

BOG Graduate Program Review Spring 2024

Chair: Steve Urbanski, Director of Graduate Studies, Reed College of Media

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
Samantha Ross, WVU
Jennifer Mallow, WVU
Ahmad Hanif, WVU
Paul Chantler, WVU
Matthew Titolo, WVU
Victor Mucino, WVU
Kashy Aminian, WVU

This year the Graduate Council reviewed 8 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

Biology, MS, PHD, WVU
Forensic Sciences, MS, WVU*
Geography, MA, PHD, WVU
Geography, MA, WVU
Geology, MS, PHD, WVU
Journalism, MSJ, WVU
Neuroscience, PHD, WVU
Occupational Therapy, OTS, WVU*

*Accredited Programs

WVU Board of Governor's Program Review

Executive Summary – Academic Year 2023-2024

Graduate Programs

- 8 programs were reviewed
 - There were 16 programs that were reviewed in summer 2023 which were considered to have fulfilled this academic year's review requirement through that process
- 5 programs were continued at the current level of activity.
- 3 programs were continued with specific action.
 - 2 actions were assigned to assessment of student learning.
 - 1 action was assigned requiring the resubmission of a complete self-study.

Program	Follow-up actions recommended
MA PhD Geography	Evidence of assessment
MS PhD Forensic Science	Resubmission of complete self-study
MSJ Journalism	Evidence of assessment

Follow-up Actions Assigned in Previous Years

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

Program	Follow-up action status
MS Computer Science	Direct assessment of learning evidence
PhD Business Administration	Evidence of assessment

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 23 - 24

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 Biology

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

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

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

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

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

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The goals of our graduate program align with WVU's mission, vision, and values in several ways. Research: Our graduate students perform original research which they publish in upper-tier journals and present at domestic and international conferences and their success has been recognized through awards and fellowships. Teaching: Our graduate program offers cutting-edge training experience through dozens of graduate courses covering all areas of biology. Research skills and professional development are covered comprehensively by our structured curriculum. Furthermore, our graduate students obtain programmatic pedagogical training by contributing to the department's mission as Teaching Assistants. Community: Our graduate program trains the leaders of tomorrow in a wide range of career paths. Our graduate students pursue careers in research fields of strategic importance, and as health practitioners, government or NGO employees, educators, administrators, and policymakers. Their research benefits our community such as via wastewater monitoring of COVID-19 and our genomics core. Our outreach events allow graduate students to share their research/knowledge with the public. Inclusivity: The Biology Department has implemented proactive measures to reach diverse groups of students, enhanced several classes with a focus on inclusive teaching and is committed to continuing its efforts to train a diverse workforce.

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

See Q4.2 of the program review.

Yes

No

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

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

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

The program reports adequate 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 Pandemic and the Academic Transformation process negatively impacted our teaching, research, and service missions. The pandemic halted experiments, significantly setting projects back by interrupting processes that were in-progress. Instruction was shifted on-line requiring significant curriculum development with little opportunity for beta-testing. The pandemic also paused outreach activities. Academic transformation and the pandemic forced many budgetary restrictions on our department. Restricted access to start-up accounts for pre-tenured faculty greatly hindered student recruitment and the acquisition of equipment, reagents and salary lines required to gather data for grant applications. Overhead accounts have been frozen since 2020 which hamstringing development of new research avenues hindering applications for extramural funding. Classroom enrollment was increased and funding for teaching assistants decreased, necessitating the development of new curriculum delivery to accommodate more students with less support. A myriad of additional limitations hampered research capacity including halting of external speakers (to build professional networks and scientific collaborations) or new administrative procedures meant to hinder expenditures. Finally, the shift to centralized service desks created a culture where faculty must continually follow up on requests for tasks to be completed.

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.

