

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
French, German, Spanish Majors and Minors, 2020-2021**

Date: April 15, 2021 from 3-4pm

Place: Webex

Invited: Interim Provost Greg Cook; Interim AVC Kristin Plessel; Dean Frank Goza (L&S); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Elena Levy-Navarro; faculty and staff in the French, German, Spanish program; Audit & Review Team Chair Bruce Cohen; Audit & Review team members Elizabeth Hachten, Corey Davis, Eric Appleton, Author Alicia De Gregorio, Assessment Representative Katy Casey

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

Provided review of course offerings.

Discussion of advisory board: The program put this work on hold this past year, but does plan to convene an advisory group in the future.

Unique qualities of the program: Only school in south central WI offering BSE in French, German and Spanish, high quality and diversity of course offerings- including professional courses.

Provost Cook's comments: Provosts across system are discussing how to support lower enrolled language programs, such as French and German. Discussing the possibility of a collaborative program. Academic leaders value these programs and recognize the need to continue language offerings.

- a) The review team was interested to learn more from the program about career paths or employment options for graduates. How is this information used for program improvement?
 - i) Some new courses aligned with career paths- e.g., translation, business (German-business class to replace travel study cancelled due to COVID), Spanish for the professions (including a minor on Spanish for the Professions currently under review), heritage language courses
 - ii) Upper level courses include service learning, internships
- b) The review team noted some unique aspects of this program. Most notably, the number of HIPs supported in the program. Is there any indication of how many students participate in HIPs and the value of that participation in meeting program learning outcomes?
 - i) Reviewed the many offered in the program, and included in the self-study
 - ii) Many are embedded in the curriculum, almost impossible not to participate in at least 1 HIP
 - iii) There is a desire by faculty to create portfolios for the program, and would like to include in that how many HIPs students participated in and how they complimented the curriculum
- c) The review team expressed curiosity about facility and staff needs. More detail regarding current versus projected needs will be helpful. Also, some understanding of acceptable versus optimal.
 - i) Loss of positions – could use more people but program instructors are working hard to maintain current staffing structure; current staffing is “somewhat acceptable”
 - ii) Ideally: replace one of the tenure lines, keep both German instructors, replace academic staff position in Chinese (currently students are taking courses through Stevens Point), reinstate ASL program, Spanish coordinator

iii) **Facilities:** Difficult to schedule courses in four classrooms, has been requesting additional classroom space for a while; also seems there needs to be increased technology support in classrooms to support hybrid instruction. Anecdotally, we have heard from prospective students the disadvantageous way in which our WL classrooms compare to WL classrooms at other schools from a technological point of view.

5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists five recommended actions (see page 14, point 4) related to program planning, assessment, and resources.

6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns*

- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
- Click or tap here to enter text..
- **Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:**
 - Next FULL self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2025 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2025.**
 - 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).

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2020-2021
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 2/22/2021 Short Self Study (SS*) _____
 Program: French, German, Spanish Major Minor

Evaluations submitted by: Elizabeth Hachten, Bruce Cohen, Katy Casey, Eric Appleton, Corey Davis
Review meeting attended by: Elizabeth Hachten, Bruce Cohen, Katy Casey, Eric Appleton, Corey Davis

I. General Program Information

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. The program is aware and reflective of changes affecting improvement since the last review.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. Characteristics of the program set it apart from others when compared regionally and nationally. The unique aspects of the program attract students.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0

5. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate (only select N/A if there is no accreditation available).

