 2016 and moved from an AOR to its own program. It has had a drop in the number of students enrolled per year (45 > 35), with the biggest drop happening after the program became stand alone. It has had slight increases in program continuance and graduates per year (15). Additionally, it is below the mean (25) of the number of graduates in similar programs in the area but matches the median (13) for those area (this could be a case where some programs in the area have sociology combined with another program, which would explain the discrepancy between the mean and median numbers for this aggregated data). The program contextualizes their marketing by explaining that sociology is not typically a major that first- year students enroll in, so they have focused their efforts of recruiting current students as a new major/double major. They have made efforts to revise the approach through curricular revisions that pair with similar programs, provide a visiting committee in a advisory capacity, and develop a student organization. This matter does not seem fully resolved, but does not warrant a follow-up action. The program notes low DFW occurrences within SOC courses. It does note a high DFW rate (67%) for a required course STAT 211. They attribute this to preparation and disconnect. They have added algebra to account for prep.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program has a well thought out assessment plan that reviews student learning through the administration of questions focused on learning objectives through tests and quizzes (multiple choice batteries), the capstone program, and graduating senior surveys. The program has noted that issues that they have had administering the assessment is that the program has no majors-only courses and have to work with other programs to get participation in assessment. They have addressed the shortcomings and have developed plans for getting more breadth in their assessment plan. There is no need for follow-up action.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The programs discussed several improvements that it seeks to make. Assessments have found that students in the major struggle to find a sense of identity as a sociology major. The program notes plans to improve this include creating smaller major-only courses for sociology students, creating a student organization, and developing 200 level courses for the major would help to improve this. Additionally, the program is looking to restructuring elective offering to ensure that students in the major are allowed to engage with its learning outcomes. The reviewer has no recommendations for improvement.

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

- Yes
- No

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

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted.

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Undergraduate Council requires that: 1) In each of the next three Octobers, the program uses the annual reporting process to provide an update on the program's enrollment and continuance metrics. The program should also use that process to provide updates on how it is responding to data presented in the self-study regarding issues with student fit and the development of 200-level courses to address that.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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.

WVUIT BS Accounting

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

Q1.5. Is the program seeking specialized accreditation? Why or why not?

Candidacy status for Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs. Expected accreditation date December 2024.

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.

WVU Tech's Accounting Program provides graduates with strong knowledge in accounting and business skills for careers in various industries and government agencies, and prepares them for professional exams. The program aligns with WVU's mission and contributes to fulfilling WVU Tech's mission to provide technical and business career degrees in southern West Virginia and the region. The program is student-centered, relevant, and current. The mission of the Accounting Program is to provide quality education in accounting through teaching, professional development, and service for the advancement of local, national, and global communities. The program prepares students for professional careers, graduate studies, and certifications in the related field, as well as encourages contributions to the betterment of communities through successful careers and entrepreneurship.

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 indicated that they have adequate and accessible infrastructure resources. No 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 has indicated that they have faculty adequacy. However, the composition and productivity items are not present in the BoG program review form. Q7.1.

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- 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 in the Accounting Program has been rising over the years, except for Fall 2021 due to a large number of graduations in 2020. The student retention rate has been consistently increasing over the last five years, and measures are in place to help at-risk students. The demand for accounting graduates is high, and companies are even considering people with just an associate degree in accounting. Considering the demand and supply of accounting majors and the potential end of the COVID-19 pandemic, the enrollment in the program is expected to increase further. Varying number of graduates in 2017-2021 with a peak in 2019-20 and a dip in 2021. The average graduation rate per year is 8.4, and most students graduate within four years. The DFW for the Accounting Program in the past three academic years was highest in ACCT 311 and caused by students' lack of preparation in principles of accounting and some disappearing students. The DFW rate in ACCT 312, ACCT 420, and ACCT 415 was due to students missing sessions/assignments because of personal issues caused by the pandemic. Instructors are taking measures to remind students of their missing sessions and assignments and provide them with necessary help to ensure their success. Graduates have been successful in finding professional employment, and some have been admitted to Master's programs in their relevant areas. Two students received the 2021 WVSCPA Outstanding Accounting Student Awards.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The accounting program has seven clear and measurable learning outcomes, which are assessed through direct measures such as case studies, quizzes, and presentations, as well as indirect measures like graduate and employer satisfaction surveys. The curriculum map has been prepared and the results for individual courses are good, which is supported by the assessment of outcomes in the capstone course, ACCT 450. The accounting curriculum is reviewed regularly based on feedback from students, faculty, and professionals, and improvements are made to meet changing needs. Changes include incorporating writing and more discussion opportunities, as well as computer-assisted instruction and updated applications in upper-level courses.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The accounting department struggled to hire a tenure-track faculty due to financial constraints, but was able to hire a highly qualified faculty member in fall 2022, bringing the total to 3 full-time accounting faculty members, all with advanced degrees and professional certifications. The department also has 2 full-time management faculty members, all of whom are involved in professional development and research. The department hopes to hire a new business/marketing faculty member when the institution's financial health improves.

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 22 - 23

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

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science) See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BS Adventure Recreation Management

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

Q1.5. Is the program seeking specialized accreditation? Why or why not?

No, the program is not seeking accreditation due to its limited number of faculty. The review states that a third faculty member would need to be hired in order to satisfy at least some of the accreditation criteria.

