

BOG Graduate Program Review Spring 2023

Chairs: Allison Dagen, Assistant Provost for Graduate Academic Affairs
Michelle Sandrey, WVU Associate Professor

Members: Jeffery Houghton, WVU
Michael Vercelli, WVU
Debanjan Das, WVU
Melissa Olfert, WVU
Katie Corcoran, WVU
Brian Popp, WVU
Jay Krehbiel, WVU
Jason Phillips, WVU
Jake Follmer, WVU
Kim Floyd, WVU
Jennifer Mallow, WVU
Ahmad Hanif, WVU
Matthew Titolo, WVU
Emidio Pistilli, WVU
Steve Urbanski, WVU
Victor Mucino, WVU
Kashy Aminian, WVU

This year the Graduate Council reviewed 15 graduate programs at WVU-Morgantown. The following pages consist of the recommendations and rationales for the review decisions for the programs listed below.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

Law, JD, WVU*
History, MA, PHD, WVU
Political Science, MA, PHD, WVU
Business Administration, MBA, WVU*
Business Cybersecurity Management, MS, WVU*
Business Data Analytics, MS, WVU*
Finance, MS, WVU*
Legal Studies, MS, WVU
Chemistry, MS, PHD, WVU
Physics, MS, PHD, WVU
Biomedical Engineering, MSBME, WVU
Human Resource Management, MSHRM, WVU*
Business Administration, PHD, WVU*
Economics, PHD, WVU*
Higher Education, PHD, WVU
Sociology, PHD, WVU

*Accredited Programs

WVU Board of Governor's Program Review

Executive Summary – Academic Year 2022-2023

Graduate Programs

- 15 programs were reviewed
- 9 programs were continued at the current level of activity.
- 6 programs were continued with specific action.
 - 3 actions were assigned to assessment of student learning.
 - 1 action was assigned around achieving viable enrollment.
 - 1 action was assigned around faculty adequacy.
 - 1 action was assigned around facilities adequacy.
 - 1 action was assigned around curricular revision.
- 1 program was recommended for discontinuance.

Program	Follow-up actions recommended
MA PhD History	Evidence of assessment, faculty adequacy
MSBME Biomedical Engineering	Enrollment
PhD Business Administration	Evidence of assessment
JD Law	Evidence of assessment, updated learning outcomes
MS PhD Chemistry	Evidence of assessment, facilities adequacy
PhD Higher Education	Curricular revision

Follow-up Actions Assigned in Previous Years

- 12 programs had follow-up actions reviewed.
- 8 programs resolved their issues.
- MS Recreation, Parks, and Tourism Resources did not resolve their follow-up action on enrollment; recommended for discontinuance.
- MS Computer Science did not resolve their follow-up action to revise their student learning outcomes.

Program	Follow-up action status
MS Chemical Engineering	On-going review of enrollment and completion
MS Electrical Engineering	On-going review of enrollment and completion

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.

JD (Doctor of Jurisprudence or Juris Doctorate)

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 university's mission by providing an opportunity for a professional legal education as the only law school in the state. More than 60% of the students in the program are in-state students and a significant majority of graduates will practice law in West Virginia and provide legal services to the state. The program boasts a larger than average placement in government, clerkship, and public interest jobs that serve the State or its citizens who might not be able to afford legal services. Program graduates help to transform and shape the state's judicial system.

Q2.1. Is this the program's first Board of Governor's program review? See Q4.2 of the program review.

- Yes
- No

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

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

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

The program does not have any concerns regarding the adequacy and accessibility of 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 affirms that it has adequate faculty necessary to meet the mission of the program and that there have been no significant negative effects on faculty sufficiency during the review period. In addition, the program notes that none of their faculty are qualified by other means than their academic credentials. Beyond these positive affirmations, no additional information or description of faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity was provided.

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 figures have been consistent during the review period, trending slightly upward. Program continuance rates have been steady around 95% each year. Number of graduates per year has been correspondingly consistent (approx. 104 per year) and the average time to completing is very close 3 years for each cohort. Three courses (LAW 605, LAW 715, and LAW 664) had relatively high DFW percentages, ranging from 12 - 20%. The program provides detailed information of placement rates and student successes using various metrics such as federal clerkships and bar exam pass rates. The program has an average ultimate pass rate (within 2 years of graduation) of 88%, exceeding accreditation standards of 75%. The average first-time pass rate was 74% and the program would like to see that number closer to 80%, but notes that uncertainties related to COVID may have affected the pass rates during the review period.

Q6.1. Are the program's learning outcomes accurately published in the Catalog? See Q 8.2 in the program review.

Yes

No

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

See Q 8.2 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.

In 2014, the ABA adopted a new standard requiring ongoing evaluation of learning outcomes and assessment processes. In response, the program created new learning objectives and a curriculum map. However, the program admits that they have not made further progress toward implementing an assessment process due to many factors including COVID. Nonetheless, for AY 2022-2023, a new Assessment Committee has undertaken the task of fully implementing the assessment plan. No assessment findings or improvements related to assessment are yet available, but the intent is to have at least a preliminary assessment of all learning outcomes prior to the next ABA site visit in AY 2025-2026.

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.

Despite lacking a formal assurance of learning and assessment process, the program has made improvements and implemented meaningful changes over the review period. In particular, the program has added an additional credit of legal writing in the first year and is working toward additional upper level writing requirements. The Co-Directors of the Legal Writing Program assessed existing learning outcomes and skill development before soliciting feedback from stakeholders to redesign of the first-year, first-semester legal writing course (LW1). The redesigned course is now more aligned with the learning objectives of preparing graduates to communicate effectively across a wide range of contexts.

