

BOG Graduate Program Review Spring 2026

Members: Jeffery Houghton, WVU  
Stephane Collignon, WVU  
Kim Floyd, WVU  
Kristen Dieffenbach, WVU  
Michael Vercelli, WVU  
Rita Colistra, WVU  
Matthew Titolo, WVU  
Melissa Olfert, WVU  
Kyle Hartman, WVU  
Carrie Rishel, WVU  
Gary Marsat, WVU  
Paul Chantler, WVU  
Marnie Reven, WVU  
Jeremy Gouzd, WVU  
Kashy Aminian, WVU

This year the Graduate Council reviewed 26 graduate programs at WVU-Morgantown. The following pages consist of the recommendations and rationales for the review decisions for the programs listed below.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

Nursing, Nurse Anesthetist, DNP, WVU\*  
Kinesiology, EdD, WVU  
Literacy Education, MA, WVU\*  
Theatre, MFA, WVU\*  
Health Administration, MHA, WVU\*  
Animal Physiology, MS, WVU  
Athletic Training, WVU\*  
Counseling, MS, WVU\*  
Nutritional and Food Science, MS, WVU  
Physical Education, MS, WVU  
Plant and Soil Sciences, MS, WVU  
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources, MS, WVU  
Forestry, MS, WVU  
Nursing, MSN, WVU\*  
Social Work, MSW, WVU\*  
Pharmacy, PharmD, WVU\*  
Animal, Food, and Nutrition Sciences, PhD, WVU  
Educational Theory and Practice, PhD, WVU  
Health Services and Outcomes Research, PhD, WVU  
Human and Community Development, PhD, WVU  
Kinesiology, PhD, WVU  
Natural Resource Economics, PhD, WVU  
Natural Resources Science, PhD, WVU  
Nursing, PhD, WVU  
Plant and Soil Sciences, PhD, WVU  
Public Health Sciences, PhD, WVU\*

\*Accredited Programs

# WVU Board of Governor's Program Review

## Executive Summary – Academic Year 2025-2026

### Annual Academic Unit Review

- All 39 WVU Morgantown main campus academic departments were reviewed
  - 11 departments had three of five metrics in the lowest quartile and provided action plans
  - 1 department was put on an attrition plan
    - The School of Agriculture and Food Systems

### University Council Program Reviews

- 62 programs were reviewed
- 27 programs were continued at the current level of activity.
  - Three were awarded "Program of Excellence"
- 27 programs were continued with specific action.
  - 24 actions were assigned around assessment of learning practices
  - 7 actions were assigned around student learning outcomes
  - 7 actions were assigned around developing external stakeholder engagement
  - 6 actions were assigned around program enrollment
  - 5 actions were assigned around program curriculum
  - 2 actions were assigned around student success
  - 2 actions were assigned around facilities
  - 1 action was assigned around adequate faculty
- 1 program was recommended for development of a cooperative program
  - PhD Natural Resource Economics
- 7 programs were recommended for discontinuation
  - AAS Sustainable Agriculture and Entrepreneurship
  - BS Health Services Administration
  - BS Sustainable Design and Development
  - MS Biostatistics
  - MS Developmental Biology
  - MS Population Health
  - PhD Developmental Biology

### Follow-up Actions Assigned in Previous Years

- 8 follow-up actions from previous years were reviewed
  - 5 were completely resolved
  - 2 were partially resolved
  - 1 was not resolved

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

DNP Nursing and DNP Nurse Anesthetist

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The DNP program supports and strengthens WVU's mission by preparing nurses to practice at the highest levels of professional nursing and expanding access to advanced nursing practice education across West Virginia and beyond, including serving rural and underserved communities. The DNP curriculum emphasizes translating evidence into practice and the program cultivates an inclusive and supportive learning environment. This focus aligns with WVU's mission to advance impactful research and apply knowledge to strengthen healthcare systems, inform policy, and reduce disparities.

Q1.8. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

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

See Q4.3, Q4.4, and Q4.6 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program reports no issues with adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program reports an adequate number of full-time faculty to meet the mission of the program and reports all faculty are qualified by their academic credentials. The program reports that three tenured/tenure track faculty teach in the DNP program and these three are supported by clinically focused doctoral prepared faculty who contribute advanced practice knowledge and project mentorship. The ratio of DNP students to tenured/TT faculty is 53:3 or 17.7:1 with additional instructor and project support by doctoral prepared clinical faculty. The faculty structure ensures students benefit from strong academic guidance, individualized project mentorship, and instruction grounded in contemporary clinical practice and advanced nursing leadership. The three core faculty of the DNP program produced 25 peer-reviewed publications during the review period, averaging 8.3 publications per TT faculty member. Faculty in the School of Nursing and DNP program have received external funding over the review period, with 100% of TT faculty who teach in the DNP program listed as PI or Co-I on externally funded grants.

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

- Yes  
 No

Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All  
 Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

The DNP Nurse Anesthetist program first enrolled students in 2020. The program has continued with an annual Fall semester start on a 3-year full-time progression plan with an August graduation 36 months after enrollment. During the period from 2019-2025 the NAP added 15 new students every August. The DNP post-master's program has remained at mostly steady enrollment with the exception of a drop of enrollment and then subsequent degree completions in 2022. Across 5-year span there was a decline of 16.7% in enrollment but the trend swings upward since 2022, with an average of 3-6 students graduating annually. Marketing and recruitment measures were implemented in 2025 to try to increase enrollment. The program notes that professional nursing bodies are striving for the DNP to be the entry degree for Advanced Practice Nurses, and that this program is of vital importance for the future of healthcare. Projected time to completion for Post-masters DNP is 2.5 years for full-time students and 3.5 years for part-time students. Average time to completion over review period is 2.62 years, which meets projections. There are no courses in either program with DFW rates above 30%. The post-masters DNP and NAP tracks both require a final project and students complete project and students examine Evidence-based practice and quality improvement projects that promote optimal health outcomes. Post-master's DNP and NAP graduates achieve 100% employment. NAP certification pass rate is 100%

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

The program provides a curriculum map and a course crosswalk grid to show the relationship and alignment of all course learning outcomes for the DNP Post-Master's Program and for the DNP NAP program. The curriculum was revised 2023-2025 to align with current accreditation expectations and contemporary professional standards (see next item). Because only one semester of the revised curriculum has been implemented, full assessment data are not yet available. All newly revised courses are scheduled for review by the School Curriculum Committee within one semester of initial offering. As part of assessment data, the program provides assignments, rubrics, and example student papers (deidentified) with faculty feedback. The Council suggests aggregating data from grading rubrics in future reviews to provide a more concise summary of student learning assessment.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The program revised curriculum beginning in 2023 and implemented beginning 2025. This process formally started in 2024 with approval of revised Mission, Vision, and Values statements. The Post-Master's DNP and NAP program learning outcomes were then updated to align with the new mission and accreditation and professional guidelines. The curriculum standards required by the COA were mapped to all DNP/NAP revised courses and learning outcomes. Revised courses were designed to support new learning outcomes. These will be assessed by the School Curriculum Committee as noted above. During the review period the Post Master's DNP program has also implemented a process for provisional admission and the one student admitted provisionally in 2024 is progressing successfully. To enhance the DNP project requirement, the DNP project manual was updated in Fall 2025. To assist with degree completion, curricular adjustment of credits by semester has allowed students to receive financial aid all semesters.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The program describes stakeholders of interest as students, faculty, employers, clinical partners, alumni, and the Dean's Leadership Council. Community representation is included on the MSN/DNP Curriculum Subcommittee. Students are represented on committees and the Dean's Advisory Board. Students engage with clinical stakeholders during Community Advisory Council meetings and work with stakeholders on project planning, implementation, and evaluation. Program faculty also engage in multiple ways with external stakeholders.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q8.2. Should the program be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q.12.4, Q12.5, Q12.6, and 12.7 of the self-study.

Yes

Maybe

No

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

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

Distinction

Faculty

Graduates

Curriculum and Assessment

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

US News and World Report #100 in Best Nursing Schools: DNP DNP NAP ranking evidence # 68 in Nurse Anesthesia Programs

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

All full-time faculty teaching in both programs are doctorally prepared (PhD, DNP, or EdD) and bring substantial academic, professional, and clinical experience needed to prepare doctoral students for advanced practice and leadership roles. Faculty maintain active licensure and certification and contribute expertise in multiple areas of nursing practice. They demonstrate strong scholarly productivity with peer-reviewed publications and presentations. Innovation in teaching is evidence across both programs with competency-based learning activities aligned with accreditation standards. Faculty are promoted in rank which reflects their effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty qualifications and achievements summarized in table 12.7.

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

Graduates are 100% employed. Evidence included in attachment.

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

The Post-Master's DNP and NAP programs are accredited through 2029 and the NAP also holds COA accreditation through 2035. The curricula of both programs aligned with accreditation standards and required outcomes measures are consistently met. The NAP maintains a 100% board pass rate.

Major revisions in 2024 updated program and course learning outcomes, aligned content with competencies, revised progression, and added a new course with updated courses launched in Fall 2025. Program outcome measures were revised in 2025 and evaluate student satisfaction with faculty, curriculum, advising, and program effectiveness on a 1-7 scale with a 5.5 benchmark. All benchmarks were met for Post-Master's DNP and all but one for NAP. The NAP also evaluates nine specialty outcomes and all exceed benchmarks. All courses are reviewed every three years and aggregated results shared at annual Dean's Retreat.

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

EdD Kinesiology

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The program aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values by preparing scholar-leaders and applied practitioners to advance the fields of teacher education, physical education, and sport coach education that promotes health, wellness, and performance across a broad range of communities and industries.

Q1.8. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

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

See Q4.3, Q4.4, and Q4.6 of the self-study.

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program has an adequate number of full-time faculty necessary to meet the mission of the program. These same faculty members serve the PhD program as well. Their teaching responsibilities are distributed across undergraduate majors and minors as well as revenue-generating online master's-level programs. Amid the merger between the former College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences and College of Education and Human Services and COVID-19 pandemic, the program lost 5 full-time faculty members. Faculty attrition necessitated a strategic reallocation of resources to areas of need, along with efforts to improve doctoral program efficiency and match capacity and funding availability. From 2020 to 2025, the School of Sport Sciences increased the tenure-track positions from 14 to 16, while non-tenure-track positions expanded from 8 to 11 and adjunct appointments from 3.35 to 4.73. This deliberate approach reflects a proactive response to support and sustain undergraduate program growth without overextending faculty resources.

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

- Yes  
 No

Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All  
 Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

The enrollment has ranged from 5 and 10 over the past five years, with 0% overall change. During the reporting period, the program graduated 4 students, ranging between 0 and 1 in any given year. The average time to degree completion in the reporting period is 4.5 years. The expected time to degree completion is 3-4 years. Graduates of the program are gainfully employed in roles that integrate teaching, research-informed practice, and high-level performance contexts.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.3. Provide a specific critique of the program's learning outcomes (especially related to clarity and appropriateness to degree level and type).

The outcomes need to state what the graduate "Will be able to do..." and not as "Should"

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

While the assessment results provided are positive, they appear to be anecdotal. The relation among program learning outcomes and the assessment results is not clearly explained. A well-defined assessment plan has not been presented by the program. While the program refers to certain ratings such as comprehensive exam, proposal, defense assessments, it is not clear how they are evaluated and used to assess and improve the program. While the scope and completeness of assessment data limit firm conclusions, the program has used available assessment and evaluation evidence to clarify doctoral benchmarks, reinforce ethical research expectations, and identify areas needing greater structure and consistency. The program improvement efforts have been also focused on better aligning program goals with the needs of professional learners by increased emphasis on applied inquiry and the dissertation-in-practice model.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The plan for any future improvements includes improving the consistency and completeness of assessment data collection across all EdD milestones to support more robust evaluation of student learning, clearer identification of developmental trends, and more intentional use of assessment evidence for program improvement.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The program maintains strong engagement with a broad network of external stakeholders who contribute to students' applied learning, research development, and professional socialization, including alumni and highly qualified external content specialists who serve on dissertation and thesis committees. These relationships support applied scholarship and professional mentoring but are currently constrained by geographic and scheduling limitations inherent in a primarily in-person model. A transition to an online EdD pathway would allow the program to leverage these existing partnerships more strategically.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program needs to formalize its assessment of learning practices in a plan and submit evidence of having implemented that plan.

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of the follow-up action(s) that should be taken by the program, the response expected to the Council (if any), and when. Most often, follow-up reports are due one or two years after the self-study was submitted.

Follow-up reports to the Council may:

- 1) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts).
- 2) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence.**
- 3) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan.**
- 4) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.**

- By March 1, 2027, submit an assessment plan and curriculum map. • By March 1, 2028, submit evidence of assessment of learning and explanation of how it is used to inform program improvements.