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
N/A	5

General Comments related to Section I

- 1-2. The program has a clearly articulated mission statement. Plans for the program seem informed by student feedback and review of current course offerings. 3. The connection to community partners seems a unique aspect of the program. Is there any data on how many majors or minors participate in CBL courses? Are there other HIPs encouraged, such as internships? 4. Some progress has been made in clarifying the roles of faculty and staff in helping support the program administratively. The majority of responsibility falls to the coordinator. Some conversations were had to discuss an advisory board. It is not clear what progress was made on assessing student learning. The exit survey sounds like a great addition.
-
2. Response focuses exclusively on staffing changes and challenges. But what about other factors that are affecting the program such as declining university enrollments and budgets, changing demand from students, etc? 3. Don't necessarily expect unique features from liberal arts programs like these - just excellence in the usual features. So would expect some discussion of aspects like study abroad opportunities, including the lower cost direct exchange programs with partner universities. Also, the Community Based Learning program may be worth highlighting. And with fewer UW System comprehensives offering French and German BAs and BSEs, that may help set UWW apart. 4. Program diligently submitted progress reports and has moved forward in several areas, e.g., began taking concrete steps in early 2020 to create an advisory board. But am still in the dark about what exactly has been done to improve program administration (priorities, responsibilities and systematic processes) and the aspects of assessment highlighted in the previous evaluation.
-
3. While solid, the features noted seem fairly standard; can the department nutshell in one sentence why a student should pick their department over the competition?

II. Alignment within the University

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. The program supports general education and/or proficiency programs at the University.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. The program is collaborative and supports other academic programs across the College and/or University.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section II

2. The recertification process was likely time-consuming. Congratulations on completing this work for so many courses. It may be interesting to review the recertification data- as it might provide interesting data on the extent to which courses address the ELOs. 3. Collaboration with COEPS on Heritage Language program. In addition, the program supports a number of other majors across the university.

1. Almost all of the goal/objective boxes checked! I wonder if the program felt they had to stretch a bit to list a response to any of the goals, or whether they were all "well, yes, of course we do this" responses.

Commendable cross-departmental work.

III. Program Goals & Accomplishments

1. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve/advance the program.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	5
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. Goals currently in place will continue to the program's advancement. Criteria for determining success were measurable and attainable.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	1

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

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	1

General Comments related to Section III

1. There were a number of goals and associated tasks listed. There is not a doubt that the faculty and staff in the program are committed to student engagement and outreach. However, the goals appeared to be a comprehensive list of tasks, and not necessarily related to common program objectives. Is there a way to harness the efforts of faculty and staff into a common set of goals aligned to the program's vision? 3. While a process was described, it does not seem like there is a coordinated vision for the program. It seems faculty and staff pursue areas of interest and work towards those personal goals.
1. Impressive expansion of regional engagement and outreach activities through CBL program, internships, and individual faculty activities. These activities could also help in recruiting Latinx students to UWW. 2. Wanted more specificity about the short and long term goals/objectives that have been prioritized by the program. Didn't see any mention of assessment - shouldn't that work be part of the program's goals?
1. Many goals were to "continue" or "enhance" current activities (Continue offering courses in French, German, and Spanish) -- are these givens, or are there forces at work that make continuation difficult and therefore a specific goal? On the other hand, there were many activities noted (e.g., "met to develop further connection with CoBE and the German program") that it would be good to hear a few more specifics regarding -- what does WLC hope to do with CoBE? 3. Reasonable, if a bit general.

IV. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. The program prepares students in majors, minors, and related emphases tracks in post-graduation and other applicable experiences.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	5
No/Limited Evidence	0

4. Students participate in the high impact practices.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section IV

1. Clear curricular scope and sequence. There are a number of options for students to develop and advance language skills. Many courses and especially HIP offerings provide student applied experiences. The student anecdote provided supports the importance of the applied experiences for students in this program. The author noted that courses of interest to students are being added, and do not replace existing courses on language, literature, and culture/history. It seems there is a desire to be everything to everyone, and that may not be sustainable. 3. The assessment data used was student feedback. It is not clear if this information was collected through course evaluation or a more coordinated effort. 4. HIPs are required and encouraged throughout the program. There may be an opportunity here to distinguish the program from others regionally and create a shared program vision and related goals centering on the unique offerings available through participation in internships, study abroad, undergraduate research, and CBL.
1. There is a typo in the description of the majors - 24 credits are required beyond 252, not 14 credits as written. Did not see advising checklists or AARs. 2. Major requirements are still skewed heavily towards literature. Would more career oriented and/or thematic courses be more attractive and relevant to students? 3. I applaud the program for working on new courses that will appeal to broader student audiences (e.g., a course focused on French culture that is open to English speakers and French students, a Spanish for Educators courses). 4. Good array of HIPs are available although the extent of student involvement in each is not completely clear. It is incorrect that service learning, internships or undergraduate research (as understood as the URP model) are required - they are available and no doubt encouraged. Note about Prof. Turek teaching FRENCH 251 to students at UW Stevens Point starting in Fall 2020: the UW System Collaborative Language program has expanded to include opportunities to share French and German

courses across campuses. This presents new opportunities for the Whitewater programs in these languages to expand offerings and student enrollments in a time of limited resources and staffing.

