The 2012-13 academic year was the second year for Pittsburg State University (PSU) to implement its new program review process and calendar that was developed and approved in 2010-2011. The PSU program review process was designed to enhance overall institutional quality and accountability. The focus is on providing campus-wide input to help departments align programs with the institutional assessment process, institutional strategic plan, and resource allocation. Program review is a major opportunity for departments to complete a comprehensive self-study in order to demonstrate that their programs are current, of sufficient size and quality, and help the institution serve its mission. As previously submitted, this new process provides two pathways to review: through an external accrediting agency recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) or by an external reviewer. Programs accredited by an external agency are scheduled for the PSU program review during the year following the visit using the response from the accrediting body.

The first year of implementing the new program review process in AY 2011-12 involved all programs accredited or associated with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE – now known as CAEP Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation) and the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE). In contrast, the past year was the first time that non-accredited programs completed the revised program review process. Specifically, in AY 2012-13 all non-teacher education programs in the departments of Mathematics and Modern Languages and Literatures were reviewed, in addition to accredited programs in the Department of Music.

For these non-accredited programs, program faculty completed a written self-study report with a primary emphasis on student learning and other indicators of program quality. This report was submitted to both the Program Review Committee and an external evaluator. Along with the annual program minima data, each program was required to provide information concerning:

1. Departmental overview, including current status of the department/program and changes since the last review.
2. Faculty credentials and summary of professional activities.
3. Students majoring in the program, including employment after graduation.
5. Assessment data and changes based on assessment, along with explicit information regarding assessment of on-line or hybrid courses.
6. Program continuous improvement plan.

For all programs reviewed, the Program Review Committee provided individual feedback to the departments and approved the enclosed Executive Summary. The Executive
Summary includes overview, concerns, and recommendations for each individual program.

The following programs were reviewed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Degree Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.0101 Mathematics</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.0101 Mathematics</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.0101 Mathematics</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.0901 French</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.0905 Spanish</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0903 Music</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0903 Music (Performance)</td>
<td>BM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0903 Music (Performance)</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During AY 2012-13, there were three main areas of focus. Perhaps the most important area of focus was adjusting to the external review component to incorporate recommendations from an external reviewer into the program review process. All programs not meeting the definition of an accredited program were required to use an external reviewer. Selection of the external reviewer followed an established protocol, developed by the 2010-11 Review of Program Review Task Force. For each non-accredited program under review, the Department Chair, in consultation with program faculty, was required to submit four external reviewer nominees, along with CV’s, to the Dean and Provost for consideration. The Dean and Provost then reviewed the submissions and selected one of the four nominees. The Dean and Provost also had the option to request additional nominees from the department if needed, but this option was not pursued during the past Program Review cycle. The external reviewer had to meet the following credential requirements:

- highest degree in appropriate discipline;
- distinguished track record in related teaching, research and scholarship, and service;
- experience with program review, institutional effectiveness, assessment and/or accreditation;
- administrative experience;
- experience at an institution with the same/similar programs as those being evaluated;
• rank of Associate Professor or higher;
• employed at (or retired from in the last 5 years) an institution outside of Kansas;
and
• no existing conflicts of interest.

The external reviewer examined the self-study documents, conducted at least a day long site visit, and submitted a final report addressing:

1. Curriculum
2. Assessment of student learning
3. Faculty/staff
4. Resources and support services
5. Other issues common to the discipline
6. Specific recommendations

The only exception in AY 2012-13 was that programs under review in the Department of Music are accredited, so the accreditation site visit team served the purpose of the external reviewer. For all programs that had an external reviewer, the department was asked to provide a written response to indicate their level of agreement with the recommendations of the external reviewer.