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

M.A. Literacy Education

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The program aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values. It offers advanced professional preparation for PK-12 teachers. This is a 100% online program and serves the land grant mission by preparing teachers to provide students with a high-quality education. The program is aligned with the International Literacy Association (ILA) Standards for the Preparation of Literacy Professionals and is grounded in the LE A3 Online Conceptual Model, both of which are widely recognized as leading frameworks in literacy education.

Q1.8. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program does not report any issues with infrastructure resources.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

#### Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program does not provide a brief summary of faculty adequacy, credentials etc. in this section. However, it does not report any problems in this area and answered "yes" when asked whether they had sufficient faculty to deliver the program. Also, they discuss their faculty resources in Q12.7 and state that two full professors and an assistant professor deliver the program. They also provide an overview of their credentials in that section.

#### Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

#### Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

Yes

No

#### Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

All

Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

Program enrollment has more than tripled since 2020, when they enrolled 25 students (~80 are reported enrolled for 2024-25). Part of the success of the growth of the program can be attributed to a partnership with the Kanawha County school system which fully funded 50 students in the program in 24-25. The program reports continued initiatives to maintain their pipeline into the future. The program faced challenges in the Covid years, and it does look like the program will suffer a dip in enrollment once its grant partnership with the Kanawha County school system runs out after May 2026. None of their required courses meets or exceeds the threshold of 30% DFW. Most students are from West Virginia, representing many of the state's counties, with the largest group from Kanawha County. Students also come from Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Utah, Texas, Idaho, and South Carolina. The online format supports access across the state. Students are at different stages in their lives and careers and actively engaged in school, church, and community leadership; 98% work in school roles. They contribute to research, publications, and conference presentations at state and national levels, and most graduates remain in schools as coaches, specialists, or classroom teachers.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

The self-study provides a curriculum map and evidence of assessment of student learning as well as findings for core program courses for 2023-2025. The data that they provide show that students are either achieving consistent performance or improvement across relevant metrics in their course work. The self-study also includes data for student scores on the Praxis II exam, with results from 2021–2024 showing that students are meeting national expectations, with first-attempt pass rates improving from 63% to 68% and mean scores consistently at or above the 165 passing threshold. The self-study notes that passing the exam is not required for program completion, and mentions that this fact may be depressing passing rates. However, the overall upward trend suggests stronger literacy content knowledge and pedagogical skills among candidates.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The program faculty completed the International Literacy Association (ILA) National Recognition self-study in December 2024. This self study was very thorough (although they frequently used the word "tenant" when they meant "tenet."). They also had a spring 2025 site visit. They also conducted a college-wide Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) self-study, and began work on the BoG report in Fall 2025. The self-study reports frequent faculty meetings to address curriculum, assessment, student support, engagement, and funding. They also report using data dashboards to monitor retention and completion rates. Student learning outcomes are grounded in ILA Standards and continuously reviewed and revised. The program actively recruits through collaborative partnerships with the West Virginia Department of Education, and coordination with WVU financial aid (e.g., TEACH Grant). There have been recent curriculum revisions based on self-study and student data.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

Yes. The program has an active Advisory Board that regularly works with faculty to support ongoing improvement. As part of the accreditation process, the program gathered feedback from employers through surveys and focus groups. Administrators consistently shared that graduates are well prepared, especially in professional practice, instructional technology, collaboration, leadership, and using assessment data. They noted a few areas for continued growth, including: planning for diverse learners, refining assessment practices, and strengthening classroom management. Feedback from surveys and focus groups reinforced this process. Graduates also highlighted the positive impact of the program on their teaching, but also suggested areas of improvement in the curriculum. The faculty has revised the curriculum in response to such feedback from stakeholders.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q8.2. Should the program be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q.12.4, Q12.5, Q12.6, and 12.7 of the self-study.

Yes

Maybe

No

Q8.3.

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

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

Distinction

Faculty

Graduates

Curriculum and Assessment

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

The program was awarded the National Recognition with Distinction by its accrediting body, The International Literacy Association (ILA). The award was granted after a self-study and a site visit. Currently six programs of 200 eligible programs hold the distinction.

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

The LE program consists of two full professors and one assistant professor, each of whom holds a PhD and other teaching certifications. The faculty have received awards and hold leadership positions in national organizations, and have secured \$800,000 in grant funding from Kanawha County.

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

The LE program is an important program for educational credentialing and training for teachers in West Virginia. Many of the students and graduates publish and present at professional conferences including the Association of Literacy Educators and Researchers, the West Virginia Reading Association, and the American Reading Forum. Most of the graduates remain in their teaching posts and very involved in their communities.

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

The literacy program has a well-developed assessment program with well-defined learning outcomes and program goals. In their most recent assessment cycle, the program achieved 100% acceptable and 82% distinguished ratings, which exceeded their accreditor's requirements of 100% acceptable and 65% distinguished ratings.

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

MFA Theatre

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study

The program aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values in several ways. First, through experiential and hands-on learning experiences both on- and off-stage, the program prepares students for careers in the performing arts. Second, the program offers theatrical cultural performances for the WVU, Morgantown, and extended West Virginia communities.

Q1.8. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program reports no significant issues related to program resources.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

#### Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program reports challenges regarding faculty adequacy. Specifically, the program describes losing three faculty lines following Academic Transformation and the colleges merger, which has made it difficult to maintain traditional course offerings. However, the program reports that a 1.0 FTE teaching line was approved in January 2026 and that a national search is currently underway with the intention of making an appointment for AY 2026-27.

#### Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

#### Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

Yes

No

#### Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

All

Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

The program reports enrollments in the 15-20 student range, with the 5-year enrollment trend steady and predictable. Because the MFA in Acting admits a cohort of 6-8 students every 3 years to facilitate course scheduling and faculty contact, there are "spikes" in completion rates that may appear as large swings (e.g., 55%) without understanding the context. Because of the high contact faculty mentoring in the program, DFW rates are quite low (2%). The program describes a number of specific student success indicators, reflecting placements in both theatre industry and academic positions.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

The program provides its accreditation self-study as evidence of student learning assessment and findings. Here the program describes its admission requirements, which include an interview and audition or portfolio review, a program concluding review, and final project or thesis. In terms of findings, in the self-study the program describes "strengths" and "areas for improvement." However, the program could be more specific describing how these areas for improvement stem from evaluation results and in how they relate to student learning outcomes as listed in the catalog.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

Here again, the program refers to its accreditation self-study. However, as noted above, the self-study document describes program "strengths" and "areas for improvement" but provides less information regarding improvements made during the review cycle and how these improvements stemmed from the evidence gleaned from student learning assessment/evaluation.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The program engages with guest artists, who may serve as mentors and professional contacts for students, through its Resident Artist Program and through membership in the University Resident Theatre Association.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The council recommends that the program provide a more detailed description of improvements made during the review cycle and/or planned for the future as a result of specific student evaluation and assessment evidence and as related to the program's student learning outcomes.

### Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

### Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

Continuance at the current level of activity

Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action

Continuance at a reduced level of activity

Identification of the program for further development

Development of a cooperative program

Discontinuance

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of the follow-up action(s) that should be taken by the program, the response expected to the Council (if any), and when. Most often, follow-up reports are due one or two years after the self-study was submitted.

Follow-up reports to the Council may:

- 1) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts).
- 2) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence.**
- 3) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan.**
- 4) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.**

- By March 1, 2027, determine if program learning outcomes can be revised and still in compliance with accreditation standards. If so, submit in CIM revised program learning outcomes. • By March 1, 2028, submit evidence of assessment of learning that aggregates what is done for individual students and explanation of how it is used to inform program improvements.

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

MHA Health Administration

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The program's mission "to develop leaders who transform health systems and services in West Virginia and beyond" aligns well with WVU's mission, vision, and values, especially the mission components of serving and leading others in West Virginia and the world.

Q1.8. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

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

See Q4.3, Q4.4, and Q4.6 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program reports no significant issues related to program resources.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

#### Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program reports losing four fulltime faculty members, one to retirement and three taking jobs elsewhere. This has led to an increase in teaching loads to at least 2-2 (more in some cases) and in hiring more adjuncts to staff classes. However, a search is underway for a new MHA program director (to replace the previous director who was one of the three departed faculty members) and this addition should alleviate the dependence on adjuncts.

#### Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

#### Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

Yes

No

#### Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

All

Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

The program reports a 5-year enrollment trend in which enrollment quickly ramped up from 15 students in the program's first year to a steady enrollment in the 40-student range in subsequent years (42 students currently). The program states that degree completing numbers are in line with regional competitor programs, with a 1-year change of -21% but a 3-year change of 36%. In an effort to become financially more competitive, the program has reduced the total hours required to 35. The program asserts that it has no courses with a DFW rate higher than 11%. The program provides an extensive sampling of student success indicators, including internship and permanent placements at several health systems and universities across the country.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

The program provides a curriculum map showing how student learning outcome competencies map onto specific courses in the curriculum. In addition, the program provides a spreadsheet of student competency ratings in various courses. However, the program does not provide a comprehensive student learning assessment plan nor does it describe how the competencies are assessed or evaluated. This section should be improved before the program's next program review.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

Here the program reiterates its successful student placements and other outcomes. However, it does not describe any improvements or plans for improvements stemming from the results of student learning assessment and evaluation.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The program has an Advisory Council comprised of students, faculty, and healthcare professionals. The council provides curricular and student association updates to the practitioners while they in turn provide suggestions for curriculum enhancements and provide feedback to students on classroom projects and learning activities. The program also has an Alumni Council comprised of program graduates. Both councils are involved with mock interviews and career panels.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The council recommends that the program develop and/or provide a comprehensive assessment of learning plan that describes the specific assessments used to evaluate student competency levels across the curriculum. The council further recommends that the program provide specific descriptions of how the program has used evidence collected through assessment and evaluation to make program improvements during the review cycle and/or plans for future improvements.

### Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes
- No

### Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

M.S. in Animal Physiology

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The program mission/vision is well-aligned with WVU's land-grant mission and emphasizes broad access, research, and engagement. The self-study clearly frames the degree as research-intensive with comparative physiology across farm animals and laboratory animals, which fits graduate research expectations and WVU's research/engagement priorities.

Q1.8. Are there are any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

On the evidence provided, resources appear adequate and accessible for current program operations.

Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

Faculty capacity appears adequate and stable for the program's current scale. The self-study reports the program has an adequate number of full-time faculty to meet the mission and indicates no significant negative impacts on faculty productivity from COVID-19 or the 2023 Academic Transformation process. The report also notes a relatively large pool of potential mentors (11 FTE faculty) relative to the program's small enrollment (4 students in Fall 2025), suggesting advising coverage is not a current constraint.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

Yes

No

Q5.2. Summarize the relationship between this program and the overall unit (department or school) profile in terms of enrollment, SCH production, and faculty FTE.

Also explain the program's projection within the academic industry and what the three-year outlook for the program is.

The program describes itself as small but stable: year-to-year enrollment down ~20%, but no net change over five years, averaging 4.6 students/year. The program expects continued competitiveness regionally (citing awards comparisons where WVU awarded degrees when peers did not in 2024) and indicates ongoing lab-based recruiting as the primary enrollment strategy. The three-year outlook appears stable, contingent on continued faculty recruiting and research opportunities. The School of Agriculture and Food has lost 50% of its SCH production at the undergraduate level and 25% overall. It has a low major-to-FTE ratio compared to the other Davis College Schools. It may need to plan for necessary attrition between this and its next program review cycle.

Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

All

Some

Q6.2. What was inaccurate or missing?

Broken web links. The program does not have published requirements in the Catalog.

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

Student success indicators are generally positive for a low-enrollment research master's program. Enrollment is reported as stable over five years, and completions show a recent increase (3 in 2024 and 6 in 2025, following a low point in 2023). Student support is described as advisor-centered with probation monitoring (3.0 GPA standard) and tools such as plan-of-study forms and a graduate handbook. Some evidence of student accomplishments (publications/presentations) is referenced as an attachment but a more thorough documentation should be compiled moving forward.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q6.5. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program should publish its required courses to the Catalog.

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

Assessment is the program's clearest gap. The self-study states learning outcomes were last updated on 9/27/2022 and that discussion occurred to update them again with a vote and planned CIM entry. However, the report's stated "most relevant finding" is that the program needs to be assessed and intends to implement an active assessment plan with follow-up and tracking. It will be imperative to see a strong assessment plan implemented and used for improvements at the next review cycle.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The strongest improvement evidence presented is student scholarly productivity (publications and presentations), referenced via an uploaded PDF list. This evidence should however reflect the outcome for all students/lab not just a few. The self-study also signals intent to improve assessment processes and graduate tracking (collecting permanent contact information to improve outcomes tracking). However, the narrative does not yet demonstrate a mature "assessment → findings → changes" loop. We reiterate that it will be imperative to see a strong assessment plan implemented and used for improvements at the next review cycle.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

External engagement is described mainly through research collaborations rather than a structured advisory mechanism. The self-study cites partnerships but also notes there is no compiled list and provides no formal documentation. The program could consider establishing a structured feedback mechanism from identified stakeholder, such as employers/alumni/agency partners such as annual surveys to inform changes in the curriculum and the evolution of skills needs.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program needs to develop a curriculum map but that has to happen after the program determines its required courses. It also then needs to develop an assessment plan based on that curriculum map and conduct assessment of learning. The program also needs to implement a formal structure and process for engaging with its external stakeholders.

