Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Film Studies Minor, 2019-2020

Date: 10/30/2020
Time: 11:30-1:00
Place: WebEx

Invited: Interim Provost Greg Cook; Interim AVC Kristin Plessel; Dean Frank Goza (L&S); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Donald Jellerson; faculty and staff in the Film Studies program; Audit & Review Team Chair James Collins; Audit & Review team members Thomas Klubertanz, Ellie Schemenauer, S-A Welch, assessment representative Katy Casey

1) Call to order

2) Introductions

3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments:
   a) Dr. Collins (review chair) provided an overview of the review team's discussion. Much conversation about the interdisciplinary nature of the program, advantages and challenges. In addition, the program contributes significantly to general education program. Commended Dr. Jellerson for a well-written report with many specific examples- accolades for the collaborative nature and strong work of the program.
   b) Noted growth in enrollment during difficult times.
   c) Dr. Jellerson shared the following comments:
      i) Program launched certificate that started in fall 2020. This summer launched writing journal for students. Major continues to grow. Outlined some challenges with interdisciplinary nature and dependence on faculty from other departments to teach classes, and some are no longer available due to budget issues. As the program is growing, it becomes increasingly difficult to meet the needs of all students with limited dedicated faculty.

4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
   a) **Staffing and Service Delivery**
   The program's interdisciplinary nature is remarkable and presents many advantages, yet it also comes with the challenge of not having dedicated faculty to develop and sustain its operations. The review team noted the importance of developing a new staffing/service delivery structure that would preserve the interdisciplinary benefits provided by affiliate faculty and staff, while also formally dedicating time and resources to the program. Doing so will help to ensure that the program will be poised to continue their important work, even if there is a future change in leadership. Providing Film Studies with an operating budget would also be useful and reasonable to consider.

   • Related to creating a culture to sustain program. Is there a way to secure faculty teaching in program in other departments? Measure of FTE and SCH to determine the value or quantify the work? Last fall we served 457 students in all film studies courses, this fall we have 100% enrollment – are students being turned away? Interdisciplinary coalition- how can these programs support each other. Provost: How are meetings of the faculty going? Dr. Jellerson responded the group usually meet 2 times per year to discuss curricular design – looking to create a curricular structure that is not dependent on FTE from other departments and some assessment work- meetings tend to be as needed, and not consistently scheduled- being mindful of peoples' time. Provost recommended regular meetings to help keep group connected and share responsibility- distribute work among faculty in the program.

b) Assessment

The program has faced challenges related to its primary use of affiliate faculty and staff, which has placed an outsized responsibility for setting and assessing program goals on the Film Studies Coordinator, who depends on the efforts and good will of affiliated personnel. These efforts have been remarkable, yet the program's ability to develop, sustain, and assess long term goals has been somewhat compromised by the unpredictable contributions from affiliated departments. Addressing this area will better position the program to continue formalizing, and implementing, their assessment plan. After taking into consideration the interdisciplinary nature of the program, what are some ways that they can effectively address and assess each of the SLOs across their various courses? Development of an example course sequence may help add structure to this process, as will the creation of more opportunities for affiliated faculty/staff to collaborate about assessment practices and data analysis.

- Dr. Jellerson acknowledged the review teams' comments and agreed on the need to track the SLOs at each level- introductory, developing, and assessed. He also noted that assessments are tied to courses and when an instructor leaves or a class cannot be offered, we lose the ability to assess in that area. This is tied to the structure of the program and need to address that piece. Would like to work on longitudinal nature of assessment, but setting up that structure is a challenge.
- Assistant Dean Hachten noted that many of the Film Studies classes are taken by students who are not in the major, which adds another layer of difficulty in measuring growth in knowledge and skills just based on embedded assessment in courses. Might want to ask students to create portfolios or use capstone assessments to measure knowledge and skills.
- Dean Goza comments: Thanked review team chair and committee on their work. Dr. Jellerson wrote a thoughtful and reflective report, he thanked him for his work to support the program with few resources. He will help to increase resources in the program.
- Provost Cook comments: Also thanked review team for a thoughtful report. Supported Dr. Hachten's suggestion regarding portfolio and capstone assessment. Commended Dr. Jellerson on his hard work and impressive progression from minor to major. Steady enrollment in minor and noticed growth in new major – noted unique nature of this program and expressed a hope that they can use that to recruit *new* students to the program from outside the UWW.