A second area of focus during the past year was assessment of student learning, with greater integration of the annual assessment process into Program Review. Currently, all departments are required to submit an Annual Assessment Report to the University Assessment Committee. The Assessment Committee reviews these reports and provides written feedback on the assessment efforts for each program to the department. In addition, the Chair of the University Assessment Committee, along with the Director of Assessment, meets annually with each Department Chair to review feedback and work towards improvement of assessment plans and meaningful use of data. Because of the integral role of the Director of Assessment, the director was invited to meet with the Program Review Committee to provide her perspective on assessment and improvement of student learning for those programs under review. The Director of Assessment also met with the external reviewer for some programs, as requested. The addition of this component provided valuable information for the review process as well as increased alignment of the existing assessment process with Program Review.

Finally, a third focus for the past year was on ensuring due diligence in review of two programs that had repeatedly encountered previous strong concerns during the Program Review process. During the last regularly scheduled Program Review in 2009-2010 for both the BA in French and the BA in Spanish, the Program Review Committee’s final recommendations included working with the four academic deans to address specific recommendations and develop a strategic plan for submission to the Provost the following year. Annual updates were to be submitted to the Provost and full department review again in 2012. With a change in administrative leadership, little progress was made and both programs were rescheduled for Program Review during 2012-13 to allow sufficient time for a new Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to assess the situation
and establish a working relationship with the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures. In addition to following the established Program Review process, the Program Review Committee met with the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to gain insight into why it appeared that the Spanish and French program faculty were either unwilling to recognize the ongoing problems with low enrollment/graduation rates or to make changes to the program curriculum to address concerns. This meeting was also intended to determine if the Committee was misunderstanding the Department’s responses to challenges of the programs. After meeting with the Dean, it was clear to the Committee members that they were not in error to believe that the leadership and faculty of these programs were not going to make any changes unless the Committee forced the issue with recommending closure for the programs and department.

Committee Membership

Dr. Peggy Snyder, Interim Director of Analysis, Planning, and Assessment (Chair)
Ms. Christel Benson, Assistant Professor, Graphics and Imaging Technologies
Dr. Chris Fogliasso, University Professor, Department of Management and Marketing
Dr. Paul Grimes, Dean, Kelce College of Business
Dr. Catherine Hooey, Professor, Department of History, Philosophy, and Social Sciences
Dr. John Iley, Chair, Department of Technology and Workforce Learning
Dr. Barbara McClaskey, University Professor, Irene Ransom Bradley School of Nursing
Dr. Alice Sagerhorn, Chair, Department of Teaching and Leadership
Dr. Duane Whitbeck, Chair, Department of Family and Consumer Science
Dr. Marti York, Associate Professor, Department of Teaching and Leadership

Summary of Committee Recommendations

All degree programs reviewed were recommended for continuation with the exception of the BA in Mathematics, which was voluntarily terminated by the Department of Mathematics, and two programs in the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, specifically the BA in French and the BA in Spanish. The committee recommended discontinuation of these programs, moving both the BA in French and the BA in Spanish to a phased out status in program inventory by June 1, 2014. Both of these programs were reviewed in 2009 and were found to have significant challenges based on review of enrollment and graduation data. At that time, the Program Review Committee recommended the development of a comprehensive self-assessment and strategic plan to address the issues identified by the committee, including chronic low enrollment for the BA in French and chronic problems with retention and graduation for the BA in Spanish. The external evaluator and the current Program Review Committee echoed the concerns identified in the previous review. After very careful consideration of written documents provided by the department, along with chair and faculty verbal testimony, the current committee expressed concern that the department is unwilling to enact significant changes based on recommendations of the previous Program Review Committee, the external reviewer, and the current Program Review Committee. The committee strongly encouraged the faculty of the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures to
reconsider alternative curriculum and course delivery formats and to develop a BA with a major in Modern Languages and Literatures that can be adequately supported by available resources and can meet the educational needs of our student body.

**General Insights and Recommendations**

Overall, the new program review process for non-accredited programs was very effective. The addition of an external evaluator contributed a valuable external perspective to further the quality of academic programs as well as provided an objective opinion from an expert in the discipline that informed difficult decisions when enrollment and graduation data indicated chronic, unaddressed problems within a program. The new process also allows for effective alignment with existing assessment processes. There is still work to be done with better integrating the program review process with unit-level planning, but this aspect of alignment is currently on hold while the unit level planning process is under review.