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

### Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of the follow-up action(s) that should be taken by the program, the response expected to the Council (if any), and when. Most often, follow-up reports are due one or two years after the self-study was submitted.

Follow-up reports to the Council may:

- 1) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts).
- 2) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence.**
- 3) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan.**
- 4) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.**

- By March 1, 2027, submit an assessment plan and curriculum map. Once those have been developed and approved, by March 1, 2028, submit evidence of assessment of learning and explanation of how it is used to inform program improvements.
- By July 1, 2027, submit a report to the Provost's Office on the progress made to develop a stakeholder council. By March 1, 2028 submit a report to the University Council explaining how that body will be used to help the program identify core skills which can be reflected in changes to or the development of program learning outcomes as well as core curricula.
- By Nov 31, 2026, publish the program's required curriculum in CIM / Catalog. By March 1, 2027, submit an update to the University Council.

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

Athletic Training

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The mission of the Division of Athletic Training is to develop exceptional sports medicine clinicians who are uniquely qualified to excel within a dynamic healthcare system. Through a collaborative education, research and clinical practice model, the Division of Athletic Training emphasizes evidence-based decision making and applied research, utilizes state-of-the-art technology, and provides unique clinical experiences to cultivate competent and caring healthcare professionals. The program mission dovetails with the WVU mission to advance healthcare, access and opportunity, and integrating research to create inclusive healthcare professionals.

Q1.8. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

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

See Q4.3, Q4.4, and Q4.6 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

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

See Q4.3, Q4.5, and Q4.6 of the self-study.

The program's target enrollment is 15 students per cohort. Enrollment has demonstrated a consistent upward trajectory, despite the absence of admissions activity during the national recruiting cycle in Fall 2022, which resulted from a personnel issue that has since been resolved. In addition to this challenge, the program has experienced notable faculty turnover since its inception. The program had hired all the faculty and staff that were proposed as of the 2024-2025 academic year. However, since that time a faculty member and administrative staff member have left the university. There are currently ongoing searches to fill both positions, with the intention that both positions are filled by the end of the 2025-2026 academic year. This turnover in faculty and staff has continually plagued the program since inception and inhibited the ability for current faculty to update the overall program assessment plan as well as meet projected research goals for the division. The program is functioning as planned but needs stability in faculty and staff to reach full potential. Information about research and external support does is not available.

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q2.5. What are the University Council's recommendations?

The program needs to address its faculty adequacy and what number of faculty and students are necessary to maintain a viable program.

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program indicates they have not experienced significant issues with infrastructure.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

No the program does not have an adequate number of full time faculty. The program has experienced considerable faculty turnover with no original faculty remain. The program employs two faculty members who meet standards for designation as core faculty, along with one additional faculty member. Accreditation guidelines require a minimum of three full-time core faculty members. The program is utilizing an adjunct instructor to fulfill teaching responsibilities. Negatively impacted by COVID. The high rate of faculty turnover has adversely affected the program faculty's capacity to maintain productivity in teaching, research, and service activities. The Division is actively recruiting an additional faculty member to serve as a research lead. All faculty are qualified at the appropriate level.

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q4.3. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program and School of Medicine must address whether or not the program has the adequate number of faculty to deliver to its current students as well as what the viable projected enrollment could be.

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

Yes

No

Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

All

Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

Enrollment has shown a steady upward trajectory. The program's total enrollment capacity is capped at 30 students (15 per cohort) due to availability of clinical placements, limitations in laboratory facilities, and classroom space. The current total enrollment is 22 students. This is a 10% increase from 2024–2025. When the program started, there were 4 students. Comparative five-year data is not available for the program. It was noted that the program is involved in intense recruitment efforts. The number of degrees completed for the 2025 academic year was 8, a 33.3% decrease from 2024. Across all master's-level programs within the School of Medicine, Department of Human Performance, there has been an overall decline of 6.7% over the past three years and 31.1% over the past five years. The program has a high retention and graduation rate, therefore an increase to degree completion is likely if program enrollment continues to increase. There are no courses in the Athletic Training program where the DFW percentage is higher than 30%. The program has over an 80% rate of graduation and job placement as an athletic trainer. Prior to the 2024-2025 academic year, the percentage of students who passed the Board of Certification examination regardless of the number of attempts was 100%. In addition to high graduation, job placement, and examination rates, the program encourages student involvement in research. Students were actively engaged in leadership and research.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

A major revision to the curriculum occurred in the 2023-2024, based on faculty and student feedback. The program has revised all syllabi to update student learning outcomes to be in alignment with current CAATE standards. The program plans updates informed by the 2025-2026 BOG review. Additionally, the program also has plans to complete a review of the curriculum when the new faculty member is in place to ensure the current curriculum is meeting the needs of the program. For the 2024–2025 academic year, the program successfully achieved or exceeded all student learning outcomes as outlined in the academic catalog, using program determined metrics. Program assessment data was not provided due to reported faculty turnover.

Program metrics were not met, and this program is aware of the need for updates moving forward to ensure alignment with current program faculty goals, and programmatic accreditation standards. From the reviewers: The challenges this program have faced appear valid and per the applicant, efforts are underway to revise learning objectives and establish an updated assessment plan. To accurately evaluate student learning, this must be implemented prior to the next review cycle.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

When the current Division Chairperson assumed the role in August 2024, access to the original assessment plan was unavailable. Due to faculty turnover, the original plan had not been preserved or shared with current faculty members. Currently, efforts are underway to revise these learning objectives and to establish an updated assessment plan that reflects the current curriculum with current faculty feedback. Program reports all student learning outcomes were met. The program underwent a major curriculum revision in 2023-2024. To strengthen future assessment practices, the program completed a comprehensive mapping of all courses to the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE) curricular standards in 2024-25. Course syllabi have been updated to include overarching SLOs. Program effectiveness is assessed annually using overall program learning objectives and SLOs, including graduation rates, Board of Certification pass rates, job placement rates, and student satisfaction as measured by the Exit Survey. Faculty productivity and scholarly contributions increased in 2024–2025. A search is underway to hire an additional faculty member. Current faculty have developed a strategic plan for the Division and will continue to use programmatic data to create and refine a new assessment plan. Additional updates to the SLOs and assessment criteria will be implemented following the finalization of the Board of Governors (BOG) report.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The program has a very active alumni and engages with the alumni on an annual basis. In the summer of 2025 that program celebrated 50 years of athletic training education and had over 200 alumni in Morgantown to celebrate the occasion. In preparation for the 50th event, the Division Chair met with a faculty advisory group at a minimum of bimonthly to plan. The Division holds a alumni event at the National Athletic Trainers' Association convention annually to engage with alumni.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of the follow-up action(s) that should be taken by the program, the response expected to the Council (if any), and when. Most often, follow-up reports are due one or two years after the self-study was submitted.

Follow-up reports to the Council may:

- 1) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts).
- 2) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence.**
- 3) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan.**
- 4) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.**

- By October 1, 2026, provide an update to the Provost's Office on whether or not the program has adequate faculty and, if not, what steps are being taken to ensure that the program will have the adequate faculty required to deliver the program.

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

M.S., Counseling

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

Yes. The MS in Counseling program supports WVU's mission by preparing future leaders in mental health care. In line with the university's focus on advancing education, healthcare, and prosperity, the program trains counselors who are ready to serve underserved and rural communities.

Q1.8. Are there are any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program does not report any issues in this area.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program reports no issues in this area, and they note that they have adjuncts that are considered graduate instructors (GIs) if they teach graduate courses, and faculty vet those adjuncts based on university policy and procedures. Masters students are hired to teach some undergraduate courses as GTAs, and these are not IoR, and receive teacher training and feedback based on their SPOT evaluations.

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

Yes

No

Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

All

Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

With respect to enrollment trends, the program has a positive 30.5% enrollment trend over five years, which as the program notes, beats the graduate enrollment in the college (-31.2%) and the University (-17.3%). The degrees completed is also on an upward trend (5.3%). The self-study does not list any DFW course % (unclear why this is.). WVU Counseling students appear to be doing well, and their alumni have achieved accomplishments across presentations, publications, grants, and scholarships. Recent students have presented at state conferences on topics like grief support, motivational interviewing, and emotional regulation, while others have research under review in journals addressing advocacy and rural mental health. Students have also earned prestigious awards such as the NBCC Minority Fellowship and the Hazel Ruby McQuain Graduate Scholarship, and several have been accepted into competitive Ph.D. programs in counseling and psychology. According to a program's alumni survey, 100% of graduates secure their first counseling job within a year, with nearly half starting before graduation.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.3. Provide a specific critique of the program's learning outcomes (especially related to clarity and appropriateness to degree level and type).

Learning outcomes as listed may not match generally accepted protocols for learning outcomes. At present more like vague descriptions: "An environment that fosters your personal growth and development. Educational experiences that foster individual and group counseling skill development. Learning opportunities to support interests in diverse populations and cultures. Training in schools and clinical mental health settings that give you an opportunity to practice and integrate the skills learned in the classroom."

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

Program has a curriculum map that indicates courses that meet defined program objectives. It is clear, however, from the accreditation report and response that the counseling program will need to work on program self assessment: "... we again recognize that our program at WVU needs improvement in (1) a systematic program evaluation plan and (2) a systematic procedure for how program evaluation data will be utilized." The program acknowledges gaps in its current evaluation plan and they have supplied a detailed timeline for how they worked on this plan, and will continue to work on it, through surveys, assessment committee review of current practices. From their description in the CACREP Addendum, it appears that this work is ongoing and will continue through the end of academic year 2026. The report supplies syllabi that show detailed assignments, rubrics and learning outcomes, as well as exams and other detailed assessments.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The Counseling Program has been actively working to improve its program. In response to enrollment and market trends, and updates to CACREP standards, the program consolidated in 2023 into a single M.S. in Counseling degree with two Areas of Emphasis: (a) Clinical Mental Health Counseling and (b) School Counseling. They sunset their M.S. in Clinical Rehabilitation and Mental Health Counseling and streamlined their curriculum. In 2024–2025, the program further strengthened alignment with current CACREP standards by revising its key performance indicators (KPIs), curriculum map, mission and objectives, course sequencing, and student disposition evaluation process. The program has been working on developing and enhancing its program evaluation and assessment practices.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The WVU Counseling Programs engage regularly with external stakeholders to support program evaluation and strengthen field placement partnerships. The program convenes an annual Advisory Council which includes representatives from the Carruth Center, WVU Hospitals, Community Care, Mon County Schools, alumni, and other partners. The program has an active externship/field placement program in schools, hospitals, community mental health agencies, private practices, and addiction treatment centers. The program also maintains formal engagement with the profession through representation on the West Virginia Board of Examiners in Counseling. Following CACREP standards, the program also conducts annual alumni and employer surveys to assess job placement, licensure rates, and perceptions of program quality, using these data to inform continuous improvement efforts.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program needs to submit revised program learning outcomes to the Catalog and then to submit evidence of assessment of learning for those outcomes and how it will be used to inform program improvement and change.

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of the follow-up action(s) that should be taken by the program, the response expected to the Council (if any), and when. Most often, follow-up reports are due one or two years after the self-study was submitted.

Follow-up reports to the Council may:

- 1) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts).
- 2) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence.**
- 3) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan.**
- 4) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.**

- Revise and submit new program learning outcomes in CIM by Jan 30, 2027. • By March 1, 2028, submit evidence of assessment of learning and explanation of how it is used to inform program improvements.

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

MS Nutritional and Food Science

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The programs vision, mission and core values all connect directly to the mission of WVU to commit to creating a diverse and inclusive culture that advances education, healthcare and prosperity for all by providing access and opportunity; by advancing high-impact research; and by leading transformation in West Virginia and the world through local, state and global engagement.