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

- Yes
- No

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

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

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

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Graduate Council requires that: 1) By February of 2024, the program will provide an updated curriculum map, a more comprehensive and detailed assessment plan, any preliminary assessment findings, and possible resulting program improvements. 2) By February of 2024, the program will update its CIM entry (and thus the Catalog) so that the published learning outcomes for the program match what was presented in this self-study. 3) By February of 2025, the program will provide evidence of having implemented its assessment of learning plan and practices, what actions the program is taking based upon those results, and how the ABA has evaluated the program, specifically for assessment of learning.

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.

MA PhD 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 PhD in History is a main contributor to WVU's R1 research mission through its completion of humanities graduates and the production of humanities research. It is also a key component of preserving the state's history and educating people about it.

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 reported no issues with having access to 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 program reports that they do not have the adequate faculty to teach the program. The report having lost 11 faculty over the review period and only replaced 8. The program also noted that COVID-19 impacted the faculty's ability to be productive in research as well as that of its graduate students.

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 been steady and healthy over the five-year review period, commendably so. Continuance has also been steady though 80% continuance in a large graduate program is a touch lower than we are used to seeing. Program completions have been steady and aligned with program enrollment. Time-to-completion is long for all doctoral programs but normal for humanities programs. We'd encourage the program to attend to planned changes in direct admit policies for PhD programs to help clarify when students are admitted to the MA vs the PhD which will mitigate some of the time-to-completion issues.

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 presented a curriculum map for its curricular requirements and evidence of indirect, post-graduate assessment via an alumni survey. It was not clear if those results directly led to any program changes. There was reference to the use of APS to review grades for the program's students however we wouldn't normally recommend using grades for assessment outside of elaborately aligned curriculum. We think this review is a good idea but not a substitute for direct assessment of the program's learning outcomes. The program's placement data also suggests that its post-graduate assessment is robust and shows that the program is delivering on its mission to its students.

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.

Improvements have come from grants that led to better mechanisms to professionalize the program's students through a new course, establish assistantships, and better engage its alumni. AHA comparative data suggest that program efforts to improve the professional development of its students has worked and the program should be commended for this improvement. The program has also developed a much more robust connection with its alumni to help students find careers outside academia and in aiding their recruitment efforts.

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

- Yes
- No

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

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

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

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Graduate Council requires that: 1) By January 2024, the program submits a follow-up report that has the approval of its college's dean's office to review and address the level of faculty in the program. 2) By January 2025, the program submits a follow-up report that presents direct evidence of learning of the program's student learning outcomes and in alignment with its curriculum map.

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.

MA/PhD 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.

Both programs align with WVU's mission to produce high-impact research and to create a diverse and inclusive culture that advances education. The faculty produce high-impact research and the programs admit diverse students and include diversity within their curriculum.

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 programs have 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 COVID-19 pandemic negatively affected faculty productivity in teaching, research, and service. This is to be expected as in-person research was halted and budget cuts limited departments' ability to purchase necessary infrastructure for these activities (e.g., computers, software, travel for research). Even still, faculty continued to participate in conferences virtually and adapted to teaching/advising online. Unfortunately, during this review period the department lost 6 faculty members and only had 1.5 join. This has affected their ability to offer certain courses, faculty have had to advise more PhD students including those further outside their own research areas, which affects faculty productivity, student research, and the ability to recruit PhD students. The department has requested the ability to hire new faculty. It appears the issues have not be resolved yet due to not receiving additional hires.

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.

Combined enrollment in the programs declined by 5 students from Fall 17 to Fall 21, which is to be expected given the pandemic. The fact that it didn't decline more is likely a good sign. There is some fluctuation in continuance for the MA program in part due to its small size (even one student leaving can significantly affect the continuance rate) and also due to some students struggling with the required quantitative methodological training. They are now actively stressing the quantitative aspects of the program to prospective students, providing resources to help prepare them, and attempting to recruit students with better quantitative training. The average number of graduates per year was 6.2 across the five-year period. The time to completion of the MA program is strong, whereas the time to completion for the PhD program has increased over time due to a few students having much larger than average completion times. They have instituted new policies that require PhD students to defend their dissertation prospectuses in a timely manner. There is one high DFW course (POLS 794- professionalization seminar) and it is due to students leaving the program and not due to failing the course. At least 90% of their 20 PhD graduates hold jobs related to their field of study with at least 60% holding academic positions. Their students reported 56 presentations and five journal articles/book chapters.

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.

Assessment includes grades in course, scores on comprehensive exams, presenting at conferences, submitting papers for publication/publications, and evaluation of teaching. Using grades of a B- or higher in courses that meeting Learning Outcomes 1-3 and 5, students are achieving these outcomes at high rates as it is unusual for students to receive less than a B- in these courses. Although most students receive at least a B- in their methodology course, which meets Learning Outcome 4, a non-negligible number of students did not. 82.5% of comprehensive exams received a passing grade with the rest failing and 100% of defenses of prospectuses and dissertations were successful. 100% of the PhD students who took teaching practicums received a grade of at least A-. In order to improve comprehensive exam grades, a proposal to require minimum grades of B- in methodology courses in the PhD program was submitted. Students who receive less than a B- will need to retake the course to improve their proficiency. This appears to be a good plan moving forward to increase methodological competencies in order to satisfy that learning outcomes. The department has also developed an exit survey for MA and PhD graduates and will begin administering it in Spring 2023, which will provide further information on how the programs are meeting learning 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 programs have started emphasizing the quantitative aspects of their curriculum for potential recruits and providing additional resources for current students to improve their quantitative skills. They submitted a proposal to increase the required minimum grade for their methodology courses to B+ to help increase the grades on comprehensive exams. They also established a policy requiring dissertation prospectuses to be defended by a particular time, which has already led to students defending sooner. They have created an exit survey for graduates and will begin administering it in Spring of 2023.