The Program Review Committee recommended changes in the Program Review calendar to allow for earlier input from the external evaluator, as the addition of this valuable component delayed completion of committee work, making it difficult for the committee to finalize its feedback to departments by the end of the Spring semester. The revised calendar of key events for Program Review will extend the process beyond a calendar year for departments, but will allow for more timely completion of work by the committee.
Academic Program Review
Bachelor of Arts, Major in Mathematics
2013

Overview

The Bachelor of Arts with a Major in Mathematics has the identical math core requirements as the Bachelor of Science with a Major in Mathematics. The BA Degree requires an additional 10 hours in a foreign language. This degree has historical low enrollments and the department has submitted the appropriate paperwork to terminate this degree.

Concerns

There is not enough interest by students to earn the additional hours in a foreign language to choose to complete a Bachelor of Arts degree instead of a Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics.

Recommendations

The Committee supports the Department of Mathematics in terminating this degree.
Overview

The Department of Mathematics offers a traditional BS degree in mathematics and a more specialized program of study with an emphasis in actuarial science. The BS in Math degree attracts academically successful students with an ACT above the university average. The department reports strong demand for graduates with actuarial students commanding relatively high starting salaries. Over the past five years, upper division average enrollment in the program has exceeded the minima established by the Board of Regents. The program appears to be adequately staffed relative to the number of majors even though the department carries a heavy commitment to offering general education courses for the university. The departmental faculty have implemented and maintained a rigorous assessment program to monitor the effectiveness of the curriculum which is aligned with national standards.

Concerns

While the average enrollment in the BS degree exceeds the established Regents Minima, the five year average number of graduates does not. However, the number of graduates is slowly trending upward. From an administrative perspective, it is important to note that the chair of the Mathematics Department was, for a period of time, serving double duty as chair of the Physics Department. Obviously, this placed a major constraint on the time and effort normally devoted to the academic programs in math. In addition, another senior faculty member in mathematics is serving as the Associate Dean for the College of Arts and Sciences. This along with other major university service responsibilities currently assumed by members of the department are placing a personnel cost on the department and restricting the number and type of courses that are offered in support of their BS degree.

Recommendations

The departmental faculty should develop and implement a plan to raise the number of annual BS graduates to meet the Regents Minima. Given that the program is currently meeting the targets for enrollment, the plan should focus attention on retention and student success. The department is working with the university central administration to resolve the issue of leadership for the Physics Department, and the Mathematics Department Chair is no longer serving as chair of this additional unit. In addition, the department should pursue the possibility of securing external funding, perhaps through grants and contracts, to enhance its resource base.
Overview

The Department of Mathematics provides a traditional MS degree program comprised of advanced courses in both pure and applied mathematics. The program attracts students who are preparing for work in the private and public sectors as well as those wishing to continue their studies at the doctoral level. The faculty has structured the MS with enough flexibility so that the program of study may be tailored to meet individual student needs and goals. Recent surveys of graduates reveal a nearly 100 percent placement rate in the job market and graduate schools. A limited number of graduate teaching assistantship are available each year. Recent enrollments in the program have fallen short of the Regents Minima, however, the average annual number of graduates for the past five years exceed the minima. Overall, based on departmental measures of assessment and placement rates, the program appears to be a strong and viable asset for the university.

Concerns

Long term growth in program enrollment appears to be constrained by the limited number of graduate teaching assistantships currently available to the department. Also of concern is the fact that the department chair in mathematics, at the time of this review, continued to oversee the Department of Physics in addition to his normal duties. This obviously creates numerous administrative constraints on a department offering a graduate program. Further complicating this issue is the fact that a senior member of the math faculty is released from a portion of his instructional responsibilities due to serving as Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences. Additional, periodic service releases within the department also place pressure on the ability to offer courses of significant depth and breadth required for a graduate program.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the departmental faculty develop a plan to recruit additional numbers of students into the MS program. This will necessarily involve finding creative ways to support graduate students through the creation of additional assistantships and the acquisition of more graduate scholarships. The department should explore potential opportunities with external grants and contracts as well as working with the PSU Foundation to enhance alumni and friends’ support of the program. Graduation and placement rates reveal that the department does very well with retention and student success, the primary goal should be growth in numbers. The department is working with the university central administration to resolve the issue of leadership for the Physics Department, and the Mathematics Department Chair is no longer serving as chair of this additional unit.
Academic Program Review
Bachelor of Arts, Major in French
2013