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 degree program, while small, is providing a service to West Virginia by preparing students for careers in the adventure recreation industry, which is an economic driver for the southern part of the state, where this program is located. Furthermore, the program is providing a unique educational experience for its majors as evidenced in its self-review. Here is the program's mission statement: "Adventure Recreation Management at WVU Tech provides an accessible and supportive learning environment where students are encouraged to be active and contributing members of our communities locally, regionally, and globally; through experiential learning, professional field experience, internships, and high-caliber classroom instruction, students are provided an atmosphere that fosters intellectual, personal, and professional growth while becoming stewards of adventure recreation resources."

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

See Q4.2 of the program review.

Yes

No

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

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

Yes

No

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

The program has not met its enrollment goal of 22 students in its third year. The program had 9 students in its third year, which is also the most recent year available for this review. The program review states that the faculty/program director position has experienced turnover, which has had a negative impact on the program. I imagine that COVID also impacted this program's enrollment, and it's worth noting here that this program requires experiential and hands-on teaching and learning.

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.

Given the number of students currently enrolled (9), it appears that this program has an adequate number of faculty (2); however, it is also noted in the review that course availability is limited due to faculty/staff constraints. It would seem that the program may have a challenge growing its enrollment (and/or retaining students) if sequential courses or courses in general are not offered regularly, but it's difficult to justify offering courses when enrollment remains low. This is a bit of a tricky place to be but not uncommon for new programs that have not had the opportunity to build the "audience" or student pipeline yet.

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.

Regarding lower than anticipated enrollment, the program has taken a very hands-on and grassroots approach to recruitment, which should be recognized and commended. The program review also states that currently faculty are working on new collaborations that will provide opportunities for recruitment and increasing program/brand awareness to a wider audience.

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- All  
 Some

Q5.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

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

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

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

As noted earlier in this summary review, enrollment is lower than anticipated. At the same time, according to the program review, enrollment has been increasing. Number of graduates is also low but increasing. The program review states that there are no courses with high D/F/W rates. The program review notes impressive student outcomes among its limited number of graduates and students. This can be seen as evidence that the curriculum and instruction is preparing students for the industry at a national level, while also helping to address workforce needs for this industry within the state.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

It appears that a formal assessment plan is not in place. Final grades in upper-level courses and career placement are being used as metrics for assessment.

Q7.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

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

See Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

This is the program's first review. We would recommend creating a formal assessment plan. We would encourage continued efforts focused on marketing and recruitment. I think the collaborations that the program is already pursuing will help with these efforts. The program might consider in the future offering "professional certifications" that may be able to help grow program awareness, engage current students, and generate revenue for the program.

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

Yes

No

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

Continuance at the current level of activity

Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action

Continuance at a reduced level of activity

Identification of the program for further development

Development of a cooperative program

Discontinuance

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted. Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Undergraduate Council requires that: 1) By January 2024, the program submits a follow-up report that includes an assessment plan and progress report on designing a curriculum map. 2) By January 2025, the program submits a follow-up report providing evidence of assessment of learning. 3) Each of the next three years, the program uses the annual reporting process to provide updates on its program enrollment and continuance as well as to provide its plans to improve program enrollment. As this is the program's first Board of Governor's program review, it is also within the discretion of the dean's office to request discontinuance of the program for not having met its enrollment targets or, really, even approached them.



Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science) See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BS in Biometric Systems Engineering

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 of educational preparation for students, excellence in high standards and impact to society by producing graduates who will apply their programming, hardware implementation, and systems engineering skills to biometrics applications for careers in industry, research, government or academia. This program promotes economic prosperity and aligns with the strategic needs of 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.

The program has adequate and accessible 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.

When this program started in 2016, it was assumed that several of the classes would be taught by existing electrical engineering faculty. However, several faculty who were contributing to this program have left WVU. The program currently has 4 faculty members in the area of biometrics and have recently hired a 5th faculty member with expertise in this field. All contributing faculty members are well-qualified with terminal degrees in electrical engineering or computer science and with research expertise in biometrics. The department plans to hire another 2 faculty members in the general area of machine learning and biometrics in the near future. This will provide sufficient faculty strength to cover the requirements for a high-quality bachelors program in biometrics.

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- All  
 Some

Q5.2. What was inaccurate?

The program received ABET accreditation in July 2022, but the catalog still says "currently seeking ABET accreditation."

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 data indicates that enrollment has been falling from Fall 2017 (47 students) to Fall 2021 (22 students). Program continuance from fall-to-fall has improved to 86% in 2021 compared to 71% in 2017. The number of graduates has increased in the past 3 years from 4 to 13. The department's primary recruiting effort has been via the participation in the Statler College's freshman engineering program. The department also participates in high-school outreach programs as well as Statler College's Ambassador program in an effort to publicize this program. CS 350 has been identified as a course with high D/F/W rates. However, due to the small enrollment in this class, it is difficult to draw statistically meaningful conclusions on changes. The department continues to monitor student success in all the biometrics courses in the program. Students graduating from the program are in high demand by government agencies and global and local private industry.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program has an assessment plan to collect and analyze data on student outcomes and a continuous improvement plan to make changes. It is noted that while ABET requires tracking 7 student outcomes, the program has an additional outcome specific to the significance of biometric traits. While adequate data is being collected, it is necessary to assess the student outcomes across multiple courses rather than tying individual assessments to course grades. This weakness has also been identified during the 2021 ABET site visit.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The number of credit hours has been reduced to 126 so that the degree is in line with the credit-hour requirements of other engineering majors offered at the Statler College. Two courses (BIOM 201 and CSEE 380) have been added to the sophomore-level in order to allow students to be engaged in their major courses earlier in the curriculum. With the addition of new faculty members into the program, it is expected that elective offerings will improve in addition to adding more contemporary material to the existing 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 Undergraduate Council is requiring follow-up reporting on the areas below. However, given that the two problems may be related, it is possible that the program should consider a reduction from a full major to an area of emphasis within another existing program should it be unable to address these concerns fully. The Undergraduate Council requires that: 1) By January 2024, the program submits a follow-up report with its dean's office's approval that details whether or not it has been successful in addressing the faculty staffing in the program and what the plan to do so in the future is. 2) In October of each of the next three years, the program will use the annual reporting process to provide updates on its program enrollment and continuance as well as updates on what the program is doing to increase enrollment.









Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science) See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BS Business Management

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

Q1.5. Is the program seeking specialized accreditation? Why or why not?

The program is seeking accreditation through ACBSP (Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs).  
Expected completion date 7/24.

Q1.6. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values.

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

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The BS Business Management aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values by offering a rigorous program that prepares students for careers in business, including private industry, state/federal government, that will enhance the socioeconomic culture of southern West Virginia along with the rest of the state and surrounding communities.

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 adequate and accessible infrastructure resources with no significant 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 Business Management program has adequate faculty with academic credentials to support 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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- 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 enrollment has grown from 68 (Fall 2017) to 81 (Fall 2021). The total number of graduates from the program did decline significantly in year 2020-2021. There could be a number of factors that this can be attributed to, possibly the significant number of students that graduated in year 19-20 at 18 graduates. High D/F/W courses include: CS 101 (49.47%), BUSA 101 (23.42%), BCOR 350 (34.85%), and ACCT 331 (21.62%). This was attributed to high absences/personal issues with students as a result of the pandemic. Faculty are working to remind students of missing sessions/due dates and making lectures available in eCampus. Most graduates have professional employment/enter into the MS program. Employer Satisfaction Surveys indicate high satisfaction in employee performance. A group of Management students won first place in Division 1 of the SHRM Classic Case Competition.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program has an excellent assessment plan with detailed evidence of assessment and findings using direct and indirect measures of assessment. Assessment was conducted through courses, graduate surveys, employer satisfaction surveys, and student internship surveys. Program changes addressed in assessment include adding courses in Business Communications, Investments, and Personal Finance.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

Course improvements, curriculum, learning outcomes, assessment plans were improved with feedback from students, faculty, and professionals. Teaching methodology changes include more writing and discussion opportunities, computer-assisted instruction in upper level courses, and the addition of computer applications courses to make the program more useful and relevant.

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

- Yes
- No

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

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted. Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Undergraduate Council requires that: 1) The program work with its dean's office to determine if pursuing specialized accreditation for this program will be a worthwhile investment. 2) If the program does decide to follow through with seeking specialized accreditation then by January 2024 it will provide a follow-up report on the progress it has made in that process and the timeline to achieve accreditation.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science) See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BS Chemistry WVU-IT

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

Q1.5. Is the program seeking specialized accreditation? Why or why not?

No, the program doesn't plan to seek specialized accreditation. Does not meet the requirements of the American Chemical Society (ACS).

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.

Mission and vision statements were adopted by WVU Tech in 2013 and are consistent with the overall mission of WVU: Mission: West Virginia University Institute of Technology provides an accessible and supportive environment in which students are guided to be active and contributing members of society by fostering intellectual and personal growth through comprehensive educational experiences. Vision: To be a nationally-recognized and preeminent regional undergraduate STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) teaching institution with well-balanced curricula across diverse academic disciplines. For many years it has been well established and recognized throughout the state of West Virginia that a priority mission of WVU Tech has been in the preparation of scientists, engineers, and technologists. Chemistry, along with physics and biology, is generally recognized as one of the basic sciences preparing these individuals for careers and post-graduate training.

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 that it has adequate and accessible infrastructure and 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 reports faculty adequacy, credentials, and composition, and has not experienced a drop in productivity over the review period.



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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- 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 in the program was highest in Fall 2018 (11 students) and has steadily decreased since (5 students in Fall 2021). Program continuance has also declined from 100% (Fall 2017) down to 33% in Fall 2019-2020 and 50% in Fall 2020-2021. The program graduates 2 students every other year. DFW rates in MATH 128 (100% of majors) and CHEM 233 (57%) are also concerning. Most majors are probably not placing in MATH 155 in this program and progressing past MATH 128 would largely contribute to the low retention rate.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

With the low enrollment in the program, it would be difficult to carry out a meaningful assessment plan. There has been some programmatic assessment (Spring 2019) and assessment within specific courses (CHEM 115, 116) in Spring 2020 and Fall 2021.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The program has put some effort into marketing and recruitment and the creation of double degree programs with Biology and Chemical Engineering. I am not sure if the modest increases in double majors will sustain the program.

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 chemistry department is a service department for engineering, biology, and nursing. Since enrollment seems to be coming back up, we would recommend that the program: 1) Details a plan to improve enrollment in the program with enrollment targets and a timeline to achieve those targets. 2) Data to show learning outcome assessments in the various classes targeted for assessment and how assessment data will be used for program improvement.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science) See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BS Construction Management (WVUIT)

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

Q1.5. Is the program seeking specialized accreditation? Why or why not?

Program is in the process of preparing to seek accreditation potentially in 2024.

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 aligns with WVU's mission, vision and values in that they provide quality undergraduate STEM education and train practitioners who will make responsible contribution to society.

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

See Q4.2 of the program review.