Q1.8. Are there are any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

No issues have been reported

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program indicates they have enough faculty; however, they have experienced challenges to impact their productivity. This includes 1. Academic Transformation (AT), reorganization in Davis College, reductions in force (RIFs), merger of Plant & Soil Sciences (PSS) and Animal & Nutritional Sciences (A&NS) into the School of Agriculture and Food Systems (SAFS), Changes in Davis College administrative leadership, unification of Davis College, WVU Extension, and the WVU Center for Community Engagement (CCE) into the Division of Land-Grant Engagement (DLGE) 2. Revisions to promotion and tenure expectations 3. COVID19 pandemic. The result was a sustained climate of instability that has affected morale and long-term planning. The university has undergone repeated budget cuts, which further constrained its ability to meet the expectations. Also, expectations for faculty performance have increased, particularly with the recent changes to annual evaluation documents, and the need to take on students and committee positions from faculty who were RIF'd. These revised criteria require higher levels of output, while the institutional support necessary to meet those expectations has decreased. This mismatch between expectations and available resources makes it challenging to carry out all aspects of our appointments effectively and sustainably. Laboratories were shut down during COVID-19.

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

Yes

No

Q5.2. Summarize the relationship between this program and the overall unit (department or school) profile in terms of enrollment, SCH production, and faculty FTE.

Also explain the program's projection within the academic industry and what the three-year outlook for the program is.

The master's program is healthy and stable in enrollment and the academic market and industry also are stable. The School of Agriculture and Food has lost 50% of its SCH production at the undergraduate level and 25% overall. It has a low major-to-FTE ratio compared to the other Davis College Schools. It may need to plan for necessary attrition between this and its next program review cycle.

#### Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All  
 Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

The enrollment for the MS in NFS has remained stable. The 5-year change is 0%, while the 3-year was an increase of 38%. Over the past 3 year, the average enrollment has been 18 students. The program graduated 49 students during this review period with the majority completing their degree in 2 years. Currently, there is not a course in this program that has a DFW percentage higher than 30%

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

#### Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

The program does not effectively evaluate student learning outside of the dietetics students which is robust and aligned with accreditation and licensure standards. Rather they provide limited information on critical writing, reflecting many observations such as "All students are demonstrating the ability to critically evaluate the literature in their field of study and answer fundamental research questions by completing not only a graduate seminar but also passing their oral defense. We are clearly seeing that these students are applying research findings to their professional practice by their major case study presentations in a clinical setting. Finally, our students are finding jobs in all areas of Nutrition, as Registered dietitians, educators, and researchers." By its next program review, the program should figure out how to extend the kinds of practices it employs for its dietetics students to the others students in the program.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The program implemented a "Plan of study" to enhance movement through the program and enhance time to completion. The AoE in Dietetics was created for the required curriculum, a means to track a sub-group of the students enrolled in the NFS MS program.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The NFS MS program incorporates external stakeholders in a variety of ways including: Academic, Industry, Advisory and Entrepreneurial. Academically, faculty rely on graduates, colleagues, and collaborators at other institutions to serve on graduate committees and collaborate with research efforts. Additionally, the Preston County Workshop Inc., and WV Farmers Market Association, other local very small produce growers or poultry meat producers are Shafer Heritage Farm, Mountain Harvest Farm LLC, are heavily involved in providing produce for research, developing proposals, and granting access to their facilities to conduct research. Some of their stakeholders are current preceptors, alumni and employers. They attend yearly meetings, provide input for changes to curriculum, rotation and accreditation. They also participate in the review of applications, interviews and selection of the DI classes. Additionally, many make up the composition of graduate committees as content experts. The faculty have long-standing relationships with previous graduates and collaborators all over the country and utilize these connections to assist in student enhancement of learning. Some faculty have external funding with stakeholders that enable students to conduct research in alternative areas i.e farms, production sites, etc.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

By the next program review, expand assessment of learning practices to all students in the program.

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

### Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

MS Physical Education

Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

Q1.5. Explain why the program is not in good standing with its accrediting body. Provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to good standing.

The program indicated there was not an accrediting body.

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The School of Sport Sciences empowers students through experiential, future-focused, and industry-connected learning to elevate health, wellness, and performance across dynamic industries. Through instructional innovation, meaningful discovery, and strategic partnership, we engage with individuals and communities to shape the future of sport, physical activity, and beyond. This mission reflects WVU's land-grant commitment to education, healthcare, economic development, and prosperity by advancing student-centered, experiential learning that promotes health, wellness, and performance across a broad range of communities and industries. Through instructional innovation, applied research, and strategic partnerships, the School of Sports Sciences supports the University's priorities of putting students first and engaging meaningfully at the local, state, and global levels. Our graduate degrees in the MS in Physical Education program deliver high-quality, cost-effective, accessible, and industry-relevant professional preparation designed to prepare learners to lead, teach, coach, and consult in dynamic sport and physical activity settings. These flexible programs offer evidence-based, experiential instruction that equips learners to meet the evolving demands of the global sport industry. Program graduates are prepared to make a meaningful impact through ethical leadership, responsive practice, and transformative engagement in sport and education.

### Q1.8. Are there are any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

### Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

### Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

### Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program reported no issues interfered with either delivering program requirements or experiences to its students or the students' ability to complete the program in a timely manner. The program reported an emergent concern regarding institutional readiness and resourcing for the new upcoming federal digital accessibility requirements. Given the scope of the changes required (spanning instructional materials, platforms, and third-party content) strategic planning and investment are needed to ensure compliance and uphold WVU's commitment to equitable access. At the local level, the School of Sport Sciences initiated proactive steps to support digital accessibility compliance in advance of the federally prescribed deadline. The instructional design team is currently reviewing graduate-level online courses to ensure alignment with WCAG 2.1 Level AA standards, focusing on closed-captioning, document formatting, screen reader compatibility, and navigable course structures. This individualized course review process is helping identify areas for improvement and guiding faculty in implementing accessible instructional practices. While these internal efforts demonstrate their strong commitment to inclusive pedagogy, broader institutional support and resourcing remain critical to meet the federal compliance deadline given competing priorities associated with our day-to-day operations.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

Across all majors within the MS in Physical Education Program, the School of Sport Sciences employs an adjunct-driven instructional staffing model to strategically engage industry leaders in curriculum development and delivery. They reported this model allows the School of Sport Sciences to preserve its limited full-time faculty resources for the delivery of on-campus courses and manage the instructional cost of its online majors. To support this model, full-time faculty collaborate with industry professionals and instructional designers to develop master course shells for all online courses. A limited number of full-time faculty teach online courses during fall and spring terms for program continuity (n=~4), while also staffing a small number of on-campus graduate courses (n=~2). However, the sustainability is uncertain given the lack of clarity surrounding the new budget model and its implications for the college, school, and program resource stewardship. The program identified national trend of increased enrollment during COVID-19 followed by a post-pandemic decline were consistent with those observed in their period; however, no data supporting this was provided. The program reported that a merger within the college contributed to the recent declines in online program. All faculty are qualified. Faculty productivity was not reported.

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

- Yes  
 No

### Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All  
 Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

The program experienced a total enrollment decline (~144 students; -45.3%). Current enrollment level aligns with the program's pre-pandemic level. The program is expanding use of accelerated degree pathways and certificate-to-degree pathways, enhancing curricular differentiation through work-aligned experiences, including experiential learning, residencies, and competency-based credentials, increased digital marketing, and hired a coordinator of online education to increase enrollment. Across the five-year period, program completions increased by 34.1%. Completions declined after AY 2022 but remained substantially above the AY 2020 baseline through AY 2025, indicating normalization rather than collapse in degree productivity. Degree completion trends indicate that the program has remained effective at moving enrolled students to completion, even as total enrollment declined. There are no courses in the major requirements for which the DFW percentage is higher than 30% for students in the program. The program currently lacks systematic data to support broad claims of student success. The program has identified a high-impact, resource conscious strategy by piloting a LinkedIn alumni group.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q6.5. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

Enrollment loss in this program has been significant. Coupled with overall enrollment decline nationally, the program needs to determine what minimum enrollment size will be viable and what number of faculty are necessary to deliver a much smaller program. The program needs to follow up with the Council on enrollment trends over the next several years.

### Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.3. Provide a specific critique of the program's learning outcomes (especially related to clarity and appropriateness to degree level and type).

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

For Professional Knowledge badges were awarded to 93.2% eligible students, Professional Practice badges were awarded to 91.5% eligible students, and Professional Leadership badges were awarded to 88.6% eligible students. Disaggregated results show that Physical Education Teacher Education demonstrates high attainment across PLOs, Sport Coaching demonstrates high attainment in Professional Knowledge and Professional Practice, Sport Management demonstrated balanced attainment across PLOs, and Executive Sport Management shows greater variability by outcome. Digital badge assessments provided faculty with detailed insight into student competency attainment, enabling targeted instructional adjustments, clearer expectations, and improved scaffolding for applied and leadership focused learning. At the program level, analysis of badge completion data supports curricular coherence by confirming alignment among outcomes, instruction, and assessment. Recommendation: in future reviews, include graduation rates and years to completion.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

All online course shells were developed using best-practice standards. Each course was reviewed at the end of each term of delivery to ensure content accuracy and functional quality. A major innovation during the review cycle was the creation of the Digital Learning Hub. The hub offered curated resources, training modules, and on-demand professional development focused on designing course content, developing course content, delivering course content, and instructional technology use, and transitional resources for content migration and course delivery to BlackBoard Ultra. Course development has prioritized intuitive design, with consistent layouts, guided learning tools, and standardized course orientation and student help materials. Personalized video messages, individualized feedback, and virtual office hours connection, supported student motivation and persistence.

These higher-touch practices improved engagement and contribute to stronger student learning outcomes. The program has adopted universal design principles to ensure inclusivity and accessibility. All course materials include captions, transcripts, and screen reader compatibility. Multiple content formats (videos, readings, interactive activities) support diverse learning styles. A review of 40 graduate-level online courses is underway for compliance with WCAG 2.1 Level AA standards. Accessibility checks include closed-captioning, document formatting, color contrast, keyboard navigation, & overall course clarity.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

A key strength of the MS program is its ongoing partnership with industry professionals, who play an integral role in course design, development, and delivery. These collaborations ensure that course content remains aligned with current industry standards and emerging trends, enhancing both relevance and rigor. Industry experts regularly contribute to curriculum planning and serve as instructors, bringing real-world experience directly into the learning environment. Additionally, the program has embedded industry-relevant digital badges into coursework to recognize and showcase discrete, marketable skills. These micro-credentials, developed in consultation with practitioners, provide students with tangible evidence of their competencies and can be shared on professional platforms such as LinkedIn to support career advancement and employer visibility.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program needs to submit evidence of assessment of learning and how that assessment is used to inform program improvements and changes, including those that could be used to potentially increase enrollment through market differentiation.

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of the follow-up action(s) that should be taken by the program, the response expected to the Council (if any), and when. Most often, follow-up reports are due one or two years after the self-study was submitted.

Follow-up reports to the Council may:

- 1) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts).
- 2) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence.**
- 3) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan.**
- 4) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.**

- By March 1, 2028, submit evidence of assessment of learning and explanation of how it is used to inform program improvements. • Submit a follow-up report on program enrollment to the University Council each of the next three academic years. These reports are due as follow-up reports in March of each year beginning March 1, 2027.

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

M.S. in Plant and Soil Sciences

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The program is well-aligned with WVU's land-grant mission through graduate education and applied research addressing soil health, water quality, climate resilience, pest management, and sustainable food systems. The self-study clearly links training and research to service of WV stakeholders and related industries, indicating strong mission fit.

Q1.8. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

Resources appear adequate and accessible for current scale of activity

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

#### Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

Faculty capacity is a material concern. The program explicitly reports the number of full-time faculty is not adequate to meet the mission in terms of dependable course rotation and advising redundancy, and describes negative productivity impacts from Academic Transformation plus faculty attrition (notably a 2025 departure in horticulture/plant sciences). The mitigation strategy—leveraging allied faculty across schools and interdisciplinary committees—appears functional but fragile (high workload, limited redundancy). This area could potentially require specific action tied to staffing/workload and course coverage planning.

#### Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

#### Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

Yes

No

#### Q5.2. Summarize the relationship between this program and the overall unit (department or school) profile in terms of enrollment, SCH production, and faculty FTE.

Also explain the program's projection within the academic industry and what the three-year outlook for the program is.

The program is small relative to the unit but its trends mirror broader declines. Reported figures indicate: ~50% enrollment decline over five years for the consolidated MS, steeper than university and college baselines; SCH production also declined substantially, attributed primarily to faculty capacity reductions rather than demand. The program notes regional MS award trends in comparable fields are generally declining, while WVU awards have remained roughly stable (2–5/year across the contributing fields) and the consolidation into a single MS with AoEs is intended to improve structure and alignment. The three-year outlook is stabilization or modest growth only if faculty capacity and funded research mentoring capacity stabilize/improve; otherwise, maintaining quality at a smaller scale is the realistic projection. The School of Agriculture and Food has lost 50% of its SCH production at the undergraduate level and 25% overall. It has a low major-to-FTE ratio compared to the other Davis College Schools. It may need to plan for necessary attrition between this and its next program review cycle.

### Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All  
 Some

### Q6.2. What was inaccurate or missing?

some broken links/missing web pages. Why is the program not represented in the Catalog?

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

Student success signals are mixed but generally acceptable given scale. Enrollment has declined (reported 50% over five years; 8 MS students in Fall 2025), consistent with reduced faculty mentoring capacity. Degree completions appear stable overall with a reported uptick in AY2025 (five MS and one PhD), and the program reports no >30% D/F/W issue in required courses. The self-study states graduates are finding positions in industry and academia, and describes advising/monitoring practices (GPA floor, probation interventions, regular advisor meetings, early plan-of-study requirements; handbook in development). The main risk to student success is program capacity and continuity (faculty attrition/restructuring), rather than evidence of widespread academic difficulty among enrolled students.

### Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

### Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

Assessment activity is present but appears to need stronger documentation/regularization. The self-study reports recent review/revision of student learning objectives and curriculum on 9/18/2025, and provides a brief findings summary: most students assessed as competent/exemplary in research-area knowledge (13 of 15), with a small number not meeting expectations due to individualized circumstances; and strong near-term placement for MS graduates (all seven from 2022–2023 placed within one year). The self-study also notes assessment will “restart” with a new APC, which suggests a transition period; the Council hopes to see clearer evidence artifacts (direct measures, curriculum map, annual cycle) in the next cycle.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The program identifies improvement plans focused on better recruitment fit, increased structure in graduate experiences (guided coursework pathways by subdiscipline, teaching opportunities, presentation/travel, internships, lab community), and continued intensive mentoring leading to scholarly outputs. These are sensible and aligned with stated program goals, but the self-study provides limited evidence that improvements to date are directly driven by an established assessment system (it is presented as a forward-looking planning during/after restructuring). These plans should be converted into time-bound actions with measurable indicators (recruitment yield, time-to-degree, publications/presentations, placement, annual assessment reporting).

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The program reports no formal/structured stakeholder mechanism, relying instead on informal professional networks and industry connections. The program could consider establishing a structured feedback mechanism from identified stakeholder, such as employers/alumni/agency partners such as annual surveys to inform changes in the curriculum and the evolution of skills needs.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program should develop a formal way to engage with external stakeholders.

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

### Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of the follow-up action(s) that should be taken by the program, the response expected to the Council (if any), and when. Most often, follow-up reports are due one or two years after the self-study was submitted.

Follow-up reports to the Council may:

- 1) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts).
- 2) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence.**
- 3) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan.**
- 4) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.**

- By July 1, 2027, submit a report to the Provost's Office on the progress made to develop a stakeholder council. By March 1, 2028 submit a report to the University Council explaining how that body will be used to help the program identify core skills which can be reflected in changes to or the development of program learning outcomes as well as core curricula.

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

M.S. in Wildlife and Fisheries Resources

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The mission of the M.S. in Wildlife and Fisheries at West Virginia University is to prepare graduate students to serve and lead as highly skilled professionals addressing complex fish and wildlife conservation challenges in West Virginia and beyond.

Q1.8. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

No issues reported

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

#### Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

they indicate sufficient. 38 publications since last review. i did not see how many faculty, composition etc.

#### Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

#### Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

Yes

No

Q5.2. Summarize the relationship between this program and the overall unit (department or school) profile in terms of enrollment, SCH production, and faculty FTE.

Also explain the program's projection within the academic industry and what the three-year outlook for the program is.

Program enrollment has remained steady since 2021 but seen a 20% decrease over the entire review period. It remains a viably sized masters program. SCH production is aligned with enrollment trends. Industry outlook remains strong for both undergraduate and graduate programs in this space.

#### Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All
- Some

Q6.2. What was inaccurate or missing?

time to degree is not clearly stated. the learning outcomes are limited.

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

The MSWFR enrollments were steady year-to-year at 26 students while the 5-year trends showed a modest decline. The highest enrollment in the period was in 2021 at 34 students. From 2022 through 2025 enrollment has been steady at 25-28 students. This level of fluctuation is common with these types of MS programs that are nearly entirely supported via research grants to the faculty. The enrollment trend in the MSWFR program compares favorably to the 5-year university baseline of -17.3% and the Davis College baseline of -29.9%. Enrollment in MS programs in the School averaged about 54 over the period and declined -6.8% over the 5-year change level.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes
- No

Q6.5. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

Publish revised learning outcomes.

### Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.3. Provide a specific critique of the program's learning outcomes (especially related to clarity and appropriateness to degree level and type).

they state the following "The learning outcomes were introduced in 2020 and have not been reviewed. The program will be tasked with that in 2026."

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

There is very limited assessment of learning. The group state courses NRS 797, 698 and defense, seminar with no reported data. they do state a plan to collect this data and reflects Assessment of learning outcomes will be through scoring of the student's thesis defense. SNRE has developed a rubric and scoring metric to be used by the student's graduate committee to assess how well the student performs in each LO. Additional data will be collected annually on the total number of peer-reviewed journal submissions per student during and within 2 years of graduation stemming from their doctoral research in these programs. Next steps reflect (1) Gather data as thesis defenses occur. Summarize when we have at least 10 data points. (2) Compile journal submission tracking for M.S. student tracking metrics. Gather data annually for summarization.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

Assessment is a work in progress. There is no current data to assess improvements in this program. While the number of publications by MS WFR students has been compiled, no progress with implementing assessment rubrics for the thesis defense have taken place yet. We anticipate that during 2026 the assessment by the thesis committee rubrics will be implemented by the Davis College and completion of the rubrics by the thesis committee will be required prior to approval of the ETD submission.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

no evidence provided just the following "Many of the students in the MS in Wildlife and Fisheries work closely with stakeholders (state and federal biologists) as part of their thesis research."

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program needs a formal assessment plan, curriculum map, and then to submit evidence of implementing that assessment plan.

### Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

### Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of the follow-up action(s) that should be taken by the program, the response expected to the Council (if any), and when. Most often, follow-up reports are due one or two years after the self-study was submitted.

Follow-up reports to the Council may:

- 1) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts).
- 2) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence.**
- 3) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan.**
- 4) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.**

- By March 1, 2027, submit in CIM revised program learning outcomes. • By March 1, 2027, submit an assessment plan and curriculum map. • By March 1, 2028, submit evidence of assessment of learning and explanation of how it is used to inform program improvements.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

MS in Forestry.

Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

Q1.5. Explain why the program is not in good standing with its accrediting body. Provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to good standing.

NA

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The mission of the M.S. in Forestry is to prepare graduate students to serve and lead as highly skilled professionals addressing complex forest and natural resource challenges. It is grounded in the University's land-grant mission, the program emphasizes practical, hands-on education, rigorous scientific training, and meaningful engagement that prepare students for impactful careers in research, management, and public service. Consistent with the land-grant responsibility to serve society, the program prepares leaders to address global change and other human-driven stressors affecting forest systems. Through mentored research, teaching, and outreach, students develop the communication, leadership, and technical skills necessary to steward forest resources and strengthen communities locally and globally

### Q1.8. Are there are any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

### Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

### Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

### Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

No issues have been reported

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program checks yes to having enough faculty. But, no information is provided on the composition, etc, of their faculty.

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

Yes

No

Q5.2. Summarize the relationship between this program and the overall unit (department or school) profile in terms of enrollment, SCH production, and faculty FTE.

Also explain the program's projection within the academic industry and what the three-year outlook for the program is.

The MS in Forestry has about 40% of the School's total enrollment at the master's level and is generally a stable and healthy program.

### Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All  
 Some

### Q6.2. What was inaccurate or missing?

I did not see the time to completion nor was there any required courses published. There is a table indicating that 30 credit hours are needed but the timeline and plan of study for this was absent.

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

The enrollment trend for the MS in Forestry has nearly doubled from a low of 12 students in 2023 to 23 students in Fall 2025. The average enrollment over 5 years was 17. The 5-year change was +21.1%. The group indicates that, based on these trends and the continued need for highly trained persons in Forestry they expect the program to persist.

### Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

### Q6.5. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program needs to publish its required courses to the Catalog.

#### Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

the program used the Thesis and Defense Evaluation Form/Rubric and the Graduate survey as evidence of learning. They state that "At least 90% of the students rated as satisfactory/excellent in each learning outcome evaluated." & " At least 90% of graduates obtained a job related to their field or were admitted to a Ph.D. program". The concern is that only 3 students provided an evaluation for part 1. Also, although 100% of all graduates were employed, only 58% of the graduates obtained a job in a forestry or related field or were admitted to a PhD graduate program. While this does not meet the performance target, it should be noted that the remaining 48.18 % of graduates were still employed in other fields and are still planning on getting a job in forestry or a related field. Of note, MSF does not have a curriculum map as the only required course is "graduate seminar". Graduates with a MSF readily find employment in their field or PhD positions. This indirectly speaks to the success of the program in LOs 1-3. The group realizes that the current LO's need revision. Additionally, a more effective (automated) way of ensuring timely assessment of the MS students is needed. This is currently a work in progress

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The assessment of learning outcomes, including the analysis of MSF alumni surveys, for this report represents the first look at self-study for the MSF. With an average of ~6 graduates from the program annually, one BOG cycle was needed to gather enough information to assess LOs. While the program did not change during the review period, the alumni survey indicated that the MSF program should offer a broader range of graduate courses. The faculty has responded by adding one new graduate course to date and updating four during 2025-26. The Program faculty will meet in 2026 and review these findings and revise Student Learning Outcomes, and discuss adding additional coursework.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The program engages with recent alumni through regular alumni surveys and with "older" alumni via the Forestry and Natural Resources Alumni Association. The group also suggests that "the recent creation of the Advisory Board to the Appalachian Hardwood Research Center (AHRC) reinvigorated ties between our academic program and employers in the field."

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

Once the program has published its required courses to the Catalog, it needs to develop a curriculum map based on those. Then it needs an assessment plan and to provide evidence of actually doing assessment. It also needs to develop a regular way to engage with its external stakeholders.

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of the follow-up action(s) that should be taken by the program, the response expected to the Council (if any), and when. Most often, follow-up reports are due one or two years after the self-study was submitted.

Follow-up reports to the Council may:

- 1) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts).
- 2) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence.**
- 3) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan.**
- 4) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.**

• By March 1, 2027, submit an assessment plan and curriculum map. Once those have been developed and approved, by March 1, 2028, submit evidence of assessment of learning and explanation of how it is used to inform program improvements. • By July 1, 2027, submit a report to the Provost's Office on the progress made to develop a stakeholder council. By March 1, 2028 submit a report to the University Council explaining how that body will be used to help the program identify core skills which can be reflected in changes to or the development of program learning outcomes as well as core curricula. • By Nov 31, 2026, publish the program's required curriculum in CIM / Catalog. By March 1, 2027, submit an update to the University Council.

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

MSN Nursing

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The MSN program aligns with the mission, vision, and values of West Virginia University by advancing its land-grant commitment to improving education, healthcare, and prosperity. The program supports a diverse and inclusive learning environment and prepares nurses to deliver high-quality, equitable care that directly benefits West Virginia and broader communities. Through evidence-based teaching, applied scholarship, and service, the program contributes to high-impact research and community engagement. Its design for working professionals promotes access and opportunity while maintaining academic rigor. Students develop competencies in clinical leadership, interprofessional collaboration, and healthcare technology, positioning them to address evolving healthcare challenges. The program also reflects WVU's core values of service, curiosity, innovation, respect, and accountability by fostering reflective, lifelong learners who are prepared to improve health outcomes and serve diverse populations at local, national, and global levels.

Q1.8. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program appears to have adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

From the materials provided, the program has adequate faculty and no issues have been identified.