Overview

The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures offers undergraduate majors in French and Spanish through two degree programs; the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science in Education. All of these majors were reviewed in 2009, and at that time, the Program Review Committee recommended development of a comprehensive self-assessment and strategic plan that addressed a list of significant issues affecting the future of the department and its programs. After the department failed to complete the assignment, the responsibility for the process was directed to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Due to successive personnel changes in the dean’s position, the recommendations were put on hold. The Bachelor of Science in Education majors were reviewed in 2011-2012 along with all other CAEP/NCATE accredited degrees. The BSE degrees in French and Spanish were recommended to continue though recommendations were made to develop strategies for recruiting additional students to better meet minima requirements for enrollment. Additional concerns about the two BSE degrees centered on the extensive number of hours required for these degrees. Subsequently, a temporary moratorium for new majors was placed on the BSE in French and the BSE in Spanish until final determination for new offerings is made by FY 2015. The two Bachelor of Arts majors were again reviewed by the Program Review Committee in 2012-2013.

Concerns

Over the past two review periods, the number of French majors in the BA program has remained below the minima set by the Board of Regents. As a result, the number of graduates receiving the degree is also below the established minima. Although the Committee applauds the efforts of the sole faculty member currently teaching French, there is no evidence that increased resources would result in the significant increases in French majors needed to reach and maintain a viable program relative to the established Board of Regents standards. After careful consideration of the department’s written report, as well as the verbal testimony provided by the chair and faculty, the Program Review Committee concludes that the department is unwilling to enact significant changes based on the recommendations of the previous Program Review Committee, the external reviewer, or the current Program Review Committee.

Recommendations

The Program Review Committee recommends that all degree programs in the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, including the Bachelor of Arts with a Major in French, be moved to a phased out status in the program inventory by June 1, 2014. Furthermore, the Committee recommends reassigning the faculty to another department or configuration. At that time, the faculty and courses will be categorized as service only. The Committee strongly encourages the Modern Languages and Literatures faculty to reconsider alternative curriculum and course delivery formats and to develop a Bachelor of Arts with a Major in Modern Languages with emphases in those languages that can be adequately supported by available resources and which meet the educational demands of our student body.
Overview

The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures offers undergraduate majors in French and Spanish through two degree programs; the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science in Education. All of these majors were reviewed in 2009, and at that time, the Program Review Committee recommended development of a comprehensive self-assessment and strategic plan that addressed a list of significant issues affecting the future of the department and its programs. After the department failed to complete the assignment, the responsibility for the process was directed to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Due to successive personnel changes in the dean’s position, the recommendations were put on hold. The Bachelor of Science in Education majors were reviewed in 2011-2012 along with all other CAEP/NCATE accredited degrees. The BSE degrees in French and Spanish were recommended to continue though recommendations were made to develop strategies for recruiting additional students to better meet minima requirements for enrollment. Additional concerns about the two BSE degrees centered on the extensive number of hours required for these degrees. Subsequently, a temporary moratorium for new majors was placed on the BSE in French and the BSE in Spanish until final determination for new offerings is made by FY 2015. The two Bachelor of Arts majors were again reviewed by the Program Review Committee in 2012-2013.