1. Are the sample plans offered in the attachments used for advising? 3. Just curious: Health and Aging in Costa Rica seems awfully specific? Why Costa Rica? Or is the locale initiated by Social Work? 3. From the activities and goals listed, it seems as though the program is generally stable and working mostly refine and improve existing elements. 3. Many of the changes listed, such as switching courses from traditional to remote, don't note the impetus or duration of the shift; are these pandemic changes, or something more long term? Will these courses return to traditional for 2021-22, or has the program already been working toward developing more on-line offerings? 3. Many changes appears to be driven by student response and interest, with "assessment projects in 2012, 213, and 2104." Is there a long term, on going assessment plan? 4. A reasonable selection of HIPs. No capstone project for majors?

V. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program has clearly articulated learning outcomes for students.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. Student learning outcomes are "mapped" to the curriculum.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. The program provided a timeline indicating when faculty and staff assess SLOs. The timeline is manageable and sustainable.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

7. Overall, the program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section V

There is an understandable struggle to measure common SLOs in three distinct curriculums. The program even noted, the three tracks do not share a course. Considering this, the common SLOs and measures are impressive. The timeline is a bit of a sticking point for me. There does not seem to be a clear cycle in place, or people responsible, for evaluation. Data is collected, but it is not clear how that data aligns to program goals or curricular improvements. Much of the data provided here was not referenced in the curriculum section when asked if data was used to support curricular changes.

3. SLOs 3-6 mention specific time intervals. For SLOs 1-2 and 7-8, are these assessments conducted every term? Or is the data collected every term and analyzed or surveyed at some less frequent interval. Trying to do this every term for every class may be unnecessarily burdensome

3. While it is clear how and when students take the ACTFL oral proficiency assessment (SLOs #1 and 2), it is not explained how and when the faculty evaluate the results and use them to improve student learning. Ditto for SLOs #7 and #8 - when and how do faculty evaluate and apply those results? Not clear if the cycle of assessment is sustainable. 4. Has the program considered collecting and assessing writing samples at the 400-level as well as 300-level in order to get a better sense of students' proficiency at the end of their program? If the program moves to a portfolio-based approach, students could be asked to collect signature assignments from multiple courses thus providing a more longitudinal picture of their skill development. 5. For some of the SLOs (e.g., #4, #5, #6), there was detailed information about the assessment findings and their implications, including thoughtful reflection on how the findings were interpreted by the faculty and how they may be used to improve student learning. For other SLOs - not so much. Hopefully, the problems with the oral assessments will be straightened out soon. 7. A portfolio-based assessment process may be a good fit for WLC. Do the assessments really have to take place in a common course that all three languages include in their major?

4. In the findings, it sounds like much assessment activity was aimed at the final year and "the issue was getting the word out to graduating majors." For other SLOs, assessment activities appear to be mainly in upper level courses (300-400). There is a note for the German assessment that there is "a point in our programs at which students have not yet been challenged to engage with and discuss more challenging discourse." It sounds like much was learned not just about student learning levels but the assessment tools themselves -- though in some places it sounds like the tools were to be adjusted while adjustments to earlier curriculum less applicable: "Hence it was felt that in order for our assessments to truly reflect the strength of our respective programs in instructing for interpretive comprehension, the assessment would necessarily have to take place later in the program." 7. Detailed discussion of assessment findings; an action plan based on the findings is given. Still, it feels like the program is looking more for ways to assess upper level courses in order to reveal strengths rather than using assessment to find those points earlier in the curriculum that could be adjusted to improve student performance in advanced courses.

