

# WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Meeting of June 21, 2024

ITEM: Approval of Undergraduate Program Review Recommendations

INSTITUTION: West Virginia University Main Campus, West Virginia University

Institute of Technology, and Potomac State College of West Virginia University

COMMITTEE: Full Board – Consent Agenda

RECOMMENDATION: Resolved: That the West Virginia University Board of Governors approves the Undergraduate Program Reviews conducted by the Undergraduate Council in this cycle, for the 2023/2024 academic year.

STAFF MEMBER: Maryanne Reed, BA, MS  
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

BACKGROUND: The West Virginia University Board of Governors is required to review one-fifth of all programs offered at West Virginia University and its divisional campuses each year, so that all programs are reviewed every five years.

BOG Policy 1, approved by the West Virginia University Board of Governors on September 7, 2001, established the procedure for this review, using a review committee.

The West Virginia University Board of Governors is asked to approve the BOG Undergraduate Programs reviewed Spring 2024, as presented.

BOG Undergraduate Program Review  
Spring 2024

Chairs: Louis Slimak, Assistant Provost for Curriculum and Assessment  
Evan Widders, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs

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

This year the Undergraduate Council reviewed 9 undergraduate programs including bachelor's and associate degree programs at WVU-Morgantown and WVU Institute of Technology. The following pages consist of the recommendations and rationales for the review decisions for the programs listed below.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY  
BS Forensic Science  
BSJ Journalism  
BSJ Sports and Adventure Media  
BSBA Organizational Leadership

WVU INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
AAS Hospitality (WVUIT)

WVU POTOMAC STATE  
AAS / BAS Criminal Justice (PSC)  
AAS / BAS Business Technology (PSC)

# WVU Board of Governor's Program Review

## Executive Summary – Academic Year 2023-2024

### Undergraduate Programs

- 9 programs were reviewed
  - There were 11 programs that were reviewed in summer 2023 which were considered to have fulfilled this academic year's review requirement through that process
- 3 programs were continued at the current level of activity
- 6 programs were continued with specific action
  - 4 actions were assigned around adequate faculty
  - 3 actions were assigned to assessment of student learning
  - 2 actions were assigned around enrollment and viability
  - 1 action was assigned around adequate facilities
- 1 program was discontinued

### Specific Actions Detail

Program	Follow-up actions recommended
AAS / BAS Criminal Justice (PSC)	Assessment of learning
AAS / BAS Business Technology (PSC)	Learning outcomes, faculty adequacy, enrollment
AAS Hospitality (WVUIT)	Assessment of learning, enrollment
BS Forensic Science	Faculty adequacy
BSJ Journalism	Faculty adequacy
BSJ Sports and Adventure Media	Faculty adequacy, assessment of learning
BSBA Organizational Leadership	Discontinued

### Follow-up Actions Assigned in Previous Years

- 10 follow-up actions were reviewed
- 7 programs resolved their issues
  - 3 programs that had previously had follow-up action assigned have since been discontinued
- 3 programs require further follow-up

BA Game Design & Interactive Media	Need to assess program post-merger, curriculum change
BS Horticulture	Need to assess program post-cooperative program
BS Wildlife and Fisheries	Follow-up on assessment of learning

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.

BS in Forensic 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

Q1.4. Explain why the program is not in good standing with its accrediting body. Provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to good standing.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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.

Per the report, the program appears to be appropriately aligned to WVU's mission and values. The statement for 3.3 (mission statement) notes ways they program aligns to WVU's values of curiosity, respect, accountability, and appreciation.

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.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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 appears to be under resourced with technological infrastructure and support. They note that as their class sizes have increased they require additional equipment (e.g., additional sequencer(s) for a DNA class). There is concern if there is not an investment in these resources that the quality and reputation of the program will suffer.