5) **Recommended Actions**: The evaluation report lists two recommended actions related to staffing/service delivery and assessment; please see page 17 for details.

6) **Recommended Result**: *(Tentative)* Choose an item.
   - **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
   - **Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:**
     ☒ **Next FULL self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2024 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2024.**
     ☐ **Next SHORT self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2024 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2024.**
     ☐ **A progress report will be due** Choose an item.**, of [Year]**

7) Adjourn.

Review team report is attached below, including Recommended Actions and instructions for Progress Reports (if required

Date of Evaluation ___4/3/2020_____Short Self Study (SS*)_____
Program:___**Film Studies Minor**_____ _____Major ☐   Minor ☒

Evaluations submitted by: James Collins, Thomas Klubertanz, Ellie Schemenauer
Review meeting attended by: James Collins, Thomas Klubertanz, Ellie Schemenauer, S-A Welch

I. Program Purpose & Overview: A. Centrality

1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's core values, Mission, and Strategic Plan.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.A.1

1. The Film Studies minor (as well as new major and certificate) provides students with key skills in knowledgeably producing, navigating, assessing, and critiquing visual media narratives--skills increasingly vital to producing life-long learners in the state, nation, and world. The emphasis on the development of "intercultural knowledge and competence" in students is laudable and has important connections to civic knowledge and practice. As an interdisciplinary program, Film Studies draws on wide ranging expertise from across the Colleges of Letters and Sciences and Arts and Communication, forging collaborative and productive relationships to enhance student learning and development.

2. The program provides ample interdisciplinary opportunities for students, and collaborative experiences for faculty and staff.

2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.A.2

1. The commitment of the program to serving General Education is impressive and is informed by the documented need for students to be able to understand, assess, create, and critique visual narratives, especially in the context of emergent communication technologies. No less than 14 courses that contribute to the program have some kind of General Education designation.

2. Seven courses are offered that support general education, not including several other GENED courses for the Film Studies major/minor provided through other departments; shared goal of increasing media literacy. National data were provided that highlights student skill deficiencies in civic online reasoning, which is one area directly addressed by Film Studies.

3. The program has achieved or is appropriately working toward achievement of at least two goals of Inclusive Excellence.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.A.3

1. Given the resources that the program has, this is done well. The program has demonstrated that it values inclusive excellence and has focused its IE efforts in enrollment, course offerings, and program administration decision making. The program has developed strong relationships with Race and Ethnic Studies and Women's and Gender Studies, two other important interdisciplinary programs on campus that contribute to inclusive excellence goals in content and practice.
2. No faculty are within the department itself, only affiliate faculty from other departments, which limits their ability to directly influence hiring decisions, promotion, etc. Inclusive excellence targets included student enrollment, course offerings, and program administration. Details were provided that showed appropriate progress in these areas.

4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Report; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.A.4

1. This is not applicable as this is the first audit and review for this program.
2. This is the first A&R for Film Studies.
3. Not applicable.

General Comments related to Section I.A

1. Film Studies provides students undeniably vital skills related to visual literacy and media narratives for the 21st century.

I. Program Purpose & Overview: B. Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments

1. The program's mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.B.1

1. The mission statement reflects key purpose and goals of the program.

2. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve or advance the program.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.B.2

1. The program has developed at an impressive speed, propelled by the interest of students and commitment by a handful of faculty and a very dedicated Film Studies Coordinator. The program has set and met impressive program development goals.

2. Because the program is relatively new, emphasis has been on development of courses. Minor development was largely complete by 2017; major development followed and was recently approved by the Board of Regents. An undergraduate certificate in Film Studies is also in process and is awaiting final approval by the Provost's Office.