Admission and enrollment demonstrate long-term stability in our MS and PhD programs. We admitted an average of 4.4 MS and 5.8 PhD students each year (prior review period was 4.0 MS and 6.4 PhD). Enrollment in both programs was stable at an average of 14 MS students and 31 PhD students each year. Our department graduated 40 students during the review period and our time to graduation has remained stable with the prior review period (3.8 vs 4.0 years for MS and 6.2 vs 6.1 years for PhD). We doubled the number of PhD students graduated in this review period (29 vs 14). 17 MS students graduated relative to 13 in the prior period. During the 5-year review period, 99% of students (90/91 combined MS and PhD students) maintained satisfactory grades in their course work. As the overall research profile of the department strengthens, the number of students awarded GRA-ships remains high with ~80% of our students supported on either extramural grants (totaling ~\$2,000,000 for our department) or graduate fellowships. Our students collectively were awarded 61 fellowships and scholarships over the review period. Over the 5-year period, there were 66 articles published from our department with graduate student coauthors and a total of 112 students were authors on manuscripts, as well as over 100 conference presentations. Of the 40 total students graduating within the 5-year period of this review, 34 are placed in jobs, with ~90% of those graduates working in their respective fields.

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.

Based on our mechanisms for assessment, our students completed their benchmarks (our primary direct assessment of learning outcomes; see attachment) earlier than the last review period, improved from year to year based on their annual evaluation of knowledge, technical skills, and professional competencies, graduated in the same amount of time as the last review period and most students obtained jobs in their field of study. Our critical metrics (time to degree, enrollment, graduation rate, job placement and research productivity) have remained stable and positive over this review period. Annual evaluations demonstrate that our students make steady progress in conceptual, technical and professional skillsets. Overall, the courses, curriculum, learning outcomes and program goals remained the same. There was a small adjustment in the curriculum to harmonize credits required in our handbook with the those listed in the university catalog, but these were minor (departmental colloquium and graduate seminar). Our greatest area of improvement was the creation of programmatic mechanisms to increase transparency and alignment of expectations between advisors and students. Finally, we developed an on-site advisor policy for students whose primary faculty advisor has left WVU, while the student remains enrolled.

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.

USA Awards/CIP data for 2020-2021 indicates we graduated comparable numbers of MS and PhD students relative to other Big 12 schools (3 MS and 5 PhD WVU, relative to an average of 4 MS and 2 PhD at other Big 12 schools). Compared to schools with 20-30,000 total enrollment (average 10 MS and 3 PhD), we graduated fewer MS students, which reflects the inclusion of course-based MS degrees which typically enroll more students than thesis-based MS degrees. As stated above, 34 of the 40 students that graduated during the review period are currently employed (~90% of those are employed directly in their graduate field of research) and the remaining 6 students are continuing their education by obtaining additional degrees.

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 23 - 24

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. Forensic Sciences

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

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

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

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

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

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

the program meets with the alignments of the WVU mission, vision and values and serves students goals to become trained in forensic sciences at the graduate level.

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

See Q4.2 of the program review.

Yes

No

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 leaders express concern about adequate funding of their labs due to budget cuts and the inability to access research funds. However, most the self-study is so brief or otherwise incomplete that it is difficult to understand what the actual source and severity of the issue is.

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.

In addition to the program leaders concern about adequate funding of their labs due to budget cuts and the inability to access research funds.

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.

Unclear or does not provide the accreditation outcome nor it does provide the accreditation agency letter. There is no description for an assessment plan. They provided the results of a survey of graduates (?) but it is difficult to see how their survey questions relate to the student's learning outcomes. There is no direct evidence of learning as related to the student learning outcomes presented. Beyond the survey, there is also no post-graduate outcome assessment.

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.

These areas of the self-study were either too brief to be substantive or totally incomplete. The program provided some evidence of assessment but it was focused on a survey and no explanation of how those results were used or if they were used was presented. Large sections of this portion of the self-study were entirely incomplete.

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.

Again, the self-study was so brief or incomplete in its responses that it is not possible to answer this question.

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 recommends the following specific actions: 1) By December 2024, resubmit a complete, comprehensive self-study for the MS and PhD programs in Forensic Science.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 23 - 24

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 Geography

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 Geography graduate program directly contributes to WVU's mission by producing high-impact research, with our students publishing in a range of peer-reviewed journals within geography and related fields. The students also regularly present their research at international and national conferences. The program looks to foster a diverse and inclusive environment; our students hail from an array of economic and ethnic backgrounds and we are privileged to host students from historically excluded backgrounds. The program contributes to transformation in West Virginia through work in social justice, uneven development, sustainable development, resilient communities, medical/health geography, and mapping of natural resources and the physical environment.