Yes

No

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

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

Yes

No

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

Program director left in the second year of the program's inception leaving only one faculty however, the program now has three full-time faculty and is in the process of hiring a fourth who will be starting in the fall of 2023. Enrollment target of 60 by the end of the third year has not been realized but program has seen continuous enrollment growth.

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.

Program has adequate resources but had to schedule courses that require use of computer labs in the evenings as other programs use the available labs. A solution of having the labs in the evenings is in place which may not be convenient for the faculty especially if they start teaching early in the morning.

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 three full-time faculty and in the process of hiring a fourth faculty member to start in the fall of 2023. Faculty productivity in scholarship and service was affected due to high course overloads. A fourth faculty hire will provide the program with adequate number of faculty with time to be productive. All faculty have credentials based on education.

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- 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.

Program has seen consistent increase in enrollment from 3 students in fall 2018 to 26 students in fall 2021 and an increase in program continuance. Program states that there were four graduates in May 2022 all of whom completed the program in four years and are working in construction firms in West Virginia. There are four classes with high DFW for the program, PHYS 102 (42.11%), CMGT 120 (30.3%), CMGT 150 (31.03%) and the highest in MATH 128 (91.67%). Program does not document any steps taken to resolve this issue. Effort should be made by the program to address the issue.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

Program learning outcomes in the catalog is different from those on the program website. Program does not have a formal assessment plan. End of semester and student exit surveys are the only assessments being conducted. If program plans to seek accreditation, they will need to put in place a formal assessment plan and have that implemented.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

Program is new, implemented in 2017. Their focus over this cycle had been on building enrollment and faculty hires. Program has established an advisory board and has a close relation with the Contractors Association of West Virginia (CAWV) and the West Virginia Department of Transportation.

(1) Program needs to have a consistent list of student learning outcomes on their website and in the catalog. (2) Program needs to develop and apply assessment plan for student outcomes. (3) Program needs to outline efforts to resolve the issue of high DFW in PHYS 102, CMGT 120, CMGT 150 and MATH 128.

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

Yes

No

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

Continuance at the current level of activity

Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action

Continuance at a reduced level of activity

Identification of the program for further development

Development of a cooperative program

Discontinuance

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted. Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

1) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts).

2) Ask the program to resubmit any section of weakness from the program review (entire sections or particular prompts) with additional supporting evidence and/or data.

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

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



The Undergraduate Council requires that: 1) By January 2024, publish its intended learning outcomes to CIM and the Catalog and remove any learning outcomes from its websites; the program should link to the Catalog and the learning outcomes there on any websites to avoid contradictory information as is the case now. 2) By January 2024, submit a follow-up report with an assessment plan and the development of a curriculum map. 3) By January 2024, submit a follow-up report explaining how the program will improve high DFW in CMGT 120, CMGT 150 and MATH 128 as well as updated DFW rates for these courses for AY 22-23. 4) By January 2025, submit a follow-up report with evidence of assessment of learning aligned with its assessment plan.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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.

B.S. in Cybersecurity

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 program is to produce graduates who have theoretical knowledge and practical hands-on skills with cutting edge technology and cybersecurity tools to apply in their careers in industry, research, government service, or academia. It promotes economic prosperity and supports the strategic needs of 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

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

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

Yes

No

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

At the time the Intent to Plan for this program was submitted, the requirement for projected enrollment was for the first five years. The enrollment in the initial school year 2018-19 was expected to be around 20 students and to grow and become comparable to other LCSEE BS majors, with around 100 students. The program reports that Argos says that there are 54 students currently enrolled in the program. The program has shown steady growth, but this is lower than comparable programs in the region and lower than projected enrollments in the Intent to Plan.

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 adequate infrastructure.

Q4.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

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

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

The program reports adequate staffing and productivity.

Q5.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areas of emphasis, etc.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- All
- Some

Q5.2. What was inaccurate?

Accreditation: Catalog says "currently seeking ABET accreditation." But program review says received in 2021. Program Outcomes Compare catalog to the program review info: "The objective of the bachelor's degree program in Cybersecurity ..... is to produce graduates who have the attitudes that will ensure success in professional positions in business, industry, research, governmental service, or graduate study or professional school." Why aren't CYBE 480 & 481 listed as required for degree?

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 steadily increasing but not equal to projected rate of increase. As new program, only a few graduates thus far (total 10). High D/F/W courses: MATH 373 Introduction to Cryptography with 40% and CS 210 File and Data Structures with 60.42%. Program has implemented some slight changes to improve (increased office hours, stricter assignment deadlines).

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program's first 5 objectives are taken directly from ABET guidelines. ABET recommends 7, so unclear why the program has 6 but not 7. The program gathers a lot of assessment data. It is summative end of course data, for the most part. It seems to be tied to grades received on an assignment. But this approach doesn't track student growth in a course or across multiple courses. There are efforts to use the data to improve instruction. With respect to objectives 3 and 4, the program might examine whether these skills are really being taught in course or students already bring these skills with them. Are they being taught how to present or are they just doing presentations? Are they being taught to make ethical judgments or are they being presented with a code of ethics? Is a grade on a final project sufficient? How is the development of these skills being assessed from beginning to end of the course? Putting the point more broadly, the ABET Venn diagram for cybersecurity program design has three overlapping components: computer science, cybersecurity, and policy/legal/ethical. The program might consider how it integrates the third component in its program design and assessment.