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.

MBA

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 Online/Hybrid MBA program is consistent with the mission of West Virginia University and is in line the vision and values utilized in aligning with the University's strategic plan.

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

See Q4.2 of the program review.

- Yes
- No

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

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

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

The program is offered in collaboration with WVU Online. The report indicates that there were no issues with access to adequate technological or physical 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 has the adequate number of experienced faculty necessary to meet the mission of the MBA 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.

The program review mentions the five-year prior enrollment reported by APS documents a persistent downward trend in enrollment for the Online Hybrid MBA program between 1% and 19% annually between 2018 and 2021. After 2021, we have seen a slight increase in enrollment. The report cites 2 potential reasons: the COVID19 pandemic and high competition. To help solve this issue, the college has a dedicated advisor for the Online Hybrid MBA program and partnered with an external advertising agency that works with the advisors on external directed marketing.

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.

Could not find it in the review.

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

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

See Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

1. Reducing the number of required credit hours for the Online Hybrid MBA from 42 to 36, which helped improve student retention rates from 65% to 82%. 2. Previous BOG self-study reports identified more need for advisor support. There was a team of advisors that work jointly on addressing student needs and planning.

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.

MS in Business Cybersecurity 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 aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values as well as its broader strategic plan. The program lists as emphases providing a challenging and supportive academic environment, advancing global engagement, and supporting and enhancing the well-being and quality of life of the people of West Virginia and beyond. It also indicates a focus on supporting local and regional businesses through experiential learning and collaborative efforts.

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 has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources. The program does not indicate having experienced significant issues with providing students with accommodations, scheduling required classrooms, accessing adequate technological infrastructure, accessing adequate technological support, or accessing adequate physical 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 has adequate faculty necessary to meet and support its mission. The program does not indicate having faculty qualified by other means than academic credentials. No significant negative effects on the faculty's productivity with regard to teaching, research or service were indicated.

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 trends appear to be healthy and steady. The program enrolled 41 students as of fall, 2021 based on headcount. The average times to completion for AY 19-20 and AY 20-21 are 1.11 and 1.38, respectively, and align with the described structure and timeframe of the program. The program's number of graduates in AY 20-21 (16) is at pace with the median number of graduates for similar programs broadly (Mdn=16). More recent indicators based on enrollment and the number of graduates in AY 21-22 as summarized by the program show increased growth (3-yr trend: +40.5%).

The program does not note issues associated with D/F/W courses. Indicators of program continuance, based on fall-to-fall retention rates, have ranged from 33.30% to 37.50%. Description or contextualization of these retention rates is not provided by the program. The program reports several indicators of student success. These include a 95% career placement rate, student enrollment in doctoral programs (focused on cybersecurity, human-machine interaction, and information technology), and student engagement with external partners (e.g., Data Drive WV). They also note student involvement in regarded activities (e.g., the Locked Shields 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's assessment plan is aligned with its program learning outcomes. The program provides a complete curriculum map and also presents a summary of attainment of student learning outcomes based on direct measures of student learning aligned with that curriculum map. Based on opportunities to assess student learning embedded in 7 unique courses from fall, 2019-spring, 2022, the program reports evidence of students meeting outcomes in the majority (31) of assessment opportunities. Evidence of partial attainment was obtained in the remaining assessment opportunities (5, across the same timeframe). Description of specific programmatic changes based on the reported evidence of partial attainment of outcomes is not provided by the program. Each of the four program learning outcomes is assessed by at least one direct indicator of student learning. Student learning assessment is based on a combination of discrete measurement items (i.e., individual multiple-choice items) and summative and project-based assessments (e.g., research papers, laboratory assignments, risk assessments). The program notes that the assessment process began in earnest in AY 21-22. They also note ongoing review of and refinement to the assessment plan, occurring in the fall of 2022, with additional data collection taking place in subsequent spring semesters. An emphasis on placement rates as an indicator of student success is reported by 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 describes improvements that center on curricular refinement and alignment. In particular, the program has directed effort toward updating and refining course offerings that meet shifts and demands in the field of cybersecurity (e.g., security architecture, machine learning). Similarly, they note ongoing expansion of the curriculum to support students' skills in and mastery (e.g., in secure software development). Other improvements have focused on the addition of faculty in core areas of expertise in the field; these faculty have furthered program improvement efforts as documented in the review materials.

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.

MS in Business Data Analytics

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 MS in Business Data Analysis program is consistent with the mission of WVU and furthers the University's achievement of its strategic plan. It is an online program and is at the frontier of data science for business. The program equips students with state-of-the-art data management, data mining, machine learning, and visualization skills to support organizations leveraging data to improve and expand operations in WV and around the world.

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 resources and did not experience significant issues with any accessible infrastructure resources. Maybe because it is an online program.