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

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

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

The program indicates that they have an adequate number of faculty (7.2). They note that leadership changes, COVID-19 pandemic, and academic transformation have impacted faculty productivity. It is stated that there is a 1:40 faculty-student ratio, and they will need additional faculty lines as students progress to upper-level courses. From the information provided, it is not entirely clear how the above-noted changes affected faculty productivity. More information is needed from the program to fully grasp how faculty productivity has been impacted (e.g., research/scholarship output). In addition, more information is needed about the need for additional lines. For instance, why is a 1:40 faculty-student ratio inadequate? Is this an increase in ratio? If there is an increase, are there any data from the program's assessment plan that shows that the increase in ratio has affected student learning/mastery of learning outcomes?

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

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- ☒ All  
☐ Some

Q5.2. What was inaccurate?

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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.

Per APS data, both enrollment and fall-to-fall retention are growing (category 1 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

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

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

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

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

The assessment plan and evidence of assessment appears to be a document related to Eberly College's process for assessing programs. Overall, the program's assessment report was well-developed and addressed the four learning outcomes. The assessment plan included direct and indirect assessments of student performance. They provide reflection on feedback from the Eberly College in their assessment document. It appears that the program has been responsive to feedback from the college re: challenges in specific courses (e.g., Microscopy). They also note where anticipated curriculum changes will occur (e.g., Death Investigation becoming a requirement). There is a high reliance on exit survey data as part of their assessment evaluation; it seems this was also noted by the college. The program notes they are moving towards more skill-based assessments.

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

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

See Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

The program notes several areas of improvement during the review period, including development of an assessment plan and developing objective, skills-based methods of evaluation. They also have made efforts to incorporate course revision into faculty evaluation (i.e., college faculty evaluation committees and chair-level annual review are providing feedback on course delivery/student performance).

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q8.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q8.3. Provide a brief summary for why the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction.

In your summary make sure to address why the program meets the requirements for each of the following categories (see the description of those requirements at the [Program Review website](#)):

Distinction

Faculty

Graduates

Curriculum and Assessment

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

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



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

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Undergraduate Council recommends the following specific actions: 1) By January 31, 2025, work with the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences dean's office to submit a plan that addresses the unit's ability to properly resource and maintain its equipment to serve current student enrollment.

Q9.3. 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.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q9.4. Provide a rationale explaining the recommendation for discontinuance.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q10.1. This is the end of the program review summary. Once you submit the survey you will be unable to make further edits without contacting the Assistant Provost for Curriculum and Assessment. Please take a moment to ensure the summary is complete before proceeding with submission.

Once you submit the survey, you will be redirected to a summary of your responses which can be Downloaded as a pdf and shared with the secondary reviewer.

**Location Data**

**Location:** [\(39.652, -79.9444\)](#)



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.

BSJ 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

Q1.4. Explain why the program is not in good standing with its accrediting body. Provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to good standing.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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.

As stated in Q3.2 the journalism program aligns with WVU's mission, vision and values through its direct focus on community engagement, inclusivity, curiosity and accountability, among other qualities. Teaching and training future journalism to be keen and curious observers of the community who hold themselves accountable to journalism's ethical standards of conduct plays an important role in maintaining a robust democracy. The College and the individuals therein remain steadfast in their mission to serve their students and communities by providing high-quality journalism education and content from the college imparted to the students.

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.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

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

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

None listed in self study 6.2 and 6.3

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

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

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

The document reports the effects of the COVID pandemic and the back to back years of budget cuts have been challenging in terms of their ability to fill vacant faculty positions, fully engage in professional development and offer experiential courses as often as they would desire. From document Q7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5.

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?

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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 College notes considerable student success with numerous students being granted external awards. These are listed in the self study on p. 71-2. They also pull data for faculty from Digital Measures and this is listed on self-study p. 109 and service starting on p. 157 of the self-study. The College notes an overall decrease of 12% for its 5-year enrollment trend. The data to support most of this trend is listed in the self-study p. 138-40. The College notes that freshmen enrollment is up this year. The self-study notes the importance of enrollment as its #1 goal and they have hired a recruiter (an alum of program) and have a highly ambitious recruiting goal. They note the decrease in college age students along with the COVID pandemic as affecting enrollments. Retention data is listed on document prepared for UPC, suggests that and states that the 5-year trend is 65.5%. The College website including all majors along with the Journalism major, suggests that 65.5 % of freshmen students from 2020 have enrolled in a third year. <https://mediacollege.wvu.edu/about/public-accountability>. Two courses were noted for high DFW rates. MDIA 215S and MDIA 225S, these are both major requirements with alternating faculty leading the yearly offering. The college curriculum committee & the faculty representative have reviewed. Revisions include 215S streamlined to its core mission of writing for the media and 225S was made an in-person (from hybrid) class.