Q7.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

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

See Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

Summary of improvements: This is a relatively new program going through its first review cycle. The program has focused on DFW rates and also appears to have a thorough assessment process in place for future improvements. Areas of future improvement: Program should work to improve its recruitment efforts into the major. Program should reconsider its 18 credit hour recommendation for first semester freshmen in its plan of study. Program should continue to monitor and improve D/F/W rates. Program should consider how it approaches assessment, considering whether there might be more targeted and informative data to guide improvement. Program should consider the role of political/legal/ethical thinking in the design of the cybersecurity program.

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 22 - 23

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

Q1.2. Program Designation and Name (such as: B.A. in English or M.S. in Forensic Science) See Q 1.2 of the program review.

BS Management Information Systems

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 promotes the value of economic prosperity and provides knowledge/skill in demand in the private sector.

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

See Q4.2 of the program review.

- Yes
- No

Q3.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

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

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

Yes, the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure.

Q4.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

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

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

The program reports adequate staffing but acknowledges that Covid has negatively affected faculty research productivity.

Q5.1. Are program elements accurately published in the Catalog and other web-based resources? This includes program enrollment requirements, expected time to completion, requirements for majors and areas of emphasis, etc.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- 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 appears to be in a strong position. Enrollment is increasing and the completion rate is strong. DFW rates have been addressed and are trending down.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program is to be commended for its recent development of a very good assessment plan. The program has four primary learning objectives, all of which are clearly defined and measurable. The program does assessment through rubrics for selected course assignments. The rubrics are explained clearly and well designed. It is less clear how the results of the assessment data themselves will be evaluated or used in order to inform improvement. The program has made use of external feedback from employers to improve students' career readiness.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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.

B.S. in Neuroscience

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 of educational preparation for students, excellence in high standards and impact to society by producing graduates who will address a wide range of health and societal issues relating to brain function. This is of significant importance as the state and the nation faces an aging population, an ongoing opioid crisis, and mental health concerns exacerbated by the pandemic. This program promotes economic prosperity and aligns with the strategic needs of 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

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

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

Yes

No

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

While the program has achieved its enrollment goal of 120-150 students (which is a remarkable achievement in light of the fact that the program started during the Covid pandemic), it has not achieved critical mass in faculty size and research output mainly due to budgetary constraints at the university- level that have limited the replacement of vacant faculty lines. The program is able to cover all the core classes but has not been able to offer a full suite of elective classes, which are crucial for long-term sustainability of the program. The pandemic has also limited the ability of faculty and students to conduct experimental research, and this has impacted some of the laboratory training that students need.

Q3.1. Briefly explain if the program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

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

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

The program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

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 needs additional faculty in the long term. While the core class offerings are currently being covered, it is necessary to develop elective streams in order to be competitive nationally and this requires the hiring of additional faculty. The current faculty have the appropriate credentials and are productive. The faculty also have strong ties with RNI, which is a strength both for conducting research as well as placing students in graduate programs. Most of the faculty have external funding and publish regularly.

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

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 undergraduate program has successfully grown to 126 students in 3 years. It graduated 16 students last year. While this number is lower than the average number of graduates of similar programs, it is likely to increase in the coming years. Three classes (BIOL 348, BIOL 219, and NRSC 101) have been identified as classes with high D/F/W rates. A detailed analysis seems to indicate that the high DFW rates reflect a “trickle-down” effect of reduced student engagement, diminished learning, and lowered academic standards in critical prerequisite courses taken online during the pandemic. Since the program is back to face-to-face classes, this high failure rate should decline in the future. The program is taking proactive action to further remediate this failure rate by raising the minimum grade requirements in some of the prerequisite courses and by using innovative teaching methodologies (e.g. flipped classrooms) in some of these classes to improve student learning. Students in the program have competed successfully for prestigious awards at the College and University level. At least two have been named as Outstanding Seniors by the WVU Foundation, and one has been inducted into the Order of Augusta. They also have had two Eberly Ambassadors and one current student currently serving as a Presidential Student Ambassador. A very large fraction of students (62.5%) are also active in research with 11 students co-authoring research publications or presentations.

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- Yes  
 No

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

See Q 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program uses two methods of assessment, indirect and direct. The indirect assessment is done via student surveys on their confidence about material related to the student outcomes. This is appropriate and should be continued. Since the program is only 3 years old, no data was presented to show what changes were made as a result of this assessment. Direct assessment of student outcomes is done by assessing the Capstone class. It appears that the final grade in this course is being used for assessing all the outcomes. It is suggested that outcomes be assessed by collecting data from multiple courses. For example, one can track how good students are at collecting data, analyzing and interpreting results (outcome 4) across multiple courses from the sophomore year to the senior year and see if there is improvement as students progress through the curriculum. Also, assuming that a final grade of A in the capstone course automatically satisfies all outcomes is erroneous as it is possible for a student to get an A grade despite not excelling in one or more outcomes.

Q7.1. Provide a brief summary of improvements made to the program over this review cycle and what plans the program has initiated for future improvements.

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

See Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The program is new and so there is limited information on improvements. The program has made changes to required minimum grade in some prerequisite classes to address the issue of high D/F/W in three classes. The program is also developing new elective classes to develop new Areas of Emphasis. These changes are in the right direction and should be continued. Assessment data should be collected from multiple courses (not just the Capstone course) and this information should be utilized in a feedback loop to make 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

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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.

Accounting, B.S.B.A.

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 supports business practices through the region and state, educating graduates who contribute to the economy of the state. The program's faculty engage in the practice of research, supporting the mission of the Institution. Additionally, under the direction of the Accounting Advisory Board, the program has established a diversity committee to promote DEI practices within the major. The mission and vision of the program support an education grounded in "innovation and impact," and the nature of the program seems to support those efforts.