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

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

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

The program indicated that it had adequate faculties but did not disclose their composition, credentials, 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

Q5.3. 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 M.S. BUDA has been consistent over the past several years. 2020-21 48 students 2021-22 50 students 2022-23 45 Students Avg Time to completion had varied between 1 and 1.94 years. Graduates by Year has also varied between 18 and 21

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.

No findings were shared after the most recent review in 2019. For Curriculum assessment, group projects, exams, and final papers are utilized.

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.

Addition of Python to BUDA 515 and BUDA 535]. Adding Dr. Bin Liu to the the faculty group, supporting M.S. BUDA Alignment of BUDA 550 to Tableau Desktop Specialist Certification BUDA 550 (Business Data Visualization) was revised to align with the Tableau Desktop Specialist Certification more closely. The program has a curriculum committee and meets regularly to discuss changes needed in the program to compete on a national and international basis. At this time, changes to the program are in the discussion stages and no plans have been formalized.

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.

M.S. 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 MS Finance aligns with WVU's mission in that the focus is on preparing graduates who can provide service directly back to financial service institutions, government agencies, and individual financial planning in 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 does not identify any issues regarding 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 unit provides a clear outline of faculty qualifications and credentials. There are no issues identified regarding faculty adequacy, credentials, composition, and productivity.

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

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 unit has developed a 3+1+g program with universities abroad to increase the number of qualified international students to the MSF program. In addition to the 3+1+g program for international students, the unit is planning a 3+1 program for WVU undergraduates to complete a BS/MS in four years. There are no high D/F/W courses reported.

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 unit provides a detailed Assurance of Learning Data assessment providing courses where learning outcomes are measured and student success rates. The unit reports meeting or exceeding 35 out of 38 learning objective thresholds.

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.

Recommendation – Continue at Current Level of Activity.

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.

MS in Legal Studies

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.

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 receive a Faculty Needs Assessment. Thus, no actions were taken.

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

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

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

No significant issues reported.

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.

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.

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.

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.

PhD & MS Chemistry

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 chemistry program provides a mission statement that aligns with WVU's mission, vision and values. Graduate students are exposed to a challenging academic and research environment, are mentored in a safe and inclusive environment, and are prepared for roles in all chemistry workforce sectors.

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 provides an addendum that describes deficiencies in facilities and equipment at the Chemistry Research Lab (CRL) and Clark Hall that potentially limit graduate students' abilities to complete the program efficiently. Examples of issues that make faculty and graduate student work troublesome include: roof leaks; rusted and/or inoperable hot water lines; dust from the current ventilation system; dated fume hoods through 85% of research laboratories. These issues with CRL and Clark Hall should be addressed and remedied by the next review cycle. The Chemistry dept report states that despite these issues, the faculty and graduate students are engaged in cutting-edge research that is published in high rated journals; this statement makes it seem that the issues above, while troublesome, are not hindering productivity currently. Also, the retention rate of graduate students has consistently been above 85%, so this does not appear to be an issue currently. The recommendation is that updating labs to contemporary standards will enhance faculty and graduate student productivity, and enhance students' abilities to complete the program.

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

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

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

The program reports that they have adequate faculty numbers to meet the mission of the graduate program. It states that there are faculty that are qualified by other means than their academic credentials, but this is not elaborated on in Q7.7. The program provides descriptions of how COVID affected faculty's ability to be productive, but also provides evidence of adapting to these situations. Many of the efforts put into place to respond to COVID are still continuing currently.

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 increases in total student enrollment from 2017-2021, with 90 graduate students enrolled in AY2021. The retention percentages are over 85% for this reporting period, with a high of 96% in 2019-2020. The program has put significant effort into reducing the time to degree for the PhD, which was reduced from a high of 7 years to the current 5.5 years. To reduce the time to degree for the MS, a new course-only track was implemented in AY2019. This track allowed students to pursue the graduate degree without a focus on completing a research thesis. Two MS degrees were recently awarded, one in each track, with time to degree of 2 years. Two courses were identified that had high D/F/W rates. However, the program has a plan in place to deal with students in these courses. The program provides an extensive table presenting student success accomplishments, including manuscript publications and research presentations. There does not appear to be any issues with this particular area.

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 lists 9 learning outcomes (PLOs). There is a curriculum map that lists the PLOs, how program requirements are related to each PLO, and whether the PLO is Introduced, Reinforced, Mastered or Assessed. While the program appears to have attempted to obtain some assessment data, there is no clear or concise assessment plan or process. Furthermore, there is no direct relation between the assessment results and the learning outcomes. In other words, they have not clearly demonstrated that all the learning outcomes have been achieved. Within the provided report, the program does identify 5 needs that they say will guide future program changes/assessments. The recommendation is to reconsider their assessment process (perhaps revising the outcomes) to establish a clear plan and consequently relevant and documentable results.

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 improvements based on recommendations from the previous 5-year BOG review. These improvements include: reducing time to degree; increasing research productivity and job placement. Changes to the admissions process has resulted in increasing application numbers and increasing admissions rates. Other improvements/additions include a regular graduate program e-newsletter, a revised graduate handbook and revised online program resources to improve program clarity.

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

Yes

No

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

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

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

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Graduate Council requires that: 1) By February of 2024, the program provide a follow-up report that presents a five-year plan to address the aging of the departments facilities and equipment that has the approval of the department, the Eberly College's Dean's Office, and the Provost's Office. 2) By February of 2025, the program provide evidence of having implemented its new assessment of learning plan and associated practices and how it is planning to use the results of those results.