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes  
☐ No

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes  
☐ No

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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 College has successfully undergone external accreditation during this time period, resulting in their self study assessment tool. Their documentation of Assessment of Learning is considerable in their self study document (p. 61-75 of the self study). In doing these assessments they have changed their curriculum to improve performance in the capstone by including bootcamp modules in several core courses. They have also added additional coursework in diversity, equity and inclusion to improve 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.

The program has made necessary curriculum changes, to facilitate industry needs along with student requirements. This included an additional 3 hours required skill course for journalism majors. They have incorporated this through a series of one-hour eight-week courses that the student may select.

They have also reorganized the journalism offerings into tracks where students may take two courses in a particular area to prepare them for a specific capstone.

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

- ☒ Yes  
☐ No

Q8.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

- ☒ Yes  
☐ Maybe  
☐ No

Q8.3. Provide a brief summary for why the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction.

In your summary make sure to address why the program meets the requirements for each of the following categories (see the description of those requirements at the [Program Review website](#)):

Distinction

Faculty

Graduates

Curriculum and Assessment

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

In 2022, the Broadcast Education Association ranked programs based on its annual competition results from the past five years. The Reed College of Media was recognized among the top 20 programs in the following categories: Top Overall Program (#19); Top Audio Program (#18); Top Interactive Multimedia and Emerging Technology Programs (#8); Top News Program (#11), Top Sports Program (#20).

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

The faculty contributions to student success and programmatic success are considerable. Their contributions are recorded in digital measures and noted in the self-study document beginning on page 109. Their service to the community constitutes and entire chapter of the self-study document and begins on page 157.

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

The program graduates have won external awards and are recognized for those in the self-study document on page 70-71.

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

The self-study document for external accreditation notes considerable and well-documented curricular changes and assessments of learning. The curricular changes have been summarized above and further detail is available in the self-study. Similarly, the assessments of learning in the self-study are well-documented and mapped to help improve the student experience and outcomes.

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

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

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

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Undergraduate Council recommends the following specific actions: 1) By January 2025, provide a report to the Undergraduate Council that explains how the program is re-allocating its faculty resources across its different majors, especially addressing how the program will handle faculty staffing given the significant decline in enrollment in the BSJ Journalism major and the growth in the BSJ Sports and Adventure Media major.

Q9.3. 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.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q9.4. Provide a rationale explaining the recommendation for discontinuance.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*


Q10.1. This is the end of the program review summary. Once you submit the survey you will be unable to make further edits without contacting the Assistant Provost for Curriculum and Assessment. Please take a moment to ensure the summary is complete before proceeding with submission.

Once you submit the survey, you will be redirected to a summary of your responses which can be downloaded as a pdf and share with the secondary reviewer

Location Data

Location: [\(39.652, -79.9444\)](#)

Source: GeolP Estimation



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.

B.S. Sports and Adventure Media



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

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

Q1.4. Explain why the program is not in good standing with its accrediting body. Provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to good standing.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

The College/School does have specialized accreditation through the Accrediting Council On Education in Journalism and Mass Communications. This major does not yet have accreditation but will seek it when its programs are due for its next review in 2028.

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 self-evaluation associated the major with WVU's Land-Grant values and does note that it contributes to the "adventure recreation and tourism potential." This is an area where the program might use data concerning this potential and any data it may have collected about graduates working 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

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 question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

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

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

Yes, the program indicates that they 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 self-evaluation states that the major is in need of a second faculty member. The APS data from the fall when the self-evaluation was filed reports a 1/155 faculty to student in this major ratio. Current APS data as of 03/01/2024 reports that the ratio is now 1/209. Either 1/155 or 1/209 is a very high teacher/student ratio, especially if the enrollment trend continues and they add another ~30 students next year. If there are enough courses taught specifically within the SAM major, it would be good for administration to consider adding an additional faculty member, especially as this major comprises 29% of the total 725 undergraduate majors in the college/school.