VI. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation:

A. Trend Data

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

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	1

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

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. [MAJORS ONLY] Program has strategies to recruit and retain students.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

4. Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	1

General Comments related to Section VI.A

1. Enrollment in French and German majors appear low. German in particular seems to fluctuate a lot and there was not much discussion other than change in instructional staff. Minors across all three are sustainable and may

- off-set the lower major numbers. The program also supports other majors across campus. 2. Based on my review of the 4-year plans, it seems the students can complete the degree in 4-years. The credits to degree are high in German and Spanish. The program explains this may be due to double majors. It is not clear if course offerings impact students' ability to stay on track to a degree in 4-years. 6. It would be helpful to know the major/minor numbers the program feels are sustainable. Is there room for growth, or is the program at the desired capacity?
2. 1. Spanish major is in fine shape, and the Spanish minor is huge. French and German majors are quite small, and the minors are only somewhat larger for each. Nevertheless, to maintain vibrant, diverse opportunities for language as part of a liberal education, it is vital to maintain all of these programs. Further, the courses offered by these programs are relied upon by other majors and minors across campus (e.g., International Business). Granted, there should still be increased recruitment efforts for both French and German. 2. It seems that French and German rely on individual studies courses to maintain upper division offerings. The faculty offering these IS courses should be lauded for the lengths they go to for students. However, I question if this is sustainable. Is this not unpaid work during fall and spring terms? I have concerns about faculty in any department routinely working for free. 5. Students can graduate without delay but only because faculty are routinely offering
-
1. Graduation data was not provided. A more extensive discussion of the sustainability of French and German would be helpful in light of the small numbers of majors. Is there data to show that minors and students from other programs are sufficient to boost enrollments? The IRP term enrollments dashboard seems to indicate small class sizes. And how have all three programs been impacted by declining university enrollments overall? 2. Data was not provided. But certainly BSE programs require more than 120 credits due to the many licensure requirements and students who double major often go over the standard 120 credits. 3. A strong array of retention activities but no real mention of specific recruitment strategies. How does the program reach out to students who come to Whitewater with a background in one of these languages to get them to enroll in a class or consider a major/minor and are those efforts at all successful? The LLAVE event sounds very promising for Spanish. Applaud efforts to use innovative course scheduling and delivery to attract and retain more students. The program may want to consider offering key required classes that can only be offered in one section (such as SPANISH 251 or 252) in an online asynchronous mode to enhance enrollment. 4. Insufficient data to make a determination. The expansion of opportunities for Heritage Learners in Spanish should be very helpful in this regard. 6. The WLC program at Whitewater is not unique in the state or nation in having to grapple with low and/or declining student enrollment in French and German programs. High schools are dropping these languages, which means that the BSE programs are also withering. And some associate programs on our campus are also shrinking, most notably International Studies. This problem needs to be confronted squarely and specific strategies developed - perhaps going beyond the campus to leverage the CLP opportunities for cross-campus collaboration.

VI. 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	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

VII. Resource Availability & Development:

A. Faculty and Staff Resources

1. Information on numbers of full and part-time faculty and staff are provided. Expertise of teaching staff are aligned with the needs and future vision for the program.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. Information is provided about changes in the faculty since the last Audit and Review.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to section VII.A

The program makes a case for an additional instructor to support the Spanish program. Considering enrollment numbers, and the number of other courses supported by the program, this seems to be a reasonable request.

3. The WLC is down two tenured positions in Spanish and one tenured position in German (replaced by a lecturer), which most definitely has a deleterious impact on the day-to-day functioning of the program in areas like advising and service. However, the WLC program is not alone in L&S in having lost FTE over the past several years, and they were able to retain their academic staff positions last year when over 25 AS positions were cut across the college. It should be noted as well that enrollment in certain Spanish courses has declined in recent years, despite the steady number of majors and minors, which has substantially contributed to increased course cancellations or consolidations of sections.