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.

MS, PhD in 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 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 closely aligned with the WVU's mission.

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's infrastructure and resources are accessible and adequate.

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 faculty in the Department of Physics and Astronomy consist of 14 tenured full professors, 5 tenured associate professors, 5 tenure-track assistant professors, 1 teaching associate professor, 2 teaching assistant professors, 1 teaching full professor, 3 research assistant professors, and 4 emeritus professors. Faculty's research productivity has been extremely high, and many have received recognition for their research, scholarship and mentorship in the form of a variety of awards and honors.

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 current enrollment is 84 PhD and 2 MS students. The PhD enrollment has increased by about 15% since the previous 5-year reporting period. The average time to completion over the past 5 years is 6.55 years for PhD and is 3.17 years for MS. The program produces 8-10 Ph.D. graduates, and 1-2 MS graduates each year. The PhD program enrollment, graduation, and time to completion trends are comparable to the national trends.

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 developed a comprehensive assessment plan. The achievement of the student learning outcomes is assessed by the oral candidacy exams, meetings with their advisor and committee, and PhD defense exam. The assessment plan, however, appears to be focused on the Ph.D. program. Furthermore, the program assessment report did not provide the assessment data collected or analyzed. There is no direct relation between the assessment results and steps taken to improve 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.

To address concerns and trends across the nation, the program has made two changes to the program: (1) The number of core courses were reduced from 7 to 6 allowing the students to take either PHYS 634 (Electricity and Magnetism I) or PHYS 752 (Quantum Mechanics II) to satisfy their requirements. (2) The written PhD qualifying exams is phased out in favor of a grade-based system. This is anticipated to come into effect in Spring 2023 and is expected to further improve recruitment and retention of students into the program, particularly individuals from diverse backgrounds. In addition, mentoring programs for incoming graduate students have been developed and implemented in the last few years. All incoming students are paired with both a peer and a faculty mentor. However, it is not clear if this is implemented only for Ph.D. students or both Ph.D. and MS students. It is the recommendation of the Graduate Council that the program do a better job of connecting its narrative explanation of assessment of learning practices to its evidence and data of assessment and to the resulting program changes and improvements in its next BOG program review.

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

- Yes
- No

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

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

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 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.

MSBME Biomedical 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

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

No. Seeking Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) accreditation is not desirable or appropriate for the MSBME program as this would: 1) limit the number of students, especially international students who enter the program; 2) would put a burden on the faculty and staff; 3) employers do not require or seek graduates of the ABET accredited master's degree for employment; and 4) would require a significant overhaul and redesign of the master's program and likely would require additional coursework for students who enter without an ABET accredited BS degree.

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 MSBME program in the Department of Chemical and Biomedical Engineering aligns and is consistent 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 MSBME program has not experienced any significant issues that would interfere with either the program's ability to be delivered to students or the student's ability to complete the program in a timely manner.

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 MSBME Biomedical Engineering program has an adequate number of faculty necessary to meet the mission of the program as well as to be productive in terms of teaching, research, and service. This is evident by the three new faculty hires in the past two years and in the process of hiring two new faculty members within the program. There are no faculty who are qualified by other means than their academic credentials (e.g., tested experience in the field).

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.

With this being a feeder program into the PhD program, enrollment numbers (fluctuates between 1 and 4 students) with graduation numbers low (usually 1-2 students/year), which may be why there is very little assessment data provided and a generic statement about accomplishments of the program students ("routinely publish referred journal papers and attend national conferences"). This could change with the new marketing plan to update the website, develop flyers that describe faculty research interests and send to US and international biomedical engineering programs, department open houses and research posters that describe departmental research. In addition the 4+1 program, implementation of the coursework-based master's program, and removal of additional coursework for students without a bachelor's degree in biomedical engineering, allows the program to become more attractive for students with science and engineering degrees other than biomedical engineering to pursue the MSBME option in a timely and cost-effective manner. These measures are currently being developed so there is no data to address whether the issues have been adequately resolved. The MSBME program does not have any high DFW 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 5 student learning outcomes for the BMEG program are being represented in assessment and accomplishment by either stating they were met, no deficiencies in this outcome based on the review of the evaluation forms of the AEC by the department chair or comparable to peer institutions for length of time to complete in the attached form. However, given the small number of MSBME students in the program (1-4 students), it is difficult to draw meaningful statistical evidence from the data. However, a qualitative review did not indicate any deficiencies. It is anticipated that with the use of the recruitment plan, the 4+1 plan, implementation of the coursework-based master's program, and a modification or prerequisites may increase the numbers and provide more meaningful assessment data related to program improvement.

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.

Three new faculty members in biomedical engineering were hired in the past two years. The expectation with these new hires is that there will be improvements in course offerings as well as graduate research. The program is also in the process of hiring two new faculty members in biomedical engineering. This should lead to a significant improvement to enrollment in the next review cycle. Continue to increase master student numbers for the MSBME Biomedical Engineering via the recruitment process outlined, the addition of the 4+ 1 option, implementation of the coursework-based master's program, and removal of the barriers of additional coursework for students without a bachelor's degree in biomedical engineering to make the program more attractive for students with science and engineering degrees other than biomedical engineering to pursue the MSBME option in a timely and cost-effective manner.