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 self-evaluation indicates that the major has undergone some significant changes over the past year. One of these is the separation from CPASS, which was associated with this major. The Program Learning Outcomes need to be updated, which the evaluation recognizes.

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 have exceeded the two and three-year predictions. As of the time of the self-evaluation the program had 155 students enrolled. Currently, APS data has enrollment at 209, so it has steadily trended upwards over the five-year period. The program graduation rate for 2023- 24 is down a slight bit but looks like it will rebound. The retention rate dipped, but the program made some changes to the system of two AoEs and now only has one single major track. Additionally, the major dropped the requirement of an internship, which is now just strongly recommended. It appears that these changes are already starting to work as the APS data as of 03/01/2024 reports that the retention rate for three years is 78.2. The graduation rate is a bit low--but they are keeping tabs on what is happening in the major and responding and making adjustments as noted above. There were two MDIA courses, 215S and 225S with a higher DF rate noted in APS. The program has adjusted these two courses to align it with the new curricular changes. Student job-placement was submitted as evidence of student success. Both specific students and jobs were noted as well as general employment upon graduation. No information on creative or research endeavors was noted. It would be good to include internships and any awards associated with the major in the next report.

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☐ Yes

☒ No

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

Because of the separation of this major from CPASS and the change in the internship requirement, the evaluation notes it needs to update two of the Learning Outcomes. As the new Major Learning Outcomes are developed it would be good to review all of the as they are not written in terms of what students will learn or be able to do upon completing the major.

1. Provide knowledge of the sports and adventure media industries so students have a foundational understanding and the necessary context for their future academics and profession in the industry.
2. Provide students with a foundation in media ethics so they understand the importance of adhering to ethical guidelines and incorporate real-world experiences that allow students to apply their professional ethics knowledge.
3. Teach students about the importance of diversity in the sports, sports management, and adventure media and recreation industries and provide hands-on experiences that require them to produce work that is about, and also serves, a diverse society.
4. Provide students with skills and knowledge in sports and adventure media content creation – through writing, photography and videography – through live and pre-produced programming, dissemination and audience engagement.
5. Provide students with field experiences in sports and adventure media.
6. Expose students to emerging technologies and guide their appropriate use/application of them.

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 provided assessment for the JRL484S course does not map back closely to the MLOs in the catalog. It is the only assessment provided. The self- evaluation stated that they ran a pilot in 2022 and this assessment from 2023 is the first true baseline. The assessment of the capstone is thorough and includes good assessment questions but is difficult to know how they map to the MLOs. Are these just for the capstone course, for the major in its entirety? Students may indeed have hit the marks for these assessment questions but is this the program major goal? The self-evaluation did include a Curriculum Map, which suggests that the capstone assessment is meant to be the culmination of most of the MLOs. The Curriculum Map should include a legend that specifies some of the abbreviations used to aid in reading it. The recommendation is to align the capstone assessment and potentially provide additional assessment materials addressing any MLO not specifically accounted for in this course assessment with the newly adjusted MLOs. The Undergraduate Council requests a follow-up.

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 major has made changes in response to student enrollment patterns and changes in collaborations with CPASS. They are streamlining the major and are eliminating the AoEs. They have also made changes to individual courses to focus them to better obtain outcomes, such as the MDIA 215S and MDIA 225S. The capstone assessment also is prompting changes at lower levels to ensure better outcomes as graduates.

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

- ☐ Yes  
☒ No

Q8.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q8.3.

Provide a brief summary for why the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction.

In your summary make sure to address why the program meets the requirements for each of the following categories (see the description of those requirements at the [Program Review website](#)):

Distinction

Faculty

Graduates

Curriculum and Assessment

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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 major is highly sought after and they are making changes to improve outcomes. They are to be commended for such success in their first five years. The Undergraduate Council recommends that: 1) By January 2025, provide a report to the Undergraduate Council that explains how the program is re- allocating its faculty resources across its different majors, especially addressing how the program will handle faculty staffing given the significant decline in enrollment in the BSJ Journalism major and the growth in the BSJ Sports and Adventure Media major. 2) By January 2025, provide an assessment plan and updated curriculum map that supports the development of the program's new learning outcomes.