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 both adequate and accessible resources are in place to carry out program requirements.

Q4.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

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

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

The program reports no issues with number of faculty to deliver the program or faculty credentialing. According to the WVU catalog, the program is delivered by four professors, three associate professors, one teaching associate professor, three teaching assistant professors, and four assistant professors. Faculty are involved in professional development within their discipline with the most recent accreditation continuous improvement report (2020) showing that many are members of West Virginia Society of CPAs and one serves on the WV State Board of Accountancy as appointed by the Governor of WV. Faculty have maintained a consistent record of publication in journals ranked "best" or "very good" over the last five years. The college has seen a number of new hires, five as reported in the most recent accrediting report, since 2015. The majority of faculty have earned terminal degrees and hold at least single, with many multiple, certifications (mainly CPA).

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- 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.

Program enrollment has seen a consistent, slight decline over the last five years. This seems appropriate given the challenges of the pandemic during this time period and the overall decline in college attendance rates in the state (and nation). Fall 2021 recorded an enrollment of just below 80% of fall 2017's enrollment. Program continuance has remained fairly consistent, fluctuating by only a rough average of 6 percentage points between years over the review period. The number of graduates per year reflects the same yearly variation noted for program continuance, an up and down trend that most recently ended at a low as compared to fall 2017, but still reflective of the challenges of the education landscape (college attendance rates, etc). DFW course rates are relatively low, with a course recorded as high DFW each year of the review period, suggesting changes have been made to increase opportunity of student success in courses once recorded on DFW list.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program is guided by five primary learning outcomes which are further branched into secondary outcome. The outcomes are clear, with overall specific targets, and are primarily action oriented. Several outcomes could benefit from revision to require a higher level of performance indicating mastery. For example, outcomes such as “will identify elements” and “will describe” could be revised to higher level skills. Additionally, outcomes such as “will demonstrate competence” or “will demonstrate understanding” could be revised for specificity. The program's assessment plan is well organized, including the assignment of one upper level course as the data collection point for each of the secondary outcomes. Results are thoroughly reported for spring 2021. The assessment plan indicates that another large collection of data across the majority of the learning outcomes is to take place spring 2023. Data collection methods are varied across courses. Primary methods include embedded questions, CPA exam questions and overall scores, Microsoft certification, and course projects such as internal control project. In many cases, the exact exam question used as the point of data collection is included in the assessment record. Analysis indicates that students have performed at a level of mastery in the vast majority of the tasks assessed. In the instances that do not meet mastery, the program has acknowledged areas of deficiency.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The program has developed an extensive recruitment plan which includes one dedicated staff member visiting high schools and student recruitment events. The program additionally utilizes a multistep communication plan for perspective and admitted students. The Chambers College has created specialized programs and holds custom events for perspective, incoming, and current students: Chambers Adventure WV, Chambers Ambassadors, Admitted Student Day. An Accounting Advisory Council was created in 2016 to partner with the Chambers College Advisory Council in matters of mission, stakeholder networking, and opportunities for career readiness and experiential learning. The program reports preparations for the new CPA Evolution exam (Jan 2024) are complete; students continue to participate in multiple experiential learning opportunities including internships at the West Virginia State Auditor's office; and the program recorded the highest career placement rate of all programs in the College in spring 2022.

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 22 - 23

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.

BSBAD Management

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 states: "The Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) program in Management is consistent with the mission of West Virginia University and furthers the University's achievement of its strategic plan." "Students completing the BSBA in Management at West Virginia University receive a quality education by earning their degree from one of only two AACSB-accredited business programs in the state." "Our students acquire a strong foundation through courses in important areas of business such as accounting, economics, finance, global supply chain, and management information systems. In addition, students acquire a good understanding of business law and ethics to guide them in their decisions in the workplace. The management program provides the skill and knowledge for students who will assume leadership roles and managerial positions in business."

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 review indicates that there was an issue in the past with having an adequate number of faculty available to teach courses; however, the review states that this issue has been addressed during the past year and a half. The program states in the review: "Until two years ago, the Management Department had a significant shortfall in teaching resources. Involvement of numerous adjunct faculty might have compromised the faculty engagement in activities central to student experience. With the arrival of the new Dean in August 2021, the staffing problem has been actively addressed."

Q4.1. Provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

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

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

From the program review: "Our faculty members teaching in the BSBA in Management excel in research. Fifteen of the nineteen full-time faculty are classified as scholarly academic." The accrediting agency for the COB&E did call attention to the college's standards for classifying faculty as "scholarly academic." From a letter to the Dean from the agency dated May 17, 2021: "The peer review team continues to have concerns regarding the school's Scholarly Academic (SA) criteria. Specifically, the team is of the opinion that the classification of scholarly journals, per the 2019 listing, into categories (i.e., A+, A, B) is overly generous in many instances." A follow-up letter from the agency to the Dean in May 2022 did not mention this issue specifically, but the letter indicated that the agency was satisfied with the college's progress. This would indicate to me that the issue was adequately resolved. It should also be noted that this accreditation report is college-wide and not specific to the management program. The program review also indicates that the COVID pandemic impacted faculty productivity but did not provide specifics. The review does not indicate that this is an ongoing problem. The program review states: "The faculty were challenged time wise in terms of time spent on teaching. While the COVID pandemic initially directly affected teaching, most faculty's research and service contributions have been affected by the pandemic."