Concerns

The current number of students pursuing the BA in Spanish exceeds the minima set by the Board of Regents. However, the Program Review Committee notes a significant concern with the pattern of retention and graduation rates. The number of graduates is not consistent with the number of majors. Many of the students admitted with a second major in Spanish do not complete the degree. It appears that students either change the major to a minor or choose not to remain in school for the additional time needed to complete the second major in Spanish. Under the current leadership, it is clear to the Committee that the department is unwilling to enact revisions to the program, or to develop different scheduling models, that might assist students to complete a second major in a language. Without significant curricular reform, the Program Review Committee concludes that the BA in Spanish program will not be able to maintain viable graduation rates over the long term.

Recommendations

The Program Review Committee recommends that all degree programs in the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, including the Bachelor of Arts with a Major in Spanish, be moved to a phased out status in the program inventory by June 1, 2014. Furthermore, the Committee recommends reassigning the faculty to another department or configuration. At that time, the faculty and courses will be categorized as service only. The Committee strongly encourages the Modern Languages and Literatures faculty to reconsider alternative curriculum and course delivery formats and to develop a Bachelor of Arts with a Major in Modern Languages with emphases in those languages that can be adequately supported by available resources and which meet the educational demands of our student body.
Overview

The Bachelor of Arts program in Music is purposefully designed for students who are not pursuing teaching or performance careers. The availability of this BA degree offers students an opportunity to pair their musical training and education with complementary fields to prepare them for specialized opportunities – numerous career paths are available for those who double major in areas such as business and technology. In addition, the BA degree provides the department with another option for students whose career choice is not firmly established. Because the program shares its primary course requirements with the Bachelor of Music and the Bachelor of Music Education degrees, the marginal cost of providing the BA option is virtually zero. Although the enrollments for the BA degree are technically below the Regents Minima, they should be evaluated within the context of the overall PSU Music programs. Rather than drawing resources from the higher enrollment music education and performance programs, the BA enhances those programs by bringing students into the Department of Music that would otherwise not have an opportunity to pursue studies in the field.

Concerns

The BA in Music program appears to be adequately staffed and resourced as it shares its faculty and facilities with the other Department of Music programs. One faculty member is tasked with advising and overseeing the administration of the degree. This appears to be the only additional cost of offering the program. Even though financially the department feels like the BA in Music is not costing the department, these limited resources could be shifted to the Bachelor of Music (BM). The department needs to develop a concrete agenda to recruit additional students.

Recommendations

The BA in Music program should be continued. It is recommended that the department faculty reach out to other programs on campus to formalize double major relationships with complementary fields. This would provide students with example degree plans that may be used to market the BA to prospective students. For example, a double major in music and management or marketing might be a viable option for students pursuing a career path in the recording or theatrical industries.

All programs need to be concerned, while watching the graduation and retention rates. The Music Department noted that this was not formally being done but does need to be a component of their annual review of the program. Faculty appear to be willing to allow a large number of students to be eliminated from the program without attempts at providing support to be able to continue in the program. The NASM review noted that the curriculum and assessment was designed to eliminate a large number of students and not to provide instruction that would elevate the students’ ability to improve and remain in the program. This method was partially responsible for the low number of students in the program.
Academic Program Review  
Bachelor of Music (Performance)  
2013

Overview

The Bachelor of Music degree is designed for those students pursuing careers in music performance or advanced and private teaching. The Department of Music currently offers a variety of specialized options under this degree. Students completing the degree are prepared for and often pursue graduate education and training. The faculty reports a strong record of placing students in prestigious graduate programs throughout the country. The BM program attracts talented and academically successful students as the average ACT score of incoming students exceeds the university average. It is important to note that the BM degree shares many common courses with the Bachelor of Music Education program, and that it must be evaluated within that context of shared resources.

Enrollment in the BM degree shows moderate growth over the past five years. Due to this growth the number of students enrolled over the past three years meets the Regents Minima. The number of graduates, however, falls below the expected target.

Concerns

The Department of Music appears adequately staffed and resourced to provide the BM program within its portfolio of degrees. The department is home to highly qualified and accomplished musicians who demonstrate a strong commitment to educating their students. The BM program is routinely monitored and evaluated within the university’s standing assessment protocols and planning processes. The program appears to be meeting its primary goals and objectives. However, the number of graduates per year is less than what is expected given the number of majors declared. The department should carefully examine the source of this discrepancy and take steps to increase the annual number of students receiving the BM degree. This may involve additional efforts in recruiting as well as retention.