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

- Yes
 No

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

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

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

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

The Graduate Council requires that: 1) For each of the next three academic years, the program submit follow-up reports via the Annual Reporting process that detail the steps the program is taking to increase its enrollment at the master's level and that document the effect of those steps.

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.

Master of Science in Human Resource Management (MSHRM)

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 MS in Human Resource Management (MSHRM) program is consistent with the mission of WVU and furthers the University's achievement of its strategic plan. The MSHRM program provides challenging academic experiences for its students. Students acquire knowledge and skills in basic HR functional areas that prepare them for their future careers in human resources management and industrial relations and related fields. Finally, students develop knowledge and skills in strategic decision making, leadership, teamwork and communications. Approximately 60% of our faculty are research active. The faculty members teaching in the program and students enrolled in the program are all part of and contribute to the diverse and inclusive culture of WVU. We actively seek a diverse faculty, staff and student population. We have formed a diversity committee and we develop programming to foster greater awareness of diversity, equity and inclusion. We have added a new required Diversity and Inclusion Management course to our curriculum. Both our instructors and students represent diverse international backgrounds. Students have an option to participate in an international study trip with an International HR/IR course. The MSHRM program contribute to students' development of important skills and knowledge, including characteristics that enhance the students' career and income prospects. Some of our research activities support well-being of WV citizens.

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.

There were no specific issues presented in their submission.

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 sufficient faculty to cover the program. They shared that COVID created several issues with course content and mentoring activities. The faculty increased tele-meeting availability and frequency of available meeting time. Further, extensive successful professional experience is sufficient for qualifying an instructor for classroom engagement. These faculty are paired with an academic faculty for instruction in the course. Non-academic, tested-experience is considered sufficient if the instructor has had a career in the field. For example, an individual that has worked for 5-years is not considered to be sufficiently tested. Demonstrated success in a career over a 20-year period in the specific arena they intend to teach would qualify.

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 number of graduates has shown consistency in recent years (AY 16-17 – 43; AY 17-18 – 28; AY 18-19 – 22; AY 19-20 – 29; AY 20-21 – 27) along with average time to completion (AY 16-17 – NA; AY 17-18 – 1.8; AY 18-19 – 1.87; AY 19-20 – 1.8; AY 20-21 – 1.44). The drop in average completion time in AY 20-21 is due to the program moving from a 2-year to 18 month plan of study. Month Post Graduation: Class of December 2020 Student Recipients 29 Total Working, includes Working, Continuing Education, Military and Volunteering 100% 29 of 29 Average Starting Salary \$73,104 Range from \$42,536-\$86,496 Average Sign-on Bonus \$9,583.33 6-Month Post Graduation: Class of December 2021 Student Recipients 34 Student Submission Response Rate 91.1% 31 of 34 Unreported 8.9% 3 of 34 Additional data calculated out of... 31 Total Working, includes Working, Continuing Education, Military and Volunteering 100% 31 of 31 Still Looking 0% 0 of 31 Average Starting Salary \$74,635 Range from \$42,536-\$87,500 Average Sign-on Bonus \$9,583.33 Full-Time Offer Acceptance: Class of December 2022 Student Recipients 32 Student Submission Response Rate 96.8% 31 of 32 Unreported 3.2% 1 of 32 No Seeking 3.2% 1 of 32 Additional data calculated out of...30 Total Working, includes Working, Continuing Education, Military and Volunteering 50% 15 of 30 Still Looking 50% 15 of 30 Average Starting Salary \$91,269.23 Range from \$84,500-\$100K Average Sign-on Bonus \$10,462

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.

In Fall of each year, the MSHRM faculty meet to review data generated by both direct and indirect assessment methods. The faculty identify areas of weakness in student learning relative to our program's goals and objectives and develops specific recommendations for actions to improve student learning. This process is repeated on an annual basis with each MSHRM cohort creating a continuous improvement mindset. Notable program improvements stemming from the deficiencies noted above include but are not limited to the following: 1. We have added a new required Diversity and Inclusion Management course (ILR 545) in support of LO 2.2 2. We added a session to the practicum course on the topic of International HR facilitated by an HR professional with extensive International HR experience in support of LO 2.1 3. The professor teaching the ILR 530 Compensation class has taken steps to enhance learning and retention by implementing a flipped classroom model and accompanying pedagogy in support of LO 1.2 4. The professor teaching the ILR 548 Strategic HR class has implemented a Capstone Team Consulting project working on strategic HR issues with external clients such Toyota Motor Manufacturing West Virginia, Inc. in support of LO 5.1

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.

In the most recent review cycle, the primary direct assessment for the program was an exit exam. However, prior to that, the program also used a student ePortfolio as a richer direct assessment tool. This means of assessment and learning integration and enhancement is being reimplemented for the incoming class in Fall 2022. Each student in the program is required to create an ePortfolio consisting, at a minimum, of five measurable artifacts that represent the five learning goals of our program. Each artifact is assessed with a rubric and we expect that 100% of our students will rate in the highest two grading categories (categories include: unacceptable, poor, good, and excellent). The portfolio requirement is incorporated into the HR practicum course at the end of the program. The ePortfolio requirement facilitates not only assessment, but also integrative learning across the curriculum and successful job placement. The Graduate Council felt that this program was exemplary in its response to previous BOG program reviews and recommendations for improvement and it should be commended for the amount of work done to make changes to the program and to understand the impact of those changes.

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.