VII. Resource Availability & Development:

B. Student Resources

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

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	4

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

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	3

General Comments for VII.B

2. The program requests additional classroom and meeting space.

1. Could the Chair of L&L provide information to answer this question? 2. Priority access to classrooms has been a problem for WLC (and they are not alone in the College of Letters and Sciences as this same situation prevails in several departments). As the program moves to more hybrid and online course delivery, this situation may ease somewhat. And as noted, several people do help the WLC coordinator find classroom space after the initial priority period ends. The bigger problem seems to be having only one Distance Education classroom available for scheduling - especially if involvement in the CLP grows in coming years.

1. It appears that the program is down two Spanish lines, has lost Chinese courses due to a retirement, and lost the ASL program due to budget cuts; they note the need for a separate coordinator for the Spanish program. 2. Note that access to more classrooms with tech is required. "Desperately Need additional classrooms." "Need one additional Distance Education classroom." "Needs a meeting room."

Staffing and facilities are a significant concern.

VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Areas of strength are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments for VIII

2. The program noted that skill-building class sizes should run at 15, but it is not clear to me if these are lower or upper division classes. This is an interesting point, because if additional staff are being requested to maintain a 15 person class size, that should be taken into consideration. While we do not have a standard class size, it seems reasonable to offer courses of 25 to 30- especially at an introductory level.

1. Strength noted: small class sizes and personal faculty interaction; substantial faculty real world experience; diversity of curriculum; offerings in film, business, translation, language for medicine, etc.; wide range of study abroad programs; strong academic advising; high level of achievement in scholarship and creative activity 2. Noted for improvement: Staffing issues/class size maintenance; work load of WLC coordinator should be revisited; program is working on reimagining program for new generation of students; assessment; looking for develop more on-line offerings; Spanish coordinator; Expanding discourse with other programs, such as CoBE

A well-documented report; thank you.

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

The faculty and staff in this program seem tireless, and truly student-centered. The significant number of contributions both in the program and to the University are commendable. Congratulations on the number of courses designed hybrid or remote due to the pandemic. While there was not a wealth of assessment data, it is clear the faculty and staff know their students and have ideas to expand the program to meet student interests. The number of HIPs embedded in the program is impressive and a unique feature and should be promoted.

Despite the travails of the past year, the program has put together a thoughtful and cohesive report -- thank you. The report reflects cohesion and collaboration within the program itself. Despite a roughness to assessment activities and plans, the program clearly is reflective of feedback and is making curricular decisions based on both current evidence and program aspiration. The report does not reveal any major structural issues in the program; it appears that things are going relatively well, and that current issues are grounded in university budgeting and resource availability. The program is looking for further ways to collaborate with other programs.

There is a great deal of excitement about and commitment to the program within the current faculty/staff. Highly collaborative internally and I commend the effort and importance placed on cross-institutional collaboration and high impact practice.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

The program noted staffing needs, which makes sense considering the large number of enrollments in Spanish. I think the program should also consider class sizes, in what ways to grow and expand, and contributions to other programs across campus in order to make the workload manageable and sustainable.

It feels that most of what the program wishes to work on is reflected in the content of the report. 1) Staffing issues, such as hiring in Spanish and the creation of a Spanish coordinator 2) Holding down the size of classes for maximally effective learning experiences 3) Access to more classroom technology 4) Further development of hybrid and online content to boost recruitment and retention 5) Revamping the assessment process 6) Continuing inter-program outreach and collaboration (such as with CoBE)

Staffing and facilities are an obvious concern.

3. Other comments/questions

The report was detailed and well written.

4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

1. Create a strategic plan and vision for moving the program toward a sustainable structure. The program should consider what sustainability means in the face of staffing shortages and develop an alternate plan that addresses possible continuing staffing shortfalls.
2. Create clear and measurable program goals tied to a vision for the program.
3. Discuss staffing needs with College administration, specifically as they relate to the program’s plans to sustain and potentially grow.
4. Work with College administration to determine classroom space and technology needs, specifically related providing remote or distance education.
5. Finish assembling advisory board. Hold initial meetings, and report back on feedback collected from the meetings.

General Comments for VI.B

There was some information provided here, but the numbers do not seem representative of the students who graduate. I think creating the advisory board can help inform the program on how to stay connected to graduates and prepare students for employment in fields associated with completing a degree from this program.

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.	5
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