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

Yes

No

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

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

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

no issues have been reported for 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 adequate faculty. The department had permission to search for 6 positions. One was frozen during the last round of budget cuts, which would have directly served the graduate program. The Chair has requested the frozen search be reopened as soon as possible. The program reports that they have suffered from a convergence of negative events that have demonstrably handicapped their ability to maintain the degrees at their historical level. 1. Faculty loss – geography lost 6 full-time faculty members in the period since 2019 with an additional 1.0 FTE transfer to another unit for an administrative position for a portion of that time. 2. Budget cuts – consistent departmental budget cuts have reduced the number of GTAs the program can support by five. Cuts have led to less advertising, less travel support for recruiting, lower GTA salaries, reduced support for graduate retention activities, and increased workload for the remaining funded students. 3. COVID - 4. Academic transformation – the department's 3 undergraduate programs were flagged for academic transformation. To address these issues, the geography and geology graduate programs have been administratively merged under the direction of one director with one committee. Faculty have increasingly budgeted for GRAs in grants & the programs have begun to identify courses that can be shared.

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.

recruitment has gradually decline from 2018 (23 students) to 2023 (16 students) reflects a -8.7% drop over 5 yrs (it is unclear if the ECAS data here reflects the combination of MS and PhD programs), while retention is steady at approx 83%. the program indicates that the PhD headcount dropped directly as a result in budget cuts that led to a decrease in GTA lines. regarding program completion on an annual bases reflects 8-3%. The program notes that the students take an extended period of time to do field work, some as long as a year. This is standard disciplinary practice in geography. D/F/W: No geography graduate course has a DFW percentage >30% other than courses where repeated registration is required (GEOG 600 Colloquium) to meet program learning objectives or courses with very low enrollment where the withdraw was predicated on the fear of the course being cancelled. the program provides a considerable list of student achievements from publications, presentations, work placements, various NSF graduate research fellowships and other grant awards, and a list of students who now have full time employment in the field.

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 plans for the student reflect a comprehensive exam over 3 days, there is also an annual assessment/formal progress of the student. To assess the program a questionnaire is sent out. Assessment findings 1: Communicate geographical concepts orally/writing show mastery of this SLO. Pass rates on exams are very high. SLO 2: Apply research skills to analyze geographical questions The use of GEOG 602: Research Methods has improved student preparation for proposal development and field research. SLO 3: Propose, produce and defend original research of publishable quality. Nearly all PhD students are now passing their final dissertation defenses that are based on the production of 3-5 journal articles. SLO 4: Explain geographic principles as they relate to their area of research Departmental evaluation through public defenses of proposals and final documents have been timelier than in the past. SLO 5: Effectively communicate the state of knowledge in their research area Student participation in conferences. SLO 6: Identify research questions in geography This was determined from survey and assessment data to be weak. Changes were implemented (adding GEOG 602) and assessment to determine effectiveness continues. SLO 7: Critique and assess peer-reviewed pub While assessment covers the learning outcomes and post-graduate outcomes, it is unclear how the data is analyzed and would be used to inform program level changes.

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

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

See Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The geography program review determined that PhD students needed a research methods course that helped them prepare for both internal and external proposal development (Learning Objective: Propose, produce and defend original research of publishable quality and Learning Objective: Identify research questions in geography). GEOG 602 was developed and taught as a response to that need during the period under review. based on feedback this addition of GEOG 602 seems to have improved the program and student development.

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 recommends that: 1) By January 2026, the program submit evidence of assessment of learning that specifically analyzes its current practices and demonstrates how that analysis will be used to inform program changes when appropriate.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 23 - 24

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

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

See Q 1.2 of the program review.

MA in Geography

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

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

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

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

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

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The program supports WVU's mission of advancing high-impact research by producing high-quality research with students publishing peer-reviewed journal articles and presenting papers at national and international academic conferences. The program further supports WVU's mission of providing access and opportunity to education and prosperity by serving students from varying economic and ethnic backgrounds including historically excluded groups. Graduates in turn contribute to the economic and social transformation in West Virginia as skilled workers in economic development, geographic information science, and environmental fields and undertake research roles in academia, government, and industry.

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

See Q4.2 of the program review.