Ph.D. 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 PhD in Business Administration program is consistent with the mission of West Virginia University and furthers the University's achievement of its strategic plan. WVU's Strategic Plan includes five goals, and as explained below the PhD in Business Administration contributes to each. Engage undergraduate, graduate, and professional students in a challenging academic environment. WVU's PhD prepares students to be future scholars in the fields of accounting, finance, management and marketing. Our students participate in a challenging educational experience consisting of formal classroom education as well as independent doctoral level research projects related to their educational focus. Excel in research, creative activity, and innovation in all disciplines. The essence of the PhD is to prepare student to be researchers. Foster diversity and an inclusive culture The PhD program attracts a diverse student body as well as the faculty who participate in this program. Advance international activity and global engagement Our program attracts a significant number of international students. There have been Chambers faculty who have served as Fulbright scholars. The nature of doctoral education is global in scope. Enhance the well-being and the quality of life of the people of West Virginia Some of the research activity emanating from the doctoral program is focused on West Virginia and the well being of the people of West Virginia.

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 is moving to the new Reynolds Hall building, which should solve earlier reported issues with space.

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 issues with faculty adequacy, which has led to several years of teaching overload. The program self-report lists this as an issue of concern that they are dealing with in several ways, including increasing the number of full-time faculty and pausing admissions for doctoral students in accounting and hiring seven new full time faculty in accounting. The school required departments to create a plan to deal with teaching overloads in the 2017-18 academic year. They also now have graduate students teaching some classes, as well expanding the number of teaching faculty. They are also working to increase adjuncts from industry and visiting professors. In terms of productivity, the program reports an increase in publication quality, although the data are incomplete for 2019.

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 is solid in these areas. Undergraduate enrollment numbers are generally strong and trending upwards. There is a discrepancy between the numbers of graduate students the program believes is enrolled and the numbers that appear to the university: "According to APS, our enrollment is about 80 students. Per the numbers that Lou Slimack sent, our enrollment is reported at about 30 students. Under the current budget environment, we do not anticipate this number growing significantly in the years ahead. Over the last five years, 6 students have withdrawn from the 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.

There are issues that need to be addressed with the data on student learning. In some of the areas, the program reports low percentages in student proficiencies in key areas in basic economic and business analysis. The program reports that they are "generally pleased with the results" and maybe these are good numbers overall for their field across institutions. They do acknowledge that the students are really struggling with the quantitative classes (not surprisingly). But they haven't identified any plan to deal with the decline other than saying they will look into it. The program needs to provide an explanation of these low numbers and a more specific plan to deal with them.

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 report lists a number of improvements in faculty, facilities and program development over the review cycle, with specific plans for improvements in each of these areas.

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

Yes

No

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

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

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

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Graduate Council requires that: 1) By February of 2024, the program submit a follow-up report explaining how the undergraduate assessment of learning evidence is relevant to the PhD program and, if that data is relevant, how the program is planning to coordinate with the undergraduate programs to address the areas that were presented as having declined. The report should also clarify what assessment of learning is being performed that is specific to the doctoral program and its majors and how the program is using that information to make program improvements.

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.

PhD 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 PhD in Economics contributes to each of the five goals of the WVU Strategic Plan. A general description is provided of how the five goals are being addressed in the context of a PhD Program in Economics.

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.

Q5.2. Is this program offered in collaboration with WVU Online?, Response: NO Q5.3. Provide the final report from WVU Online for the Faculty Needs Assessment. This question was not displayed to the respondent. Q6.1. Program Resources Program Resources: No issues were reported (of a list of five 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.

Q7.2. Does the program have the adequate number of faculty necessary to meet the mission of the program? Response NO. Q7.3. How is the program addressing faculty inadequacy? Faculty staffing is challenging in the current economic environment and the Provost and administration has been engaged in faculty resource discussions. The program has hired new faculty (mostly young assistant professors) over the past 5 years. These young scholars are contributing to the program's mission by teaching graduate classes and engaging with the Ph.D. students. Q7.4. Has anything happened during the review period that has had significant negative effects on the faculty's ability to be productive in terms of their teaching, research, and service? Response YES. The COVID Pandemic and its impact on students for the Fall 2020 and 2021.

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 data provided: Headcount has a slightly increasing trend from 33 students in fall 17 to 42 in fall 21, with an average of 38, which reflects a little "bounce" towards the end of the pandemic. Program continuance: Has had ups and downs with an average of 83% (+/- 10.3%) with the highest 91.2% in 2021. Reflecting also a "bounce" towards the end of the pandemic. Graduates per year: Ups and downs, with average of 6.4, a max of 8 graduates in 2019 and 7 graduates in 2021. Time to completion: Pretty steady with 4.6 years average (+/- 0.4 years) D/F/W courses: Two courses with 18% and 14% DFW respectively (ECON 701, ECON 702) The trends recorded do not raise any red flags.

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 PhD Program is an accredited program under the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business AACSB. Accreditation requires an assessment process cycle which was completed in 2019-2020 and the next review cycle is in 2024-2025. The Chambers College has addressed all the issues in the AACSB Self Study Report (access to the report was provided), which describes the structure of a comprehensive plan 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.

The PhD Program in Economics has addressed issues that came up during the last Accreditation Review Cycle and are documented in the Self Study Report and the Accreditation Board letters. The issues were resolved and full accreditation was extended till the next cycle in 2024-2025. The Programs has maintained stability in spite of the pandemic and has continued to address hiring new faculty, and have a continuous improvement process in place to maintain accreditation. The Program has the opportunity to compete with peer institutions and perhaps improve in its ranking.