Q9.3. 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.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q9.4. Provide a rationale explaining the recommendation for discontinuance.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q10.1. This is the end of the program review summary. Once you submit the survey you will be unable to make further edits without contacting the Assistant Provost for Curriculum and Assessment. Please take a moment to ensure the summary is complete before proceeding with submission.

Once you submit the survey, you will be redirected to a summary of your responses which can be downloaded as a pdf and share with the secondary reviewer.

Location Data

Location: [\(39.652, -79.9444\)](#)

Source: GeolP Estimation



WVU INSTITUTE TECHNOLOGY (WVUIT)  
AAS Hospitality (WVUIT)

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.

A.A.S Hospitality

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

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

Q1.4. Explain why the program is not in good standing with its accrediting body. Provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to good standing.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

Yes, they report meeting graduate number requirements and hope to seek accreditation through the American Culinary Federation Education Foundation Accrediting Commission (ACFEFAC) in fall 2024.

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

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



See Q 3.2 of the program review.

The program does not have a mission statement. The reviewer reports that the program seeks to provide students with an inclusive environment, access, and opportunity to work with various cooking methods and cultural ingredients. Students connect with the community, and community partners visit the classroom to share knowledge.

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

See Q4.2 of the program review.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

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

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

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

The program started in 2020 with two students. The target enrollment at that time was 42 students by the end of the third year. During this third year, the program has an enrollment of 17 students and projects 7-10 more students to join the program in fall 24.

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. No significant issues were noted.

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

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

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

Currently, the program is facilitated by one full-time faculty member and supported by a few adjuncts. Staffing is presently adequate, but more faculty are needed to cover the anticipated growth of the program.

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

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- ☒ All  
☐ Some

Q5.2. What was inaccurate?

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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.

In 2020, the program started with two students. Currently, the enrollment is 17 students. Four students have graduated from the program. Three of the four are working in the industry (baker at a local restaurant, Director of Dining at a healthcare facility; one graduate interned at a bakery and offered a full-time position), and the other student is pursuing additional education. The report did not include other student enrollment trends and graduation completion data.

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes  
☐ No

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes  
☐ No

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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.

I was unable to open the document 'Pattern Sheet WVU Culinary 2023' embedded in the review. Written quizzes and exams, practical exams, events prepared for the community, and a national certification exam. The program review did not include data on specific assessment outcomes. For example, final grade reports, evidence of assessment of practical exams and community events. The national certification pass rates were not provided.

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

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

See Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

Although the program did not meet expected enrollment numbers, it has had steady growth. The reviewer identified that the program aligns with the Tourism Works program of WV. The intent of the \$5.1 million dollar funded Tourism Works program is to grow the tourism industry of WV and prepare individuals to work in the tourism/hospitality industry. This statewide focus and scholarship opportunities may draw more individuals to this program. The Council recommends the following: 1. Develop a systematic plan for program evaluation that includes alignment of program learning outcomes to course learning outcomes, the expected level of achievement upon graduation, assessment methods and frequency of assessments, outcome data, and maintenance and change decisions based on the data. 2. Create a community advisory board (stakeholders and alums) to assist in strategic program planning, build community relationships, make additional connections for experiential learning for students, and increase the program's visibility within the state. 3. Consider a recruitment campaign highlighting how the Hospitality program aligns with the state's Tourism Works program and tourism initiative. 4. Actively seek national certification. 5. Develop a mission statement for the Hospitality program.

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Q8.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q8.3. Provide a brief summary for why the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction.

In your summary make sure to address why the program meets the requirements for each of the following categories (see the description of those requirements at the [Program Review website](#)):

Distinction Faculty

Graduates

Curriculum and Assessment

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

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

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

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Undergraduate Council recommends the following specific actions: 1) Via the annual reporting process for each of the next three academic years (AYs 24-25, 25-26, and 26-27), submit follow-up reports on the program's enrollment, continuance, and completion and address in those reports the steps the program is taking to increase enrollment towards meeting its original projected enrollment. 2) By January 31, 2025, submit an assessment plan to the Undergraduate Council. 3) By January 31, 2025, submit evidence of assessment of student learning to the Undergraduate Council.