3. Mostly curricular development since the program is so new.

3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals and making decisions about changes to the program goals.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.B.3

1. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals, but because of resource limitations, it is less than ideal. Much of the onus for setting and assessing goals falls on the Coordinator who depends on the good will of affiliated faculty and staff for input and consultation. Sustainability is an issue.

2. Challenges were shared that stem from having only affiliate faculty and a program coordinator. Progress has nevertheless been impressive, but in the future and in light of the formation of a Film Studies major and other progress made in the past six years, I think that it is reasonable to conclude that goal-setting and programmatic decisions would be better structured by having dedicated faculty/staff supporting the initiatives, or at least some FTE routed for this purpose. Otherwise, a disproportionally large burden is placed on a single person (coordinator) despite ample collaboration with faculty/staff from other departments. This arrangement also has the potential to place the program in jeopardy if the coordinator decides to discontinue employment, unless somebody is being developed to continue management responsibilities.

3. The process has worked remarkably well so far, but the structure of the program is vulnerable. Will it retain advocates during general enrollment and/or budget declines without having its own FTE?

4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a "vision" for where it wants to be in the future and how to get there.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.B.4

1. The challenge for many interdisciplinary programs like Film Studies is that their work is incredibly dependent on the good will and contributions of faculty, staff, and departments outside of their control. When faculty and staff retire or leave the university all together, interdisciplinary programs have very little say, if any, in their replacements. When budget issues arise for departments and Colleges, the impacts to interdisciplinary programs are considered secondarily, if at all. This is an organizational issue in that many of the university's

processes and practices privilege disciplinary (rather than interdisciplinary) programs and practices. One of the real strengths of interdisciplinary programs is that they are flexible and collaborative. They provide innovations by pushing the boundaries of disciplinary practices. There is a tremendous amount of creative and transformative potential in these programs that gets stymied by privileging college and department silos. Vision statements are therefore dependent on the resources that the program has access to, resources that they don't really control.

2. The program continues to grow, yet reliance on other departments (all of which are in the process of reducing expenses) continues and this presents challenges to meet student and staffing needs. Uncertainty surrounding replacement of affiliate faculty who have retired or those re-directed to other priorities within their home department. Long-term goals are present, yet sustainability is clouded by contingent and unpredictable contributions from other departments. Evidence supporting a new faculty line or dedicated FTE for Film Studies has become apparent, particularly after considering stability (even increases) with student enrollment, while many other programs on campus are faced with declines in this area.

3. So much has happened in so little time that it feels like the programs wants to catch its breath and make sure that quality of program is most important, not the number of new initiatives. This is a good thing right now.

5. The program, faculty/staff, and/or students have earned recognition or awards.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.B.5

1. The Coordinator has been acknowledged for his work in teaching and mentoring students.
2. Student awards/recognition has fallen beneath other programs of study for the Film Studies minor, so these have not been monitored. Major is new. Impressive recognition attained by the program coordinator.
3. Records for such activities are in the home departments.

6. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.B.6

Accreditation is not available.

General Comments related to Section I.B

1. Films Studies has done an excellent job in the development of the program in the last six years. The challenges that it faces are due to the organizational position of interdisciplinary programs on campus more generally.

II. Assessment : A. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable).

Sufficient Evidence	3

Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.A.1

1. There is an excellent array of courses across levels of difficulty and content.

2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.A.2

1. This is not applicable.
2. Dual-listed courses are not offered.
3. Not applicable.

3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.A.3

1. The development of the program over the last six years has been purposefully informed by various kinds of feedback (focus groups, surveys, etc) and more formal in class assessments of student learning.
2. Because the program is relatively new, curricular revisions essentially reflect the development process taken to launch the program itself. Examples were provided that led through major developments, including feedback from students and affiliate faculty, as well as a comprehensive study conducted to understand comparable programs throughout the Midwest.
3. So much accomplished in such a short time. They tried to plan strategically and based decisions upon data.