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.

PhD Higher Education

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

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

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

Q1.6. Provide a brief explanation of how the program is 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 program is aligned with WVU's mission, vision, and values. The program provides education and research experiences that are inclusive and promote diversity. The program prepares its students to be effective in their future higher education roles, charting a positive future for colleges and universities.

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 reports target enrollment, projected research, and external support were not required information when the program was established in 2017. No new faculty or administrators were needed for the program. No intent to plan documentation was available in CIM. While this data was not necessary in 2017, the program may wish to now provide internal planning data/discussions, presumably had by program leaders when the program began, establishing context for current program growth and outcomes assessment.

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

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

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

The program does not report inadequacies or ongoing issues related to 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 they have adequate faculty for their research, teaching, and service mission. All faculty qualify based on standard University approved 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

Q5.2. What was inaccurate?

The "Specialization Coursework" credits in the plan of study catalog tab is confusing. These seem like AoEs; however, no AoEs are listed in CIM. No courses are defined for each specialization. Expected time to completion was not found on catalog pages nor the program website.

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 established the first PhD class in 2019/20 with a cohort size of 19. The program has steadily grown since the first class. Program continuance over the past two years (ca. 88-89%) is reasonable. The limited number of graduates from this program is expected for a new PhD program. It is not clear what the expected time to completion for the program is. Those completing the HIED PhD program were previously enrolled in the HIED Ed program, which suggests evaluation of the reported numbers for AY19-20 and 20-21 is premature.

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 established an excellent assessment plan as reflected in the document "HIED_PHD_Assessment_Q9.3". The program reports that doctoral qualifying examination (DQE) assessment findings led to targeted responses that should lead to beneficial outcomes on the DQE requirement. Summative assessment data (student reflections and placement) suggest the program is meeting/exceeding expected student 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.

Given the relative newness of the program, faculty leadership are appropriately using assessment findings to evolve the program. They have added structure and direction for key milestones, including for the Doctoral Qualifying Examination and HIED MS and PhD course-based activity differentiation. Assessment plan improvements are also being undertaken, which is appropriate and necessary for a new program as program outcome improvements and program milestone inefficiencies become apparent.

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.

By January of 2025, the program will: 1) The program will provide a target optimal enrollment for the program and put that in CIM by way of a Word document attachment. This program was created around the time that the new Intent to Plan process was implemented in CIM and the Graduate Council would like that on record for future program review evaluations. 2) The program will address the "Specialization Coursework" section in the published curriculum in CIM and Catalog. Those requirements need to be made transparent to students and potentially reformatted as AOE's as well.

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.

PhD 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

Q1.6. 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 PhD in Sociology has three primary objectives that contribute to WVU's mission to be student-centered, research-focused, and to serve our state, nation, and professions. Within a context that embraces human diversity and social justice and always rooted within the rich history of the sociological and anthropological disciplines, we contribute by: (1) 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. (2) Conducting innovative, relevant and collaborative research on topics of broad interest that draws on and feeds back into our teaching and service. (3) 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

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

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

Yes

No

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

This is a new PhD in Sociology program that was approved last semester. The projected target enrollment will be 7 students per year, so 21 by the end of the third year of operation.

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

Within this report it is stated that the department has received all the support that was requested and needed in the projected, and now approved application (two new TT faculty hires). In addition to those hires, three new TT faculty have been hired and a TTline is currently advertised. This program is not offered in collaboration with WVU Online.

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

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

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

No significant issues are identified that interfere with the programs ability to be delivered of for the students to complete the program in a timely manner.

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.

Q7.6. Does the program have any faculty who are qualified by other means than their academic credentials(e.g., tested experience in the field) as defined in the WVU Faculty Qualifications policy? ANSWER: NO Also policy for the unit to determine qualified teaching faculty was embedded and clarified.

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 Sociology Departmental visiting committee comprised of alumni are considered the assessment and external advisors for feedback on proposed program changes, in addition to the internal measures from teaching and research faculty. Each course now connects back to specific program learning outcomes, which we visually depict in our curriculum map. We assessed all course syllabi using a rubric (see document attached at end). The biggest issue we found was that the learning outcomes in the syllabi did not match those in CIM. So we updated CIM with the new course learning outcomes approved by the full faculty. One of the core required courses (SOC 610, Advanced General Sociology) was originally designed as a survey of the field of sociology. We revised this course based on student feedback to focus on the specialty areas of the department, which connects to learning outcome 4 of the PhD program. Course evaluations indicate that the students have benefited from this course revision. Originally the comprehensive exam process was not clearly specified as we had never done it before. As students began taking their comprehensive exams, details regarding the process were clarified. Even after the revision, our program committee realized that comprehensive exams were extending students time-to-graduation. After doing an extensive amount of research on how peer institutions conduct exams, we completely overhauled our comprehensive exam process.

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 PhD in Sociology is a new program. Of the students admitted to the PhD program, 9 have received a Masters degree along the way. This program aims to admit between 5-7 graduate students a year and to have around 30-35 students in enrollment in any given year. We did not admit any students in Fall 2021 in order to preserve funding for our students who needed an extra year to complete their dissertation due to COVID-19. Several of the students had to change their dissertation methodology from qualitative field research to a COVID-19 friendly methodology, which extended their time-to- graduation. For the upcoming year (Fall 2022), we admitted a strong cohort of 8 students and will have 35 current 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