Q9.3. 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.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q9.4. Provide a rationale explaining the recommendation for discontinuance.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q10.1. This is the end of the program review summary. Once you submit the survey you will be unable to make further edits without contacting the Assistant Provost for Curriculum and Assessment. Please take a moment to ensure the summary is complete before proceeding with submission.

Once you submit the survey, you will be redirected to a summary of your responses which can be downloaded as a pdf and share with the secondary reviewer.

**Location Data**

**Location:** [\(39.652, -79.9444\)](#)

**Source:** GeolIP Estimation



**WVU POTOMAC STATE (PSC)**

**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.

BAS Criminal Justice, AAS Criminal Justice

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

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

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

Q1.4. Explain why the program is not in good standing with its accrediting body. Provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to good standing.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

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

See Q 3.2 of the program review.

Program description provided in question three states that the program offers authentic learning experiences with community connections. It is an alignment with the University's mission and core values.

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.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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 and accessible infrastructure and has no needs at this time

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 lost a full-time faculty line during this review cycle. (due to the departure of the instructor, not replaced) Impact of this is seen in data collection in the assessment cycle. It appears this issue is being dealt with by reconfiguring curriculum, reassigning courses taught, and determining new course measures for collection as part of assessment.

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?

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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.



BAS - completion 5 year trend shows a 3.9% growth, with an average of 55.6% over 5 yrs. PSC campus experienced a 6.9% decline over the last five years. 2022-2023 program graduation is up 12.8%. Fall to fall retention rate is 68.4%. Fall 22- 30 students. The range over the last five years is 25 to 31. The five year trend is down 0.8%. Three-year enrollment shows the same head count with a trend of -9.7%. The college, as a whole, has seen a serious decline in headcount over the last two academic years. Other BAS degree programs on this campus recorded a -17.8% 3 yr trend. CJ BAS is higher. Program continuance- 68.4%, which is up 4.9%. 58.3% of students graduate within four years of earning 60 credits. Migration into the major shows that most students are attracted to the major as first-time freshmen. DFW rates highest in 100 and 200 level courses. AAS-Range of 23 to 53 head count over 5yrs. Lowest is 22-23 at 23 students. 5 yr trend of -15.9%. Program continue is 18.2%. Although program completion shows a five-year trend of -8.1%, the overall college trend is -4%. The percentage of students earning a degree within four years of completing 60 credits is 88.9 % for the program, with College statistic being 62.3%. DFW courses- several 300 level-Some courses with low enrollment and electives or special topic.

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

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes  
☐ No

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

- ☒ Yes  
☐ No

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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.

Regarding program assessment, it's important to note that the bachelor level program underwent several different configurations and alignments with other bachelor level programs during this review period. Originally, the bachelor level program in criminal justice was assessed on its own. Early in this assessment cycle, it was combined with other bachelor level programs at the College. An assessment workbook for the combined bachelor level programs is included in the self-study. This workbook covers years 2018 to 2023. Four program level learning outcomes are included with a curriculum map, all measured at least once, with the most recent measures occurring during spring 2023. It appears that most benchmarks have been met. There are several action plans in place stretching into spring 2024. Although data collection is present, data analysis and action plan should have a stronger presence in assessment reporting. (Some analysis may have been difficult in this cycle due to the changes in BAS assessment format and loss of faculty.) More on "common assessment" of BAS programs appears in next section. The plan is well developed with measurable outcomes, appropriate measures to assess mastery of those outcomes, and appropriate tools for measuring mastery. The program is encouraged to follow through on data analysis and planning based on that analysis.

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.

As noted previously, after following a common assessment plan, the bachelor's program in criminal justice was separated again into its own program in 2021. This new assessment workbook includes five measurable program learning outcomes. Data collection on the outcomes is mapped through 2025. As part of the combined assessment efforts for bachelor degree programs at the College, common rubrics were developed and used in computer information systems, sustainable agriculture and entrepreneurship, business technology, and criminal justice. The criminal justice assessment plan has continued to make use of those common rubrics. It appears that a range of measures across various courses has been planned in the assessment workbook. Program faculty have been upfront in the review self-study stating that some courses are being realigned with curriculum being reimagined to focus more on required courses as the source of data for assessment purposes, rather than special topics or elective courses. Concrete assessment analysis and follow up action plans should appear in the next review cycle.