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

- Yes  
 No

Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All  
 Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

Enrollment in the MSN program declined during and immediately after COVID-19, consistent with national AACN trends (-9.5% over five years). However, enrollment has rebounded since 2023, increasing from 108 to 124 students in 2025. This recovery reflects targeted recruitment efforts, including outreach at conferences, engagement with undergraduate students, and coordinated marketing with WVU Online. Graduates demonstrate strong success outcomes, with 100% employment across healthcare systems and rural clinics. Certification pass rates remain high (96% in 2024), indicating strong preparation and timely completion aligned with professional standards. As a practice-focused degree, scholarly outputs (e.g., publications) are not primary indicators of success. There is no evidence of high D/F/W course concerns, and time to completion appears consistent with program design. The primary issue—enrollment decline—has been actively addressed through strategic recruitment and appears to be improving. Continued monitoring is recommended, but current trends suggest the issue is being effectively resolved.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

The MSN program demonstrates a comprehensive, competency-based approach to student learning assessment aligned with CCNE standards, AACN Essentials, and NONPF competencies. Beginning in Fall 2023, all courses were systematically mapped to national standards, ensuring alignment between program outcomes, course activities, and assessments. Diverse methods, including case studies, scholarly papers, presentations, exams, and clinical evaluations, measure competency development. Assessment findings (2020–2024) indicate strong performance, with certification pass rates of 89.2%–96% and completion rates of 67%–92%. Student work samples demonstrate high achievement aligned with outcomes. A key issue identified in 2023 was misalignment with updated AACN Essentials and gaps in experiential learning. In response, the program revised outcomes, updated courses, and added in-person competency experiences. Faculty development and ongoing course review support implementation.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

During this review cycle, the MSN program made improvements driven by assessment findings. In 2023, data identified misalignment with AACN Essentials and gaps in experiential learning. In response, the program revised learning outcomes, fully mapped the curriculum to national standards, and implemented competency-based updates across courses. Student feedback also led to reinstating on-campus learning, with two required in-person experiences beginning in 2026 to strengthen hands-on competency development. Student outcomes remain strong, with certification pass rates up to 96% and recent completion rates at 90%. Program rankings have also rebounded, indicating improved competitiveness. These changes were clearly supported by assessment data, including accreditation standards, student surveys, and performance metrics, demonstrating sound evaluation practices. The program has also initiated ongoing course review processes and faculty development to ensure alignment and continuous improvement. Future improvements should focus on monitoring the impact of the revised curriculum and in-person experiences on student learning, as well as maintaining alignment with evolving professional standards. Continued use of student feedback and outcome data is recommended to sustain program quality and responsiveness.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The program demonstrates a formal and structured approach to engaging external stakeholders. Governance structures explicitly include students, alumni, employers, and clinical partners as part of the "community of interest," with required representation on key committees (e.g., Curriculum, Assessment and Evaluation). These stakeholders have access to materials and voting roles, indicating meaningful participation in program oversight. Additional mechanisms include advisory board involvement, student feedback processes, surveys, and engagement with clinical partners and employers through program activities. Evidence also shows stakeholder input informing mission and program revisions.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes
- No

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes
- No

Q8.2. Should the program be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q.12.4, Q12.5, Q12.6, and 12.7 of the self-study.

- Yes
- Maybe
- No

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

MSW

Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The larger mission of WVU is to improve the lives of communities and constituents of West Virginia through education, research, and service. The MSW program trains graduate students to become professional social workers who have the skills to engage in practice at multiple levels and with multiple constituencies. They offer a curriculum specialization of "advanced integrated practice," which ensures that students are trained to practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. This means that students graduate with skills to practice in either direct clinical work and administrative, policy, or management positions in the social service field. Their mission is to train graduates who will be prepared to provide social work services to individuals, families, groups, and communities, with an emphasis on interdisciplinary practice in rural areas. As such, their graduates are prepared to provide services in multiple roles, which expands their capacity to provide service to address social problems via multiple means. Additionally, they emphasize the values of social justice, empowerment, racial equality, and empowerment throughout our curriculum, all of which are important values that support the mission of a land-grant institution. As such, their mission aligns well with that of the university, as our focus is on preparing graduates who can provide service directly back to underprivileged members in the rural community.

### Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

### Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program did not identify any significant issues with providing students with student accommodations, ability to schedule required classrooms, access to adequate technological infrastructure, access to adequate technological support, access to adequate physical infrastructure (labs, performance spaces, equipment, etc.) during this review period.

### Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program indicated the adequacy of the number of full-time faculty necessary to meet the mission of the program with no concerns related to COVID-19 or Academic Transformation. All faculty have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and two or more years of post-master's social work degree practice experience. It was further report that faculty carry teaching loads commensurate with their faculty role and faculty size is commensurate with the faculty's teaching responsibilities across both program options in the MSW program. It was noted that both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty engage in a range of scholarly activities including research, manuscript development, scholarly presentations, and grant activity. The faculty size across is commensurate with scholarly responsibilities expected of faculty and they regularly engage in professional development through participation in the Society for Social Work Research annual conference, the annual NASW-WV spring conference, and the North Central Field Directors Consortium. Faculty also engage in professional development by making scholarly presentations and by participating on panels and committees to influence social work education and advanced integrated practice.

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

- Yes  
 No

Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All  
 Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.). *Both the primary and secondary reviewer should consult the data file provided.*

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

The program experienced a 14.2% enrollment decline (University decline [-17.3%], Eberly College decline [-49.8%]). On-campus program decreased by 38.1%, the online program increased by 12.8%. A 2022 decision to cap online enrollment due to limited adjunct and overload resources contributed to recent declines. With additional resources now available, the program plans to scale up online enrollment, strengthen recruitment, and increased outreach to BSW students through an accelerated application process, expanded information sessions, recruited from other WVU undergraduate programs and local colleges, improved the website, enhanced social media and internal marketing, implemented a provisional license pathway for WV social workers, and adopted early decision and rolling admissions. Planned strategies include reducing application essay requirements, streamlining the application process, extending deadlines, launching a full-time advanced standing online option, admitting students each semester, and developing accelerated undergraduate-to-MSW pathways. Collectively, these efforts aim to increase enrollment across both on-campus and online programs. They typically have between 60-90 MSW graduates each year. There was an overall increase of 131.7% in degrees awarded (University [+6.3%], Eberly College [+15.7%]). The average time to completion for the MSW degree was 1.5 years. As cohort degree plans range from 1-3 years in length, most students are graduating as outlined.

#### Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

Across years, the overwhelming majority (97%-100%) of our MSW students met the competency benchmarks outlined in their assessment plan for both online and on campus. Regarding the implicit curriculum, the majority of students (between 80%-100%) endorsed positive responses to all of the items across years. Some students noted that there are limited opportunities to learn from students of different backgrounds. They actively aim to recruit diverse students, but this was often challenging due to the demographics of our state and limited ability to fund international students. Overall, results indicate that the majority of our MSW students are meeting the established benchmarks and are satisfied with the program's educational environment. It is important to note that these data were collected during the time period when both COVID-19 pandemic and Academic Transformation occurred.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

Most students are meeting (or exceeding) the established benchmarks and are satisfied with their learning environment. However, they have initiated a few processes for providing additional support for students to help maintain this level of achievement and support student retention. They encouraged a high-touch approach to advising, including proactive communication with students in our programs, identifying and intervening early on with students who are encountering difficulties, and the implementation of a "Student Success Protocol" to identify and support students who might benefit from more intense academic and professional advising. They increased the accessibility of both online and on-campus course material. They completed a large-scale overhaul of our online and digital course material to ensure global accessibility, in which they collaborated closely with the Office of Student Accommodations and the Eberly online design team. A new student support series, which will include synchronous, online sessions designed to address a variety of topics relevant to MSW students, such as licensure, resume building, job searching in social work, financial aid policy changes, and other issues related to student support and retention. In sum, we continue to strive to create a supportive, collaborative, and open learning environment, in which students can access instructors for academic and other support as they need.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The MSW program reported continuously engaging with their accrediting body, CSWE, in order to stay up to-date on new policies and updates to social work curriculum. Additionally, they engaged with both the state and national level of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW). This organization provides their ethics and values that guide the social work profession. Additionally, the program engaged with external stakeholders year-round on a daily basis, primarily through Field Education Office but also through community-engaged research conducted by their faculty. There was no specifics of how the program engages with external stakeholders.

#### Q9.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes
- No

#### Q10.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

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

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

Doctor of Pharmacy

Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

Q1.4. Are there additional elements of the self-study included at the request of the dean's office (if so, they would be questions beginning with "5")?

If so, what is the reason for those? See (Q1.8 or Q1.9, as applicable) of the self-study.

NA

Q1.5. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

No issues reported

### Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program reports adequate faculty, and the appendix provides a faculty CV with a list of accomplishments, including grant funding. 227 publications and Total WVUSOP Faculty Reported Grants 2021-2023 = 99

### Q5.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

All

Some

Q5.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.). *Both the primary and secondary reviewer should consult the data file provided.*

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

The program states, "Enrollment declined from Fall 2020 through Fall 2023. In Fall 2025, we are seeing an increase in enrollment that we hope will continue to trend upwards in the coming years." However, numbers are limited in this report, with a 5-year trend (-9.4%) reported at the end. The program states that they have implemented several new initiatives since fall 2024 to increase enrollment and matriculation, including increasing the scope of recruitment activities across the state and in neighboring states, expanding the number of affiliation and articulation agreements with colleges/schools in WV and surrounding states, development of new recruitment activities including partnering with 4H and M-Tech and implementation of our first summer recruitment camp for high school students. They are also in the process of expanding our Direct Admit Pathway program and are inviting students in the Healthcare Pathway with pharmacy interest to join our PHAR 199 – Orientation to Pharmacy course in the spring 2026 semester. This course is taught by pharmacy faculty and staff, so our goal is to foster relationships with those students to increase matriculation to the School of Pharmacy. The School of Pharmacy's degree completion trend has trended down since AY 2021 as a result of our decrease in enrollment. They believe that come 2027, this trend will improve due to their recruitment efforts. Again, numbers are missing There are no courses in the major with a DFW rate above 30%.

#### Q6.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

#### Q6.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q6.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

The program provides extensive documentation on various aspects of assessment. They use FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS focusing on grades and formative -geared to provide feedback for improvement. They also use Comprehensive Examinations - NAPLEX and MPJE scores are part of this. AACP Surveys also support the student learning and assessment. No issues are reported

Q6.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The committee chairs submit reports with assessment outcomes and improvement plans, which are discussed in Executive Council and faculty meetings to inform and discuss actions. It was challenging to find this information in the massive 746 page document. some "stuff" are listed below. Some changes reflect: the three foundational spring P1 pharmaceutical sciences courses (Drug Chemistry [and Biotechnology], Biopharmaceutics and Pharmacogenomics, and Biochemical Pharmacology) are sequenced purposefully to build conceptual interrelationships, with each further divided into two modules. A recent change involved adding a "mini-capstone" after every two modules across courses to further develop practice connections and integrate learning. In 2023-24, an integrated exam question plan was implemented to enhance students' higher level thinking skills and application of previously learned concepts to later courses (Appendix 3-2). The Curriculum Committee completes a course review process with each course evaluated on a staggered basis (see Standard 10). Additional feedback is now provided to coordinators on incorporating DEI and integrated assessments, practicum rigor, and curricular hoarding ( Appendix 10-14). Course reviews are accompanied by a request to coordinators to provide a plan for addressing proposed changes, to more effectively 'close the loop.'

Q6.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The program regularly engages with external stakeholders. The Leadership Council meets with the Dean and other School of Pharmacy leaders twice yearly. The members of this Council serve as advisors regarding program/curricular changes made or contemplated (e.g., provide evaluative feedback, guidance), goodwill ambassadors with the community, and contacts with business and industry who might assist our program in achieving its mission/goals. The School's Office of Admissions and Student Affairs (OASA) maintains strong relationships with pharmacy employers, who regularly share internship and employment opportunities that are distributed to students through newsletters and postings. The School also benefits from strong alumni engagement.

Q7.1. Dean's Office Additional Elements

If the program's dean's office requested additional elements be included in the review, they would be found in Q5.2/5.3, Q5.4/5.5, Q5.6/5.7, Q5.8/5.9, and Q5.14/5.15.

Please provide a summary and analysis, as appropriate, of the information provided in the self-study in response to these additional elements.

NA

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q8.2. Should the program be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q.12.4, Q12.5, Q12.6, and 12.7 of the self-study.

Yes

Maybe

No

Q8.3.

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

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

Distinction

Faculty

Graduates

Curriculum and Assessment

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

The WVU School of Pharmacy was ranked #44 in the Best Health Schools-Pharmacy category of the U.S. News and World Report's 2024 edition of "America's Best Pharmacy Schools." This places the program among the top third of pharmacy school programs nationwide (44 out of 141 programs).

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

The program and thus faculty consistently have received between \$3.7 and \$4.2 million federal and foundation funds, during the BOG review time of 2020-2025. Further, the funding amount has held steady since the last review. The received dollar amount places us within the rankings of 38 to 44 for Schools of Pharmacy (141 total) for federal and non-federal grant funding totals. Moreover, the tenure track faculty have published an average of 3.1 to 4.2 primary research articles/faculty per year over the BOG review time frame.

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

graduates consistently achieved residency match rates above the national average. From 2020 to 2025, match rates ranged from 68% to 90%, compared to national averages of 63% to 82%. Even in years with lower rates nationally, WVU maintained strong performance, demonstrating a commitment to preparing students for successful residency placement. West Virginia University ranks in the top 21 percent in the nation with a 93% first-time pass rate. Among the 142 schools and colleges of pharmacy whose graduates took the exam nationwide, WVU's Class of 2025 exceeded the national average of 87% by six percentage points. In 2025, 96% of students had obtained a job or residency/fellowship by graduation.