Yes

No

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

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

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

No issues were noted regarding inadequacies or inaccessible infrastructure resources.

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

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

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

The program notes an inadequate number of faculty to meet the programs mission. The program has demonstrated the need for faculty to the College and University. The department was given permission to search for six faculty positions. One of these was frozen during the last round of budget cuts, which would have directly served the geography graduate program. The Chair has requested the frozen search be reopened as soon as possible. The program further explains that four primary factors, 1) faculty losses, 2) budget cuts, 3) the COVID pandemic, and 4) academic transformation efforts, have had significant negative effects on the faculty's ability to be productive.

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

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- All
 Some

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

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

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

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

The program has experienced a decline in enrollment numbers over the review period as follows: 2018-2019- 24, 2019-2020- 26, 2020-2021- 24, 2021- 2022- 19, 2022-2023- 16. The program attributes this loss in enrollments directly to the loss of program faculty and program related budget cuts, especially those reducing GTA lines. No specific steps to address declining enrollments were noted, leaving some doubt as to whether enrollments can be stabilized or increased moving forward. In addition, graduation rates seem low during the review period as follows: 2018-2019- 5 (34.x%), 2019-2020- 9 (19.x%), 2020-2021- 9 (37.x%), 2021-2022- 8 (32.x%), 2022-2023- 4 (xx.x%). The program notes that efforts are being made to enforce program timelines and to encourage students to complete the degree. The program provides evidence of student research productivity, research awards, and a 100% placement rate.

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- Yes
 No

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- Yes
 No

Q6.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

Yes

No

Q6.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

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

See Qs 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program assesses student learning using: 1) exit interviews, 2) annual progress reports, and 3) comprehensive examinations. No formal assurance of learning assessment plan was observed. The program provides a summary of assessment findings relative to the programs learning objectives.

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.

A new research methods course, GEOG 602, was developed and taught during the period under review as a response to a need to improve student research proposal development. The program may consider developing a formal recruitment plan to help stabilize and increase enrollment numbers. The program may also consider creating a formal assurance of learning plan.

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

Yes

No

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

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

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

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

Submit a formal student recruitment plan aimed at stabilizing and increasing enrollment Submit a formal assurance of learning plan

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 23 - 24

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.

Geology MS & PhD

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 Geology graduate program at West Virginia University directly contributes to WVU's mission in producing high-impact research, with our students publishing in a range of peer-reviewed journals within the earth sciences and related fields, including Geology, Geophysics, PLOS ONE, Journal of Sedimentary Research, Hydrogeology Journal, Sedimentology, Frontiers in Earth Science, Frontiers in Energy Research, Environmental Earth Sciences, and Paleobiology. Our students also regularly present their research at international conferences such as the Geological Society of America Annual Meeting and Unconventional Resources Technology Conference. We also foster a diverse and inclusive environment; our students hail from an array of economic and ethnic backgrounds and we are privileged to host students from historically excluded backgrounds. We contribute to transformation in West Virginia through work into energy sources and solutions and the mobilization of critical minerals that will directly benefit the state economy as well as through environmental remediation. Students graduate with experience and qualifications to operate as skilled geoscience workers within energy and environmental fields and undertake research roles in academia, government, and industry. All of these elements fit within the overall mission of the university, which is focused on improving the lives of the communities and constituents of West Virginia through research, education, and service.

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 Chair has demonstrated the need for faculty to the College and University. The department was given permission to search for six faculty positions. Three of these were frozen during the last round of budget cuts, including two that would have directly supported the Geology graduate program. The Chair has requested the two frozen searches be reopened as soon as possible. From this, it appears the Chair has taken all steps within their purview, but due to the hiring freeze (out of their control), not all needed faculty to support this program are not in place.