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Q8.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q8.3. Provide a brief summary for why the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction.

In your summary make sure to address why the program meets the requirements for each of the following categories (see the description of those requirements at the [Program Review website](#)):

- Distinction
- Faculty
- Graduates

## Curriculum and Assessment

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

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

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

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Undergraduate Council recommends the following specific actions: 1) By January 31, 2025, submit an assessment plan for both the AAS and BAS to the Undergraduate Council. 3) By January 31, 2026, submit evidence of assessment of student learning for both programs to the Undergraduate Council.

Q9.3. 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.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q9.4. Provide a rationale explaining the recommendation for discontinuance.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*


Q10.1. This is the end of the program review summary. Once you submit the survey you will be unable to make further edits without contacting the Assistant Provost for Curriculum and Assessment. Please take a moment to ensure the summary is complete before proceeding with submission.

Once you submit the survey, you will be redirected to a summary of your responses which can be downloaded as a pdf and share with the secondary reviewer.

Location Data

Location: [\(39.652, -79.9444\)](#)

Source: GeolIP Estimation



The map displays a region in the Northeast United States, including parts of Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Maryland. A yellow diamond marker is placed in West Virginia, near the border with Ohio and Pennsylvania, indicating the location of the program. Major cities like Pittsburgh, Harrisburg, Baltimore, and Washington are labeled. The map shows state boundaries and major roads.

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.

A.A.S B.A.S Business Technology

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ Not specially accredited; no national accrediting body

☒ Not specially accredited; there is a national accrediting body

Q1.4. Explain why the program is not in good standing with its accrediting body. Provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to good standing.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

The program has not explored seeking specialized accreditation.

Q1.6. Provide a brief explanation of how the program 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 provided the broad divisional mission, vision and values of WVU PSC. The program website has a solid basis for a mission statement; however, there is no evidence of a specific programmatic mission or vision statement. As an integrated division of WVU, PSC "provides a broad range of high-quality associate degree programs as well as baccalaureate degree programs at a reasonable cost with a historic focus on teaching and learning and a commitment to providing access to a better life for all West Virginians.

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.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

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

See Qs 5.2 and 5.3 of the program review.

No concerns regarding 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.

No evidence of specific faculty adequacy, credentials, composition and productivity. However, the following is noted : Inadequate faculty due to an unexpected faculty death. The following actions have taken place as of Spring of 2024: 1. Business faculty have had to take on an overload of courses 2. Cancellation of course(s) offered 3. Consolidation of one online and face to face course Program is requesting an additional faculty member to meet the needs of the program.

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

See Qs 7.2 and 7.3 of the program review.

- ☐ All
- ☒ Some

Q5.2. What was inaccurate?

Admission requirements states for A.A.S: Entering freshmen are admitted directly into the major. - Is this common with PSC programs? Should there be a web link for WVU PSC Admissions Office?

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.

A.A.S Enrollment Trends: 2018-2019 (40), 2019-2020 (42), 2020-2021 (38), 2021-2022 (34), 2022-2023 (38). Program data confirms a positive trend in enrollment. B.A.S Enrollment Trends: 2018-2019 (22), 2019-2020 (16), 2020-2021 (21), 2021-2022 (21), 2022-2023 (19). Self study evidenced a recent development of hyflex program modality to allow for greater flexibility and hopes to increase enrollment. Students have the option to attend both in person, online/ mix of both. Plan to request a "recruit back" campaign for students who finished the AAS degree in the last 5-10 years and did not continue into the BAS program. Plans to explore micro-credentials. Notable improvements: Within this major, retention rates have demonstrated significant growth, increasing from 44% to 57% over this review cycle. A.A.S Number of Graduates: 2018-2019 (12), 2019-2020 (16), 2020-2021 (10),

2021-2022 (12), 2022-2023 (13) BAS Graduation numbers: 2018-2019 (19), 2019-2020 (9), 2020-2021 (9), 2021-2022 (14), 2022-2023 (6) Graduation numbers down due to decrease in enrollment, likely a product of COVID. BAS time to completion: Students in this program graduate within four years of earning 60 credit hours in comparison to the college percentage of 64.4%. AAS DFW Highest DFW rate in the department is BCOR 199 and Econ 201. Student time management concern: Plans to implement a time management workshop as a requirement in the BCOR 199 courses. Tutor options available for those taking ECON 201.