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

Following its most recent comprehensive review in 2024, the WVU School of Pharmacy's professional Doctor of Pharmacy program was granted full accreditation by the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE) for the maximum 8-year term. This outcome reflects the program's strong alignment with ACPE's rigorous standards for quality and continuous improvement. The School is in compliance with all 25 ACPE standards, reflecting ACPE's confidence in the program's ongoing assessment processes and commitment to sustained excellence. Four standards are being monitored to ensure that changes from the Academic Transformation and curricular modifications continue to be successful, with data thus far (e.g., recent graduate performance on the national licensing exam (NAPLEX) indicating they are.

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

Ph.D. in Animal and Food and Nutritional Sciences

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The PhD in Animal and Food and Nutritional Sciences supports WVU's R1 land-grant mission by training research leaders who produce meaningful, externally funded work in animal health, food systems, and nutrition—areas that matter directly to West Virginia's economy and communities. It also reflects WVU's service mission by working closely with industry partners and focusing on practical, real-world solutions while preparing graduates for leadership roles in academia, industry, and government.

Q1.8. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

Based on the self-study, physical and technological resources appear adequate to support doctoral-level research and timely degree completion.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program reports sufficient full-time faculty to deliver required coursework. However, Academic Transformation, budget reductions, reorganization into the School of Agriculture and Food Systems, revisions to promotion and tenure expectations, and COVID-related lab shutdowns negatively affected faculty productivity and morale. The loss of technical staff and increased expectations for external funding have increased faculty workload. Despite these challenges, research productivity remains substantial, with an average of 3.8 publications per tenure-track faculty per year and 91% of tenure-track faculty serving as PI or Co-I on funded external grants totaling approximately \$27.7M (2021–2025).

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

- Yes  
 No

Q5.2. Summarize the relationship between this program and the overall unit (department or school) profile in terms of enrollment, SCH production, and faculty FTE.

Also explain the program's projection within the academic industry and what the three-year outlook for the program is.

The program appears to be a strength within the School. It reports a 29.4% five-year enrollment increase and indicates it is the only doctoral program in the School with positive five-year growth. Fall 2025 enrollment is reported at 22 students, described as "above average." The three-year outlook is stable or modestly increasing, contingent upon stabilization of federal funding cycles and continued alignment of doctoral recruitment with externally funded research. The School of Agriculture and Food has lost 50% of its SCH production at the undergraduate level and 25% overall. It has a low major-to-FTE ratio compared to the other Davis College Schools. It may need to plan for necessary attrition between this and its next program review cycle.

### Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All  
 Some

### Q6.2. What was inaccurate or missing?

Web links not functional. There are no published curricular requirements in the Catalog.

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

Student success indicators are generally described as strong. Enrollment has increased over the five-year period, with a reported 100% increase over the last three years following a temporary 2023 decline. Average time to degree for 18 graduates during the review period was 3.79 years, which is efficient for a doctoral program. The program highlights substantial student research productivity, conference participation, and publication activity however the documentation of this productivity is partial and should be more systematic.

### Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q6.5. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program needs to publish its required curriculum in the Catalog.

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

Assessment is an area requiring improvement. While learning outcomes were updated in 2022, the self-study acknowledges that annual assessment was not consistently conducted during the review cycle and that no formal assessment plan was implemented. The appointment of a new Assessment Program Coordinator (APC) and planned curriculum revisions represent positive steps, but the program currently lacks a documented, cyclical, evidence-based assessment system demonstrating direct measures of learning outcomes.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The program cites improvements including implementation of learning outcome-guided assessment discussions, development of degree progression requirements, required Plans of Study within the first year, and curriculum revisions pending CIM approval. However, these changes are described as recent or forthcoming rather than fully implemented and documented through assessment findings. These improvements, while strengthening the structure of the program, were not implemented to improve student learning as a result of identified weaknesses in student progress.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

External engagement is robust but informal. Faculty maintain strong industry partnerships, multi-state research collaborations, and alumni engagement events. However, there is no structured documentation of stakeholder feedback tied to program improvement. Considering the existing network of stakeholders, the program might consider implementing an explicit feedback mechanism.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program needs to develop an assessment plan and perform assessment of learning at the program level. It also should formalize the robust but unstructured engagement with its external stakeholders.

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of the follow-up action(s) that should be taken by the program, the response expected to the Council (if any), and when. Most often, follow-up reports are due one or two years after the self-study was submitted.

Follow-up reports to the Council may:

- 1) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts).
- 2) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence.**
- 3) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan.**
- 4) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.**

- By March 1, 2027, submit an assessment plan and curriculum map. Once those have been developed and approved, by March 1, 2028, submit evidence of assessment of learning and explanation of how it is used to inform program improvements. • By July 1, 2027, submit a report to the Provost's Office on the progress made to develop a stakeholder council. By March 1, 2028 submit a report to the University Council explaining how that body will be used to help the program identify core skills which can be reflected in changes to or the development of program learning outcomes as well as core curricula. • By Nov 31, 2026, publish the program's required curriculum in CIM / Catalog. By March 1, 2027, submit an update to the University Council.

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

Ph.D., Educational Theory and Practice

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The program prepares students for careers in higher education and policy, which broadly aligns with WVU's mission and values to expand access to education.

Q1.8. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

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

See Q4.3, Q4.4, and Q4.6 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program reports no problems in this area.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program reports challenges from Academic Transformation and the COVID-19 pandemic. Particularly, the program cites structural changes and financial limitations that have limited research and travel funds. These limitations have led to reputational challenges in student and faculty recruiting, which the program has addressed by increased marketing and recruitment efforts. These efforts have led to a 95.83% increase in applications from 24 to 25 admission cycles. They also report an uptick in support for travel and research. As reported: "Faculty have won the WVU Foundation Outstanding Teaching Award, various research fellowships, and external funding from competitive sources and agencies (e.g., National Science Foundation, West Virginia Department of Education, American Educational Research Association). Faculty expertise and achievements have also been recognized by various professional organizations (e.g., American Educational Research Association, International Literacy Association, National Rural Education Association)."

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

- Yes  
 No

### Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All  
 Some

### Q6.2. What was inaccurate or missing?

The link provided does not lead to a "plan of study."

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

Enrollment trends are stable and growing slightly: "In the 2024-2025 academic year, fall enrollment was 24, exceeding the approved target enrollment (of 20). In the most recent academic year, the fall enrollment was 32, representing positive year-over-year change of 10.3% in enrollment, against negative enrollment trends at university levels. At the same time, the Educational Theory and Practice program has also realized relatively stable persistence in student enrollment, with fall-to-fall continuance rates equaling or exceeding 80.0% across the previous five years. For basic reference, the mean fall-to-fall program continuance has been 90.15% across the period of review." Degree completion trends in this relatively new doctoral program remain within a reasonable range but are not yet stable enough to support firm conclusions. Completions increased from 2 in AY22–23 to 5 in AY23–24, then returned to 2 in the most recent year, suggesting variability rather than a clear upward trajectory. The program anticipates a steady-state range of approximately 4–6 graduates annually but acknowledges that additional years of data are necessary to establish reliable benchmarks. Year-to-year fluctuations may be influenced by the cited part-time enrollment options, federal funding trends, and external pressures such as uncertainty in academic job markets and hiring trends.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

The program has a well-developed curriculum map. The program supplied an assessment summary which included student surveys as well as course-based assessments. The data and summary indicate students are meeting benchmarks and are generally satisfied with the program. Over 85% of graduates report securing employment in areas related to their doctoral study.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

The program continues to improve the doctoral experience through curricular refinement and enhanced assessment practices. Recent changes include adjustments to the plan of study to better support students' development and mentorship. The program reports a slight decline in fall-to-fall retention rates. In response the program has launched initiatives to strengthen culture and climate, including a peer mentoring program and a student organization. The program also acknowledges that they need to do more to improve assessments and to gather more data on student completion rates. The program will particularly focus on strengthening early academic support for students so that they can meet the challenges of the later stages of the program.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

They provide no evidence of engagement with stakeholders, perhaps because that activity is undertaken by the School of Education generally, or by other programs within that school. Nevertheless, if this is a case of mere oversight or lack of attempt to engage with external stakeholders, then perhaps the program can be encouraged to build outreach to alumni and other stakeholders.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

### Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

PhD Health Services and Outcomes Research

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The program provides its mission statement along with a detailed description of how its mission aligns with both the School of Pharmacy's mission and the university's mission. In particular, the program's mission aligns by delivering high-quality education that promotes innovative research benefiting health locally, nationally, and globally as rooted in WVU's principles of service, curiosity, respect, accountability, and appreciation..

Q1.8. Are there are any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program reports no significant issues regarding program resources.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program has experienced a net loss in faculty head count of 3 (7 in 2021 to 4 in 2026) but has successfully sustained program offerings through the use of adjuncts. Due to federal government policy changes and reduced assistantships, enrollment has fallen from a high of 14 in 2021 to a projected 8 in 2026. However, additional external and internal funding sources have been cultivated to provide for doctoral fellowships and grants, which has helped to stabilize support for the students. Despite these headwinds, the faculty have maintained a high level of research productivity while also engaging in teaching, mentoring, and service activities.

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

- Yes  
 No

Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All  
 Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

Enrollment during the review period has been in the 10-13 student range with 2-3 students completing the program each year. Enrollments have declined since the prior review period due to faculty attrition and government funding cuts. The program aims to maintain a smaller enrollment ranging in the 8-10 student range in alignment with faculty numbers. The program highlights a number of student success indicators including competitive awards, fellowships, recognitions, high research productivity figures, and placements in various industry and academic roles. The program reports steady graduation and time to completion rates that compare favorably with peer institutions. The average time to completion is 4.7 years. Finally, no courses in the program have a DFW percentage higher than 30%.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes
- No

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes
- No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes
- No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

The program describes the direct assessments used to evaluate student learning. These include the dissertation project, which involves the completion of three peer-reviewed publications, and comprehensive examinations, involving both written and oral components. Students are also required to complete a teaching training program, after which they complete at least 9 hours of teaching, in which teaching performance is evaluated by program faculty. Despite these descriptions, the program does not provide specific assessment results nor are the assessments linked with the program learning outcomes.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The program provides a robust overview of a number of program improvements made during the review cycle. However, the program does not specifically describe whether the improvements resulted from evidence acquired through assessment and evaluation.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The program engages with external stakeholders, especially program alumni. An annual alumni dinner is held in conjunction with the annual ISPOR meeting and alumni also engage directly with students in program-hosted events, both virtually and in person, to provide valuable networking and mentoring opportunities focused on internships, career development, and placement. The alumni also support students financially by funding Graduate Student Travel Grants and the Dr. Suresh Madhavan Award.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

Continuance at the current level of activity

Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action

Continuance at a reduced level of activity

Identification of the program for further development

Development of a cooperative program

Discontinuance

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

Human and Community Development, PhD

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The program explains that its mission aligns with the mission of WVU as a land-grant R1 institution committed to advancing education, research, and public service. The program prepares scholars to address real-world challenges across West Virginia and beyond. The program promotes community-engaged research, collaboration with government, non-profit, and educational partners, and supports WVU's commitment to improved quality of life, economic opportunity, and social well-being. It is student-centered and research-intensive and reflects WVU's mission to create opportunity, foster innovation, and serve the public good.

### Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

### Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

No issues with program resources regarding adequate and accessible infrastructure are reported.

### Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program reports not having an adequate number of full-time faculty to meet the mission of the program. This program has no dedicated faculty but relies on faculty from the AGEE BAgr and these have decreased in number during the reporting period from 7 down to 3.3 in Fall 2025. Reasons for this included 4 retirements, 2 faculty accepting jobs elsewhere, 1 RIF, and one faculty moving to an administrative role. In addition, another faculty has taken a job elsewhere and as of Feb 2026 current FTEs are at 2.2. Transformation helped adjust the program with respect to enrollment, but did not allow for adjustment to service courses, graduate course offerings required by licensure, and a high number of transfer students. Program has decreased number of times service courses to institution are offered in response. The program reports this is not affecting program students' progress but may make a bottleneck for other majors in the college. Adjustments to maintain quality for students have included increased teaching, supervision, and mentoring loads for faculty (2 of whom are untenured and up for promotion this year). There have also been increased service workloads on committees due to need for representation and few faculty eligible. This is affecting faculty available research time. Program has requested a Non TT faculty to assist with teaching and service. Council suggests that the need for additional faculty to deliver and meet this mission of this program is addressed.

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

Yes

No

Q5.2. Summarize the relationship between this program and the overall unit (department or school) profile in terms of enrollment, SCH production, and faculty FTE.

Also explain the program's projection within the academic industry and what the three-year outlook for the program is.