Recommendations

As noted above, the Department of Music should develop and implement a plan of action to ensure that the annual number of BM graduates rises to meet and maintain the Regents Minima of ten per year. However, it is important to note that the BM program shares a significant common body of curriculum with the department’s other bachelor degree programs and the number of graduates should be evaluated within that institutional context.

In addition, the minor curriculum issues and facilities concerns addressed in the latest National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) visitors report should be resolved. All programs need to be concerned, while watching the graduation and retention rates. The Music Department noted that this was not formally being done but does need to be a component of their annual review of the program.
Overview

The Master of Music degree is designed for students seeking advanced education and training in a variety of performance specialty areas. In addition, the master degree prepares those students who wish to further their studies at the doctoral level. The Department of Music is staffed by highly qualified and accomplished faculty who have obtained the academic and professional credentials necessary to offer programs at the graduate level. The department appears to have the necessary resources and physical facilities to maintain a quality program. The department faculty report that recent program graduates have established successful careers with many furthering their studies at the doctoral level. The program appears to meeting its primary educational goals and objectives as measured by the department’s established criteria.

Concerns

The Master of Music program is currently operating below the enrollment levels established by the Regents Minima. However, the program appears healthy and stable. Given the personal nature of specialized music programs, it is questionable if additional economies of scale could be realized with the department and university’s resource base. To significantly grow the program may require costly investments in faculty and facilities. The economic rationale for applying a uniform “minimum” enrollment and number of graduates to extremely faculty-intensive programs such as advanced music performance is highly questionable. Given the success of its graduates and the department’s current resource base, the MM appears to be a viable and valuable program that enhances the university offerings.

Recommendations

The Department of Music should develop and implement a plan of action to grow the MM program’s enrollment and annual number of graduates. The Regent’s Minima should be set as a long term goal. However, the department should carefully consider and plan for the acquisition of new resources or the reallocation of existing resources that this growth may require.

All programs need to be concerned, while watching the graduation and retention rates. The Music Department noted that this was not formally being done but does need to be a component of their annual review of the program.
Fiscal Implications for Program Review Process

12-13 Programs going through the program review process in AY 2012-13 did not require additional funding. However, the transitioning of faculty due to the recommended closure of a department has fiscal implications. It will be difficult to estimate savings from this closure until a plan has been completed for realignment of faculty, staff, and operating assets to best address the needs of the university in foreign language learning. This plan will be completed by June 1, 2014. In addition, change in the program review process itself to include an external reviewer necessitated budgeting to cover the cost of reviewer stipends and travel expenses, with an approximate total cost of $2,000 per non-accredited degree program.

11-12 Programs going through the program review process, as well as those having to submit follow-up reports, did not require additional funding. The focus of the review was centered on assessment and long range planning, as well as only those programs with NCATE and KSDE accreditation.

10-11 The programs reporting progress this year did not indicate any fiscal implications. The majority of updates were based on assessment and long range planning.

09-10 The programs in the College of Technology were reviewed during the 2009-10 academic year. While significant program changes were recommended, no fiscal outcomes are apparent at this time. History programs were reviewed during this cycle as well and while all programs were approved for continuance, the History Department has been merged with the Department of Social Sciences and renamed the Department of History, Philosophy and Social Sciences. The estimated savings will be in the range of $50,000.