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- 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 in the program has declined by about 20 percent during the past 5 years, although it increased slightly in the most recent year reviewed (fall '21). The program partly attributes the decline in enrollment to an expansion of new programs in the college that have detracted from the management program. The program's number of graduates per year has been declining, but that would be expected with a declining enrollment. On a positive note, the program continuance rate improved to nearly 81% in the most recent year reviewed (f20 to f21). Also, the program has a solid rate for the number of students graduating in 4 years: 87.8%. The program took direct and appropriate steps to address courses with higher D/F/W rates. The program highlights the placement of a student at Microsoft's global headquarters in human resource management. The program also notes that many of its high-performing students often continue their studies in the human resource management 18-month master's program.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program has a clear assessment methodology and is meeting or exceeding all of its metrics. The program measures whether students are achieving learning outcomes through pre-testing/post-testing, evaluating specific course assignments' grades, and through a simulation. Additionally, the program evaluates itself against a college-wide assessment approach that looks at 49 qualities, and the program is doing quite well in this assessment. The program only fell short in two areas, and those shortfalls are already being addressed through curriculum adjustments.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The program indicates that staffing issues, particularly related to teaching, have been addressed. The program is thoughtful in its approach to address its enrollment trend. It has plans through recruitment and curriculum development to address enrollment. In fact, the program has already made adjustments to the curriculum to generate more interest and excitement around the major. Here are more details from the program review on that point: "In response to feedback from students to instructors in their courses and benchmarking of peer institutions, the MANG 422 course was made more distinct by treating it as a traditional organizational behavior, as compared to BCOR 370, which was renamed as principles of management. In addition, the organizational behavior course emphasized in-class activities, self-assessment tools, team activities, class discussion, case analysis, etc. The curriculum of the Management Major was modified by the addition of the tenth course, which was treated as an elective. This has provided the option for students to take a course on decision analysis (MANG 426) that includes concepts such as optimization techniques, regression analysis, and basic ideas of machine learning, which are consistent with emerging trends in skills required in the industry."



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 22 - 23

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.

Bachelor of Science in Business Administration in Marketing

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 is in alignment with WVU's mission and vision; specifically mentioned is the academic experience for the students and the research productivity of the faculty.

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.

None 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.

Self study notes the impact of COVID on the faculty's teaching, research and service due to the impact of the pandemic on all aspects of their work.

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- All  
 Some

Q5.2. What was inaccurate?

The AOL from the self study and the Learning Objectives on the web are not exact specifically numbers 1 and 4.

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 are noted as increasing 15.5% for marketing as compared to 5.7% for the College overall. \* Graduation trends are up 5.2% as compared to 3.9% for the College. \* Retention is higher than the college average. \* There are no high D/F/W courses noted. \* Job placement is at 57.14% at graduation as compared to 73% for the College and the salaries are \$47.5 k (as compared to \$54.5 k). \* Student numbers at graduation not provided, nor was time to complete.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

Program asserts all 13 areas in Chambers meet expectations. AOL is attached to the self study.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

Additional courses have been added to increase student learning and placement potential. Suggestions were made as to help students find jobs.

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 22 - 23

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.

Organizational Leadership, Bachelor of Science in Business Administration

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 the WVUs mission, vision, and values by preparing students to partner with and lead communities to find solutions to problems.

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

See Q4.2 of the program review.

- Yes
- No

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

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

Yes

No

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

The program anticipated 30-50 students in the first two years with a 10% per year growth. The program did not meet the anticipated number of students but has demonstrated an increase in enrollment each year. The program count for the fall of 2018 was 7, fall of 2019 was 10, 19 for the fall of 2020, 22 for the fall of 2021, and 27 in 2022. The program noted that the interest of the Boy Scouts Of America played a role in developing this program. However, The Boy Scouts of America faced several challenges during the last few years, decreasing the opportunity for partnership. The COVID pandemic negatively impacted enrollment and provided limited opportunities for recruitment and fundraising for the program.

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 6.1. section of the document was blank. However, it was noted that more faculty resources are needed. Currently, the program is delivered by one full-time faculty member and an adjunct faculty.

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.



Currently, the program is supported by one doctorally prepared full-time faculty member and adjunct faculty. Since the program is increasingly growing, more faculty are needed, and the program is pursuing opportunities within the faculty of the General Business Department and considering hiring other adjunct instructors. The program noted that the COVID pandemic has negatively impacted scholarly productivity and service activities.

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

All

Some

Q5.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.)

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

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

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

The program has an upward enrollment trend. The program's inaugural year was 2017, and they welcomed seven students. Each year the program has increased, and 27 students entered the program in the fall of 2022. The continuance rate in the program is 73% - 100%. Since this is a new program, time-to-completion data were not included. The program had four graduates during the 2019-2020 academic year and seven graduates during the 2020-2021 academic year. No high D/F/W courses were identified. Placement data collected shortly after graduation indicated 100% of Organizational Leadership graduates secured jobs at graduation.

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 8.2 in the program review.

Yes

No

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

The program's outcomes are not specific or measurable. Nor do the learning outcomes illustrate growth from building knowledge to high-order thinking. The verbs align with lower levels of learning.

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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The assessment plan included the five program learning outcomes and provided one to two aligning course objectives, one assessment method, assessment time, performance target, and results. The review did not include how assessment data were used to make changes.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

This is the first time the council has reviewed this program. We commend the program on its steady growth and continuance rates. Additionally, the program actively seeks growth by adding a new Self Leadership Development course (ORGL 305) and submitting a Non-Profit Management minor for approval. The program recognizes the benefits of the newly developed General Business Department. These benefits include additional faculty to share resources and ideas and maximize marketing and recruitment efforts. Additionally, the program increased its Advisory Council members for appropriate representation of the development and for-profit expertise. The Undergraduate Council recommends that the program work with the Associate Provost for Curriculum and Assessment to improve the program's learning outcomes. Improvement of the learning outcomes will assist in developing a systematic assessment plan. Additionally, consider a formal community of interest, including students, alums, and stakeholders, to include in the systematic plan.