4. The program provides opportunities for students to learn in ways that extend beyond the classroom, and discussed the extent to which students are involved in these activities and opportunities.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.A.4

1. Given the resources allocated to this program, extra- and co- curricular opportunities have been sufficient. The collaboration with Women's and Gender Studies and the Pride Center to create a Queer Film Series is a good precedent for future collaborations. More resources and collaborations are necessary to develop these opportunities further.

2. They have a capstone course and a couple of examples of students taking independent study courses. This is an area where they could invest some thought.

5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.A.5

1. The program offers very few online classes. When it does, Film Studies utilizes the same procedures of evaluation as face-to-face classes.

2. The few online classes (offered on an ad-hoc basis during the summer semester) have no special evaluation procedures that differ from traditional courses.

3. They have a couple of online courses.

II. Assessment : B. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program has a clearly articulated learning outcomes for students, courses are "mapped" to these learning outcomes, and some outcomes received specific attention during the review period.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.B.1

1. The Film Studies Student Learning Outcomes are excellent. They are focused and follow best practices in assessment (e.g., highlights Bloom's taxonomy of learning objectives and limited to a doable 5-7 major learning outcomes).

2. The Assignment Audit matrix details points at which SLOs are addressed and assessed, but it does not show how these learning objectives are fostered throughout the program. For instance, when is SLO 2 developed among students in the program? It appears to be introduced during all 13 classes listed and assessed at multiple points. What is the typical sequence that students follow when completing the courses?

3. They already have updated their SLOs. The scheme has good flow. I don't see where courses are mapped to these.

2. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.B.2

This is well done.

3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.B.3

1. The Films Studies Program has done an impressive amount of assessment to date and has some excellent rubrics. The question about the plan moving forward is unclear. For example: Will all SLOs be assessed each year? If not, what is the rotation plan? How will the program determine which classes to pull papers from?

2. The Assessment Score Sheet / rubric that's used is impressive. Other assessment methods (i.e., focus groups, course content assessments, etc.) were described and appear to provide multiple ways to understand and aggregate data.

4. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgments about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.B.4

1. Film Studies has done an impressive amount of assessment, especially given the interdisciplinary nature of the program and the relative lack of committed resources.

5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.B.5

1. All evidence points to thoughtful consideration of student learning in making alterations to the program.

2. The members do not have many opportunities to meet and work directly with each other to utilize assessment data.

6. Results of assessment efforts have been shared with appropriate internal and external constituencies.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.B.6

1. Film Studies is a new program. As they become more institutionalized, sharing assessment data with an advisory board which includes members outside the university may be instructive.

2. Ample details were provided about data sharing with internal constituencies, but it does not appear that much dissemination has been done externally.

General Comments related to Section II.B

1. Film Studies is a very new program, having developed from a brand new minor to a major in six years. The amount of assessment that has gone on is impressive and certainly has informed the growth of the program. As the program settles, perhaps an assessment rotation of just a couple learning objectives each year would suffice?
2. For the current period of review, it appears possible that topics can be assessed before they're introduced, and assessment always appears to take place before skills are developed. This likely isn't actually the case, so it may simply be a matter of re-framing the map that links SLOs to specific classes.

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: A. Trend Data

1-2. Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for III.A.1-2

1. The interest in the program has grown over the past six years.

3. [MAJORS ONLY] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years, or reasonably efficiently.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for III.A.3

1. This is a very doable major within 4 years.	
2. Not applicable for this review.	
3. Not applicable	

4. Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for III.A.4

1. The courses and instructors themselves are the strongest tools here. The emphasis on advising is also key to long term success.
2. Several examples of working with diversity-focused groups across campus.

5. [MAJORS ONLY] Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University

Sufficient Evidence	3

Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for III.A.5

1. Please note that one area of diversity that the university has not been great at collecting information on (especially in academics) is the LGBTQ student community. In my own intersections with this program, I have heard many positive things about the LGBTQ content covered in some film studies courses.
2. Not applicable for this review.
3. Not applicable

6. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for III.A.6

1. They state there have not been enrollment logjams.

7. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level is justified or supported by examples or data.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

No Comments for III.A.7

General Comments related to Section III.A

1. Film Studies is a new program on campus. Early indicators suggest high interest by students and an exciting array of classes that students can complete with 4 years.