08-09 The arts and humanities programs in the College of Arts and Sciences were reviewed during the 2008-09 academic year. While significant program changes were recommended, no fiscal outcomes are apparent at this time.
Follow-up Reviews
Academic Program Review
Feedback from Committee

Status of Programs Needing Additional Review AY 2009-2012

With the implementation of our new Program Review schedule and process, all programs that were on the listing of those needing additional review can be removed. All of the prior programs listed will be going through a regular and full program review process in the next year or two, or were reviewed this academic year. Programs listed on this current table that were part of the AY 2012-2013 process include programs within the Department of Music and the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures. The recommendations of the Program Review Committee for each of these programs are contained in the table and narrative of the PSU Program Review Report for 2012-2013.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Program</th>
<th>Year of Review</th>
<th>CIP Code</th>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>Explanatory Category</th>
<th>Recommendation*</th>
<th>I sentence update on status of program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>50.0701</td>
<td>B, M</td>
<td>B-C, M-D</td>
<td>B-Continue</td>
<td>Master’s Degree eliminated due to low enrollment and lack of resources to sustain programs with focus now on the baccalaureate program and emphases at this level (full program review scheduled for AY 2015-2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>13.1302</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Discontinue</td>
<td>Program eliminated and art education has become an option within the BFA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>16.0901</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Discontinue</td>
<td>BA not to extend beyond Spring 2017; BSEd has a temporary moratorium for new majors until final determination for future offering is made by FY 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>16.0905</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Discontinue</td>
<td>BA not to extend beyond Spring 2017; BSEd has a temporary moratorium for new majors until final determination for future offering is made by FY 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>50.0903</td>
<td>B, M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>The BSE was reviewed in AY2012 and based on results of the NCATE/KHDE accreditation review, will continue; other majors underwent full program in AY 2013 and were recommended to continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>45.1001</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>Due to change in program review process and rescheduling to align programs more closely with their schedule for program accreditations, these programs will be reviewed again in AY2017 during regular program review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>45.1101</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>Due to change in program review process and rescheduling to align programs more closely with their schedule for program accreditations, these programs will be reviewed again in AY2016 during regular program review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Studies</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>43.1010</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>Due to change in program review process and rescheduling to align programs more closely with their schedule for program accreditations, these programs will be reviewed again in AY2016 during regular program review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Start Year</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering Technology</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>15.0805</td>
<td>BSET</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>Satisfactory annual report of progress; will undergo full program review AY2015 during regular program review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastics Engineering Technology</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>15.0607</td>
<td>BSET</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>Satisfactory annual report of progress; will undergo full review AY2015 during regular program review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics Engineering Technology</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>15.0303</td>
<td>BSET</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>Satisfactory annual report of progress; will undergo full review AY2015 during regular program review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technology</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>15.0000</td>
<td>MET</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>Satisfactory annual report of progress; will undergo full review AY2015 during regular program review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics Communication Management</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>10.0301</td>
<td>BST</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Discontinue</td>
<td>Program discontinued and replaced with Graphic Communications degree which will undergo full review AY 2016 during regular program review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Graphics</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>50.0409</td>
<td>BST</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Discontinue</td>
<td>Program discontinued and replaced with Graphic Communications degree which will undergo full review AY 2016 during regular program review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Education (renamed Technology &amp; Engineering Education)</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>13.1309</td>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>BSE was reviewed in AY2012 during regular program review cycle, and based on results of the NCATE/KHDE accreditation review, will continue; next full program review AY 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Technology</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>15.0612</td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>Satisfactory annual report of progress with significant improvements noted; will undergo full review AY 2014 during regular program review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Technology</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>15.0612</td>
<td>BST</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>Satisfactory annual report of progress with significant improvements noted; will undergo full review AY 2014 during regular program review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Management</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>15.1501</td>
<td>BST</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Discontinue</td>
<td>Program discontinued and replaced with BS Workforce Development; will undergo full review in AY 2017 during regular program review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>15.0612</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>Program must follow up on previously defined issues and will be fully reviewed in AY2014 during regular program review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Technical Education</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>13.1309</td>
<td>BSV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>Program must follow up on previously defined issues and will be fully reviewed in AY2014 during regular program review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development and Education</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2010</td>
<td>13.1309 EdS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>Program must follow up on previously defined issues and will be fully reviewed in AY2014 during regular program review cycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Options are: Continue, Additional Review, Enhance, Discontinue*