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

- Yes
- No

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

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of what follow up action(s) should be taken by the program, what response is expected to the Council (if any), and when. Typically reports are due at the end of the same calendar year when the program review was submitted.

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Undergraduate Council requires that: 1) By January 2024, the program revises its program learning outcomes and publishes them to CIM and Catalog. 2) By January 2024, the program submits a follow-up report with the approval of its dean's office that provides a plan to address faculty adequacy in the program. 3) By January 2024, the program submits a follow-up report that includes an assessment plan and progress towards the design of a curriculum map. 4) By January 2025, the program submits a follow-up report demonstrating evidence of assessment of learning. 5) In each of the next three years, the program uses the annual reporting process to provide updates on its program enrollment and continuance as well as uses that process to provide the plans it has to improve enrollment.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 22 - 23

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.

BSBAD Finance

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 supports awareness of business practices and financial literacy for the state of WV and beyond by delivering equity and inclusive minded curriculum ranging in principles including management, global supply chain, and economics. Faculty are engaged in research and publication. Faculty have obtained grants allowing for studies and practices that support the state and its students. The program includes a Center for Financial Literacy and Education whose mission is to promote financial literacy throughout the University and 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.

The program reports both adequate and accessible resources are in place to carry out program requirements.

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 the need for additional faculty lines to adequately deliver curriculum. Currently, there is a recruiting process in place to fill two tenure track lines, with the start date a fall 2023 posted. The program has also worked to develop a pool of highly qualified adjunct instructors to meet immediate needs. The need for additional, qualified faculty was also raised during the program's most recent accreditation review. Faculty are engaged in research and publication process. The most recent self-report of the accreditation process, supplied as part of the program review, notes that faculty comprise many standing committees and councils within the College as well as numerous ad hoc committees. Faculty are involved in critical retention efforts in the College such as midyear academy, contractual readmission, scholars' programs, Adventure West Virginia, and the Chambers College Center for Career Development.

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

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.

Program enrollment has steadily increased since fall 2018 with program continuance seeing a slight increase from fall 2017 to fall 2018 and remaining fairly consistent since. The program's graduates per year have increased since the last program review in fall of 2017, with the year following the last review graduating 116 students and most recently graduating 143. DFW course rates are low. Only one course is indicated as a DFW course for each academic year during this program review cycle. This suggests that curriculum changes have occurred during each yearly cycle to increase student success in those courses.

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- Yes  
 No

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

See Q 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program is guided by four "learning goals" which are published on the program's catalog web page. The outcomes are degree level appropriate and each specifically related to identifiable concepts within the major. However, the outcomes do not all use language that is actionable and easily measured. For example, knowledge of financial markets and institutions does not specifically indicate student action to be carried out or imply how such knowledge should be measured. The program reports assessment data for all four of its learning outcomes. The assessment data has been primarily collected in one course, Finance 305, with one other course, BCOR 340, represented. Excel modeling assignments are used as data collection in four of the learning outcomes. Embedded question is used as an additional source of data collection for one learning outcome. Targets of proficiency have been met for all but one of the learning outcomes. Data collection is present for spring 2022 only.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The program reports an extensive recruitment plan with one dedicated staff member serving as recruiter at high school events as well as other outreach events (DECA conferences, Discover WVU Days). The program utilizes a specific recruitment communications plan. The program currently recruits students internationally through a Center for Chinese Business. The program also has retention efforts in place by way of midyear academy as well as contractual readmission for suspended students. The program additionally utilizes a multistep communication plan for perspective and admitted students. Although the program does not report having a specific Advisory Council, the Center for Career Development does maintain engagement with outside employers and offers graduate placement efforts. The Student Managed Investment Fund, utilized by students in the investment area of emphasis, is another example of a specific program opportunity within Chambers College.



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 22 - 23

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.

BSBAD, General Business

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 prepares its students in principles of business ranging from accounting, economics, finance, global supply chain, management, and management information systems. Sixty percent of the faculty are research active and publish their work in peer-reviewed journals and books, and succeed in getting grants and contracts to support their work.

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 both adequate and accessible resources are in place to carry out program requirements.

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 that the COVID pandemic has impacted Chambers faculty's productivity. Initially, COVID had a significant impact on teaching...primarily in terms of course design for different modalities. The faculty were challenged time-wise in terms of time spent on teaching. While the COVID pandemic initially directly affected teaching, most faculty's research and service contributions have been affected by the pandemic.

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.

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

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.

Program enrollment, continuance, and graduation rates have steadily increased since Fall 2017. There are four high DFW courses (BCOR 121, 360, ECON 201, and ACCT 201) that need to be examined in the next cycle.

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 8.2 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 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program has only provided assessments of Learning Outcomes (LO) 1 to 13 for two years (Spring 2021 to Spring 2022). Consider assessing a few LO's every year throughout the next five years. It may be more productive to thoroughly assess and analyze a handful of LO's each year than attempt all LO's over a few semesters.

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 Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The program plans to introduce a number of new courses to the curriculum in an effort to better prepare students in a career in business. Encourage students to become more involved in extra-curricular activities and options to boost their resumes.

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