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: B. Demand for Graduates

1. [MAJORS ONLY] Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for III.B.1

1. This is a brand new major and no evidence exists.

2. Not applicable for this review.

3. Not applicable

2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for III.B.2

1. Thanks for sharing the employment data!

2. Examples given of importance of media industries.

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	3

Comments for III.B.3

1. This is a new program. A tracking system is in preliminary discussions.

2. Tracking obviously isn't being done for the major yet since it's new, but what about for minors? How are former students utilizing skills learned from the program?

3. Can minors be tracked as well?

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: C. Comparative Advantage(s)

1. The program has unique features that distinguish it from competing programs--giving it a competitive edge

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for III.C.1

1. This is an exciting and important program for students. It benefits not only the Film Studies majors and minors, but also makes vital contributions to general education. Its interdisciplinary focus and collaborations with many other departments works to increase visual literacy across many programs.

2. Some details were provided elsewhere (particularly as they relate to the comparative study conducted to help justify creation of the new major), but all information was not included in this section. Collectively, this area has been nicely addressed.

3. This is one of the most compelling aspects of the program. It fills a niche in the UW System

IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty Characteristics

1-2. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.)

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for IV.A.1-2

1. Faculty and instructional academic staff impressively are drawn from across at least seven different departments.
2. Some of the requested faculty (affiliate faculty) information was provided. Other areas, such as rank, expertise, etc. were excluded. Expectations for faculty were not provided.
3. Names and affiliated departments, but deeper information was not made available to the coordinator.

3-4. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	1

Comments for IV.A.3-4

1. One of the biggest challenges that Film Studies faces is the lack of control of faculty and staff resources. The university is organized around disciplinary and department control of resources, making the success of interdisciplinary programs very dependent on the good will of multiple units, as well as, the programs own ability to be flexible and make friends.
2. Program did not describe what expertise a new dedicated position in Film Studies would have.

General Comments related to section IV.A

1. In order to ensure the sustainability of Film Studies, it needs to have some control over teaching resources in order to absorb the "shocks" of personnel changes in contributing departments. The consistent cooperation and support of Department Chairs and Deans is vital to the success of this program.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement

1-2. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	2

Comments for IV.B.1-2

1. For the program to be as successful as it has been, some enhancement activities have obviously gone on. However, the administrative challenges of interdisciplinary programs like Film Studies is highlighted here in that affiliated faculty only report to home departments. Film Studies depends on the good will of its affiliated faculty and staff and has no formal supervisory role over them.

2. Unknown. Was not explored due to the affiliate faculty arrangement. How is the coordinator enhancing his teaching and advising for the benefit of students in the program? It seems appropriate that he, as the dedicated person to the program, could provide some information here. Considering that affiliate faculty from different departments serve as a backbone for the program, would it also make sense to work with them to ensure that they have necessary opportunities to effectively serve students in Film Studies? They're essentially the ingredients to the recipe that's been made. Ultimately, I think that adding structure here would be beneficial, and these issues continue pointing to the benefits of having dedicated faculty or FTE in the program.

3. All members have home departments.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities

1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	2

Comments for IV.C.1-2

1. See comments for B-1.
2. Unknown. Was not explored due to the affiliate faculty arrangement.
3. Information was provided particularly for the coordinator.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding

1-2. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	3

Comments for IV.D.1-2

1. See comments for B-1.
2. Unknown. Was not explored due to the affiliate faculty arrangement.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service

1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	3

Comments for IV.E.1-2

1. See comments for B-1.
2. Unknown. Was not explored due to the affiliate faculty arrangement.
3. Not applicable.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: F. Resources for Students in the Program

1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	1

Comments for IV.F.1

1. The program can be most successful if it has dedicated faculty and staff lines (even if a percentage of an appointment is shared with other programs). It also needs some dedicated resources for supplies.
2. Question was not directly answered. It was made clear that no funding has been provided to the program, but is this a problem? Does the program need supplies, student supports, etc.?