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 pandemic had a marked impact on faculty/student productivity. Numerous graduate thesis/dissertation projects pivoted to alternative research questions with restrictions on travel, resulting in delayed graduation; travel restrictions delayed faculty research. In a number of cases, graduate students have left the program due to familial bereavement or mental health problems as a direct result of the pandemic. Another difficulty the program has faced is faculty attrition; in the last 5 years, the program has experienced a reduction from 13 tenured/tenure-track faculty to 8, reducing the advising capacity of graduate students as well as reduced graduate courses able to be offered to students with faculty covering undergraduate courses. An increased service burden on the remaining faculty members has further reduced their efficacy and productivity. In response, we have undertaken specific actions to address the underlying: In order to support our graduate students impacted by COVID, we have extended financial support beyond the 4 years granted to PhD students or 2 years for MS students to support their completion. We have revised our depart. service structure to reduce overall service positions; reducing to a shared Associate Chair, Graduate Director, and Graduate Committee for both programs within the Department, concentrating service onto a few individuals. Hiring searches were underway for 3 faculty. This would increase our course offerings, but are frozen.

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 Geology graduate program at WVU compares favorably with similar programs in the recruiting region, producing more graduates (12) than the mean (10) and median (7) of all programs. Specifically, WVU graduates more MS students (10) than the mean (7) and median (5) of similar programs and an equal number of PhD students (2) to the region median (2), slightly below the mean (3). Notably, WVU is the sole institution in West Virginia conferring both MS and PhD degrees in Geology. Over 5 years, there's been a -10.7% decrease in graduates, attributed partly to the COVID pandemic's impact on research projects and student withdrawals. However, decreasing enrollment is the primary cause, evidenced by stable graduation proportions per semester. Plans to increase graduation rates entail boosting enrollment, restructuring programs, and introducing a direct-to-PhD pathway. Regarding class performance, no consistent high D/F/W rates exist, with unearned credit hours often occurring in auditing classes. Varied completion rates in certain classes during AY 2020-2021 were influenced by alternative grading modes due to the pandemic. Efforts to address high D/F/W rates include faculty changes, revised syllabi, and support for students facing mental health challenges

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- Yes
 No

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

Yes

No

Q6.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

Yes

No

Q6.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

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

See Qs 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

Program assessments determined MS students made good progress related to learning outcomes, are able to conduct original research, communicate geologic concepts, analyze geologic questions and explain geologic principles. In addition to their thesis, students present at international conferences and several have often published in peer reviewed journals. Students in the professional studies track communicate geologic concepts, demonstrate knowledge in energy or environmental geology, and apply geological knowledge in applied situations. Feedback from students suggested that the professional studies seminar could be further tailored to provide information on specific careers (A11). Assessment of the PhD program revealed students graduate achieving all learning outcomes. In addition to their dissertation, students presented their research at international conferences and publish in peer-reviewed journals. The preliminary exam was determined to not sufficient as an assessment of the 4th and 5th learning outcomes in communicating the state of knowledge in a research area and identifying research questions in geology (A12). Across both programs, some students indicated their progress to graduation was negatively impacted by delays in receiving edits of thesis or dissertation drafts from their advisor (A13). Employers are impressed with our graduates' breadth and application of knowledge, problem solving skills, and communication abilities, demonstrating success of MS/PHD 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.

The curriculum for the prof.studies seminar has been revised to be more flexible, with enrolled students providing information on target careers and developing targeted content for the semester alongside the instructor. The new mode of instruction ensures students gain the needed introduction to topics in their field needed for achieving applying geologic knowledge learning outcome. The PhD preliminary exam were revised to student research projects to the development and proposal of a single dissertation chapter. This assesses the ability of students to communicate the state of knowledge in their research area and to identify research questions in geology while maintaining the assessment of their ability to analyze and critique the peer- reviewed literature. This framework allows students to progress toward their dissertation at early stages of assessment, streamlining progress through the degree & decreasing the time to graduation. This sets out clear expectations/guidelines for faculty in providing feedback to students as well as information for students on action to take if they are not receiving feedback within the timeframe set out within the policy. All these recent actions and their efficacy will be evaluated over the next few years as students progress through the program. Initial observations indicate that PhD students are better prepared for the dissertation proposal/comprehensive exam milestones, indicating the revised preliminary exams better prepare for research.

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 23 - 24

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.

MSJ Journalism

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, they note that their accrediting body stresses professional programs over academic research and thus does not align with their graduate program that does both.

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

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

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

WVU's mission includes creating a culture that advances education. The MSJ provides students with advanced understanding of media disciplines, which prepares them for careers in those areas.

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

See Q4.2 of the program review.