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

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

See Q 8.2 in the program review.

☐ Yes

☒ No

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

Per program website PLOS: AAS and BAS have similar PLOs; however, this may be an industry standard that I am not aware of. Perhaps revisions can be made to the BAS to reflect current industry trends and best practices. Also, the Program Assessment Workbook reflects possible updates to PLOs; however, the program websites does not reflect revisions. These revisions are sound, I am just not seeing them on the program website. Evidenced by program website: Specific PLO concerns: AAS - Employ professional oral business communication skills. BAS- Demonstrate effective communication skills The BAS PLO that assesses communication skills appears to be more so entry level than the AAS? Can this be further specified? - Addressed in the Program Assessment Workbook, not reflected on program website.

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.

AAS Changes in texts and software have improved student scores in courses that address PLO 2. One constraint in this area is that PSC is not a certified testing facility that can offer the Microsoft Certification credentials to our students- Not directly listed under infrastructure accessibility but noted in Program Assessment. Presentation workshops have been added to BCOR 299 to enhance student presentation skills. BAS The assessment plan in the BAS program has a gap in data collection due to faculty turnover and assessment collection modifications, but current faculty have an assessment plan in place going forward in the redesigned courses.

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

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

See Qs 8.6 and 8.7 in the program review.

Self study evidenced: A formal assessment workbook has been developed for the new review cycle to allow faculty to consider and implement course improvements each semester. The Assessment Plan clearly states that PLO1 Measures A and B use a rubric. We recommend stating that the other Measures, for example, the BCOR 199: Final Project, are assessed using a grading rubric. Developing and improving the rubric is discussed as part of the action plan. Moving forward, clearly state this in planned measures. Feedback in the last review cycle addressed BTEC 350. Since then, the course was redesigned and modified with the new prerequisites of BTEC 113 and CS 101 to address the challenging course material Course assessment measures will be used to identify success with this change. Improvements have been made to BTEC 225 to allow the program to gather additional data and gain valuable feedback. Current faculty meet each spring to review assessment data and brainstorm ways to address shortcomings in the program. Mention of meeting with their advisory board in the near future to discuss further program improvements.

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

Q8.2. Do you believe the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q8.3. Provide a brief summary for why the program should be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction.

In your summary make sure to address why the program meets the requirements for each of the following categories (see the description of those requirements at the [Program Review website](#)):

Distinction



Faculty

Graduates

Curriculum and Assessment

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

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

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

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

Examples of reports back to the Council often may:

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

The Undergraduate Council recommends the following specific actions: 1. By January 2025, provide a follow up report to the Undergraduate Council that ensures that the student learning outcomes published in CIM and Catalog are current. By January 2025, provide a follow up report to the Undergraduate Council that explains if the program has had success in its faculty search. 2. Via the annual reporting process, provide follow-up reports for each of the next three academic years (AYs 24-25, 25-26, and 26-27) on enrollment and completion <u>in</u> the BAS and the steps the BAS program is taking to increase its enrollment.
---

Q9.3. 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.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q9.4. Provide a rationale explaining the recommendation for discontinuance.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q10.1. This is the end of the program review summary. Once you submit the survey you will be unable to make further edits without contacting the Assistant Provost for Curriculum and Assessment. Please take a moment to ensure the summary is complete before proceeding with submission.

Once you submit the survey, you will be redirected to a summary of your responses which can be downloaded as a pdf and share with the secondary reviewer.

#### Location Data

**Location:** [\(39.652, -79.9444\)](#)

**Source:** GeoIP Estimation



DRAFT