3. A small budget for the program would be used productively, I believe.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings

1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, technological, and library resources to effectively serve its students.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for IV.G.1

1. It appears that facilities and equipment resources are sufficient.
2. Existing resources and supports are adequate.
3. Not applicable

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Program strengths are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for V.1

1. The program has supportive faculty and staff with a range of expertise, interested students, and a dedicated coordinator. The interdisciplinarity of the program allows it to bring together in creative and innovative ways, content and methods from a variety of disciplines and departments. The flexibility and collaborative efforts of the program are laudable. The importance of the program's learning outcomes given the prominence of visual narratives and related emerging media technologies is undeniable.

2. The program notes a conundrum involving their strength (interdisciplinary nature of service delivery) and the subsequent problems associated with this.

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for V.2

1. The biggest challenge for this program is the lack of control of resources given its interdisciplinary structure. More organizational support for interdisciplinary programs like this one needs to be considered.

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for V.3

1. These recommendations for comparatively minor access and control over resources are completely reasonable.

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

1. The program has supportive faculty and staff with a range of expertise, interested students, and a dedicated and skilled coordinator. The interdisciplinarity of the program allows it to bring together in creative and innovative ways, content and methods from a variety of disciplines and departments. The flexibility and collaborative efforts of the program are laudable. The importance of the program's learning outcomes given the prominence of visual narratives and related emerging media technologies is undeniable.

2. The program has developed remarkably in a short amount of time; very impressive work by the coordinator and affiliate faculty. The interdisciplinary nature of service delivery is a strength that presents challenges.

3. Good enrollments. Collection of affiliated staff who are committed to the program. Excellent leadership. Unique focus of program to film analysis, rather than production and/or technology. Program marketing and information are well-conceived.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

1. The program is incredibly productive given its access to resources. The coordinator is obviously dedicated and skilled in program development. One question is the sustainability of maintaining a major and minor and creating vibrant extra- and co- curricular opportunities for students over the long term if slightly more resources are not provided. Interdisciplinary programs like this one do need and deserve some additional resource support.

2. Exclusive use of interdisciplinary service delivery, with no dedicated FTE or faculty, has presented challenges. Program is requesting (a) faculty FTE to help resolve this and (b) discretionary budget of $500 per year. These requests seem very reasonable after considering the value that Film Studies offers to students and faculty/staff on campus.

3. Greater pseudo-departmental structure to ensure stability, such as split appointments. More formal interactions among members would be advantageous. Is the program positioned to survive a change in leadership, should that ever happen?

3. Other comments/questions

1. The development of Film studies from a minor to a major and certificate has been very impressive. The assessment work used to inform its development was thoughtfully and intentionally done.

2. This is a very well written report. Dr. Jellerson should be commended for his work and efforts to help develop Film Studies.

3. It is difficult for me to judge some aspects of this review. The lack of departmental structure leaves some aspects of the review document rather shallow, though I believe that is expected.

4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

a. Staffing and Service Delivery
- Work with the dean of your college to develop a new staffing/service delivery structure for the program that would preserve the core benefits of interdisciplinary instruction, yet would also formally dedicate faculty time to help address the limitations of having a program supported primarily by affiliate faculty. Consideration should also be given to providing Film Studies with an operating budget.

b. Assessment
- Focus details related to student progression through SLOs and provide specific classes where concepts are introduced, developed, and assessed.
- Develop an example course sequence for students to follow within the Film Studies minor. This would add structure and may help to address and document student progression through SLOs. It could also help support students throughout the advising process.
- Continue formalizing the program's assessment plan. What will assessment look like from one year to the next and how will obtained data inform instructional and curricular decisions?
- Share assessment results with external constituencies and consider the feedback obtained from doing so.

5. Recommended Result

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	0
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	3
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns	0

Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	0
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion.	0
Non-continuation of the program.	0
Report not submitted; refer to Provost for action.	0