Yes

No

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

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

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

The program has not experienced any issues with 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 has an adequate number of faculty and has not experienced anything that would affect 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 has remained relatively steady with 17 students in 2018-19, 24 in 2021-22 and 23 in 2022-23. The five-year trend for graduation is +7.8%. The five-year trend for program completion is +25.7% and for program continuance was +6.5%, which are all positive and strong. There are no DFW courses with percentages higher than 30%. Student accomplishments were not reported in Q8.5.

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.

Raw data for alumni survey results were provided, which demonstrated that alumni are satisfied with the program with several glowing comments regarding faculty. There wasn't evidence of any direct assessment of learning though the curriculum map provides the measures they use to assess the learning outcomes but no data is provided for those measures. Students have been successful at obtaining service assistantships.

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

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

See Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The program has made an effort to remind students each year of the value of professional internships and most students are successful at obtaining them. No data is provided for this though. Council informally recommends to provide additional detail on student accomplishments and internships in the 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

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 recommends the following specific actions: 1) By January 2026, provide direct evidence of assessment of the student learning outcomes as indicated by the curriculum map. Demonstrate how analysis of the assessment evidence will inform program change when appropriate.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 23 - 24

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 in Neuroscience

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

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

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

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

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

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The Neuroscience PhD program 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 Neuroscience PhD program does not report issues that hinder its ability to deliver their program or impact students' time to degree.

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 Neuroscience PhD 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. The program reports that COVID caused challenges yet the faculty adapted to the new environment with continued publication/presentation of scholarly works, extramural grant support submissions, and graduate student training. 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.

The program has experienced flat and then increases over the last two years of this program review, increase from 21 to 26. The program notes that this, in part, reflects the hiring of 6 new junior faculty and purposeful efforts to recruit students from the pool of biomedical sciences PhD students. The program has seen an increase from 2 to an average of 5 PhD students receiving their PhD each year with a significant reduction in TtD, a laudable 5.1 years. The program notes no high DFW courses. The program notes appropriate activities that meet the criteria of student success, including an expectation that all PhD graduates publish at least one peer-reviewed publication.

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- Yes
 No

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- Yes
 No

Q6.4. Generally speaking, do the program's learning outcomes ensure students collect, analyze, and communicate information, master modes of inquiry or creative work, and develop skills that are adaptable beyond the program?

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- Yes
 No

Q6.5. Provide a brief summary of the program's assessment plan, evidence of assessment, relevant assessment findings from this cycle, and program change and/or improvement related to assessment.

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

See Qs 8.3, 8.4, and 8.5 in the program review.

The program has a curriculum map that is appropriate. The program does in-program and post-program assessment (annual reviews and exit interviews), including the tracking of student placement. The program uses assessment data to improve their curriculum.

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

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

See Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The program noted changes to core coursework, to improve TtD, with a reduction of 2 to 1 semester. The department now uses their own course to train students in data acquisition and analysis methods related to carrying out their research projects. Core program requirements, previously comprehensive exams, were updated due to student feedback to now feature more research relevant activities. No additional recommendations are suggested.

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 23 - 24

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.

OTD Occupational Therapy

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 clearly supports WVU's mission to advance education and healthcare in the state. The program claims that 47% of the state's OT licensure register have come from WVU and the OTD program is currently the only doctoral level program in the state. Students and faculty in the program are participating in funded research that supports children with feeding difficulties, TBI, intellectual disabilities, and cancer care.

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 does not have any issues with its infrastructure or resources.

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

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

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

The program has adequate faculty to deliver the program, none of which are qualified through alternative means. The program does not report any significant issues during the review period that negatively impacted faculty 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 has grown steadily each of the first three years of operation from 17 to 29 to 39 in fall 2023; the first cohort of students have yet to complete. Continuance of the first cohort was 76% but that improved to 96% from fall 2022 to fall 2023 which is more aligned with program expectations. There are no significant DFW courses as yet.

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 and detailed assessment plan. The program also presented evidence of direct assessment of learning aligned with the program learning outcomes. As a full cohort has not yet completed the program, the full assessment cycle for the program has not yet been completed either.

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

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

See Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The program has had a successful launch and should be commended for it. The Council recommends presenting analysis of the completed cohorts' assessment of learning and explanation of how those results have been used to inform program change and improvement in its next five-year 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