The degree accounts for 2/3 of doctoral students in the School, making enrollment trends significant to graduate capacity. Enrollment has decreased but this is in alignment with reductions in faculty numbers. The HCD PhD program does not have specific faculty lines dedicated to the program but is supported by faculty from AGEE and other areas of the School. Faculty capacity has declined from 7 to 2.2 FTE as of February 2026. The program addresses this and related issues further in the self-study and has worked to strengthen the program in multiple ways, both aligning enrollment with capacity and developing a more clear and consistent degree structure, expectations, and assessment plan. The program anticipates enrollment to remain stable or modestly decline aligning with faculty FTE and that target of 3-4 graduate annually will be maintained. The School has lost a significant amount of its enrollment and SCH production through enrollment decline as well through departmental restructuring. Its major-to-faculty and SCH-to-faculty ratios indicate that it has been brought within institutional norms.

Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

All

Some

## Q6.2. What was inaccurate or missing?

I did not see any information on anticipated time for completion. This is addressed later in the self-study but is not in the catalog.

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.). *Both the primary and secondary reviewer should consult the data file provided.*

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

Enrollment has declined 12.5% since most recent BOG review. Program compares this to 8.8% decline at University level and 16.5% decline at college level for same degree level and reports this is generally aligned with broader trends. Program describes decline as partly structural and partly intentional. With fewer faculty, program has aligned enrollment with advising capacity. Program has also worked proactively with stalled students to ensure steady advancement toward graduation. Degree completion rate has remained stable since most recent BOG review. Graduates per year range from 2-5 and average 2-3 per year. This is slightly below reported peer average of 3.2 annually but program notes peer comparison data included institutions with much larger faculty size. Approved time to completion is 3-6 years. Full-time students are positioned to complete within 3 and part-time more likely 3-5. During this review cycle the program has strengthened degree requirements, clarified sequencing and benchmark expectations, and implemented advising checkpoints to reduce delays. Internal tracking shows average completion at 4.65 years (full-time average 3.6 and part-time 4.7). Current students now have a more structured and predictable plan designed for 3-5 year completion window. No courses with DFW percentage higher than 30% are reported. Doctoral students regularly present at professional conferences; several have co-authored pubs, and have secured positions in various fields.

## Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

Program attaches evidence of all students' years to graduation as one form of evidence of student learning assessment. Program attaches curriculum map that shows where program learning outcomes (PLOs) are covered in the curriculum and the type of assessment to be used for each outcome, including benchmarks. Program attaches assessment plan for PLOs and lists action triggers for when data reaches point of concern. Actual assessment data is not included in attachments. Program notes that under this cycle there was not a formalized assessment plan other than tracking graduation rates, time to degree completion, and post-graduation placement. The program has developed a plan to assess PLOs during this review cycle with clear benchmarks and embedded assessment points. The current year is the first full cycle of implementing this plan so assessment findings directly tied to PLOs are not yet available. The program notes it will provide these in the next BOG cycle. Council suggests a mid-point check in on assessment outcomes prior to the next BOG review may be helpful for the program.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The program has made several improvements over the review cycle. It transitioned to a stand alone degree during academic transformation and now has more independent administrative control. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) were revised beginning in 2024 and the Plan of Study (POS) was restructured to clarify sequencing, expectations, and benchmarks. Defined checkpoints now align coursework, comprehensive exams, proposal defense, and dissertation milestones. These revisions are not yet entered in CIM (as stated by the program) but implementation is underway to ensure the assessment framework is viable prior to submission. A formal assessment plan has been developed with embedded assessment measures. The program is in first year of this process and plans to finalize and codify the assessment process after the May data review meeting. In addition, advising expectations were strengthened and average time to degree completion now falls within a defined 3-6 year window. Enrollment has been aligned with faculty advising capacity to sustain quality mentorship. Faculty productivity has remained strong. Overall program has transitioned from loosely structured model to a clearly outcomes-aligned doctoral program with defined expectations, strong advising oversight, and a newly developed frameworks for assessment and improvement. Council suggests that increasing the number of faculty may help the program implement and sustain these improvements.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

Due to individualized nature of the program, the program states that there is not one formal external advisory board. Stakeholder engagement is embedded in the program functions as students regularly work with higher education, extension, nonprofit, schools, community organizations and so on as part of their research and applied scholarship. Faculty mentors and committees connect students with collaborators aligned with their focus area. The program reflects its mission with engagement through relationships, research partnerships, and applied real-world contexts.

Q9.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q10.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

PhD Kinesiology
-----------------

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.6. Is the program seeking specialized accreditation? Why or why not?

See Q2.4 of the self-study.

The program is not seeking specialized accreditation. The Association for Applied Sport Psychology (AASP) accreditation requires a specific set of designated courses to be embedded within a single degree program. This model does not align well with the structure and intent of the sport, exercise, and performance psychology major, which prioritizes research training, scholarly independence, and individualized academic pathways over the completion of prescribed coursework. There is no national accreditation body for the coaching and teaching studies major.

#### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The program aligns with WVU's mission, vision, and values by preparing scholar-practitioners through integrated research, applied practice, teaching, and community engagement that promotes health, wellness, and performance across a broad range of communities and industries.

#### Q1.8. Are there are any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

#### Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

#### Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

### Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program has adequate and accessible infrastructure resources.

### Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

### Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program has an adequate number of full-time faculty necessary to meet the mission of the program. These same faculty members serve the EdD program as well. Their teaching responsibilities are distributed across undergraduate majors and minors as well as revenue-generating online master's-level programs. Amid the merger between the former College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences and College of Education and Human Services and COVID-19 pandemic, the program lost 5 full-time faculty members. Faculty attrition necessitated a strategic reallocation of resources to areas of need, along with efforts to improve doctoral program efficiency and match capacity and funding availability. From 2020 to 2025, the School of Sport Sciences increased the tenure-track positions from 14 to 16, while non-tenure-track positions expanded from 8 to 11 and adjunct appointments from 3.35 to 4.73. This deliberate approach reflects a proactive response to support and sustain undergraduate program growth without overextending faculty resources.

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

Yes

No

Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

All

Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

The enrollment has ranged from 22 to 40 students over the past five years, showing a 22.7% overall increase. The peak of enrollment at 40 students in 2022 was related to pandemic and merger-related faculty attrition which led to a temporary accumulation of enrolled students beyond typical program capacity or desired cohort size. Since 2023, enrollment has declined and subsequently stabilized in the mid to high 20s which aligned with the program's enrollment target of 20-30. During the reporting period, the PhD program averaged 5.67 graduates per year, increasing by 14.3%. 5 additional students graduated in Fall 2025. The average time to degree completion and the expected time to graduation in the Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology major was 4.18 and 4-5 years (includes the concurrent completion of the MS in Counseling program.), in the Coaching, and Teaching Studies major was 3.39 and 3-4 years. The PhD students in the Kinesiology doctoral program have produced over 60 first- and co-authored publications in the related journals and secured multiple external grants to support their research.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

While the assessment results provided are positive, they appear to be anecdotal. The relation among program learning outcomes and the assessment results is not clearly explained. A well-defined assessment plan has not been presented by the program. While the program refers to certain ratings such as the core doctoral benchmarks, committee ratings, qualifying, comprehensive, proposal, and dissertation defense, it is not clear how they are evaluated and used to assess and improve the program. During the review period, the program has implemented some improvements including the standardization of research benchmark expectations and the introduction of scoring rubrics to promote consistent evaluation. However, no data has been presented.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The program has not described any plan for any future improvements.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The program benefits from the expertise of highly qualified external content specialists who serve on dissertation and thesis committees, providing complementary perspectives and enhancing the rigor of doctoral scholarship. Students regularly interact with practitioners and organizational partners, including those connected to the Center for Active WV, which serves as a key context for community-engaged research, evaluation, and outreach.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program has no structured assessment of learning that informs program improvements.

### Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

### Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

Continuance at the current level of activity

Continuance at the current level of activity with specific action

Continuance at a reduced level of activity

Identification of the program for further development

Development of a cooperative program

Discontinuance

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of the follow-up action(s) that should be taken by the program, the response expected to the Council (if any), and when. Most often, follow-up reports are due one or two years after the self-study was submitted.

Follow-up reports to the Council may:

- 1) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts).
- 2) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence.**
- 3) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan.**
- 4) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.**

- By March 1, 2027, submit an assessment plan and curriculum map.
- By March 1, 2028, submit evidence of assessment of learning and explanation of how it is used to inform program improvements.

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

PhD Natural Resource Economics

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The Natural Resource Economics (NRE) PhD program aligns with the mission and vision of West Virginia University by advancing its land-grant commitment to education, research, and service that benefits West Virginians. Its focus on sustainable development, natural resource management, and regional economic growth directly addresses the state's reliance on natural resources and rural communities. The program prepares students with expertise in economic theory, policy analysis, and quantitative methods to tackle challenges such as environmental sustainability, energy transitions, and rural development, key priorities tied to WVU's vision of innovation and prosperity. Its emphasis on applied, high-impact research supports WVU's R1 mission by generating knowledge that informs policy and practice. Graduates' placements across academia, industry, and public sectors further demonstrate this impact. Additionally, the program strengthens WVU's national reputation by attracting strong doctoral students and producing competitive graduates, supporting long-term economic and environmental sustainability in West Virginia.

Q1.8. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

No significant issues identified

### Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

### Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

Due to academic transformation and the loss of the Division of Resource Economics and Management (REM), program faculty was reduced by 60% from 10 to 4. These faculty are qualified by their credentials. Faculty shortages are being addressed by consolidating courses, streamlining curriculum and assessments (e.g., replacing exams with a mentored paper), and reducing program size. These changes maintain quality with fewer faculty, though they require adjustments to class size policies and limit overall student capacity. GTAs have full responsibility in ug course delivery. Loss of hard-funded PhD assistantships has weakened recruitment, as peer programs guarantee funding. New policies limiting support to TA or external grants which are scarce in this field, reduce program size. Since early PhD years require full funding, restoring base support is critical to sustain training quality, competitiveness, and strong graduate placements. The student to faculty ratio in 2026 was reported as being either 3.3 or 2.5 depending on calculation method. No money is associated with GTAs in the NRE program. 11 students received GA funding totaling \$202,584.52. Of these, 3 were externally funded (\$34,804.82; 1 split-funded) and 9 were state funded (\$167,779.70; 1 split-funded), showing the majority of support comes from state funds. Faculty publication output rose from 2.78 (2020) to a peak of 4.67 (2022), then declined to 3.40 (2023) and 3.14 (2024), remaining above 2020 levels overall.

### Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

### Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

Yes

No

### Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All
- Some

Q6.2. What was inaccurate or missing?

Expected time to completion is not noted

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

Enrollment declined from 21 (2021) to 12 (2025), largely due to the loss of college-funded assistantships, which has constrained recruitment. Despite this, degree production remained relatively stable, with 13 PhD graduates (2021–2025), plus additional completions in late 2025 and related programs, only slightly below the prior cycle (15). Time to completion averages 4.7–4.9 years, consistent with disciplinary norms. There are no reported high D/F/W courses. Student success indicators remain strong. Graduates secure high-quality placements across academia (e.g., Virginia Tech, Purdue, UC Irvine), industry (e.g., State Farm, Bank of America), and public sector roles, reflecting strong research training and professional preparation. Students also contribute to research, presentations, and externally funded projects (see Appendix A). The primary challenge is reduced funding, limiting program size and recruitment. The program has maintained quality outcomes despite contraction, but long-term sustainability will depend on restoring stable funding and faculty capacity.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes
- No

Q6.5. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program's decline in enrollment, loss of faculty expertise, and continued reliance on students unfunded students raises serious questions about whether or not the program is viable.

### Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.3. Provide a specific critique of the program's learning outcomes (especially related to clarity and appropriateness to degree level and type).

The learning outcomes are overly narrow and lack specificity for a doctoral program. They omit key expectations such as independent research design, advanced methodological competence, teaching/mentoring, and ethical/professional practice. Outcomes are not clearly measurable and do not reflect the breadth or rigor expected at the PhD level.

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

The program demonstrates strong evidence of student learning through multiple assessment points, including qualifying exams, mentored research papers, dissertation proposals and defenses, and research outputs such as publications and presentations. These are aligned with a structured curriculum map and supported by detailed rubrics evaluating research quality, methods, and communication. Assessment findings indicate students consistently meet learning outcomes. Students pass key milestones, produce mentored research papers, and successfully defend dissertations.

Evidence shows mastery of economic theory, quantitative methods, and applied research skills. A key issue has been the strain on faculty resources in maintaining both qualifying exams and mentored papers. To address this, the program is eliminating the written qualifying exam and relying on the second-year mentored paper as the primary milestone. This aligns with peer programs and emphasizes applied research assessment. This change appears appropriate and improves efficiency while maintaining rigor. Overall, the program shows strong student learning outcomes, and recent adjustments effectively address resource constraints while preserving quality.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The program improved student outcomes, including strong scholarly productivity, competitive placements, and post-graduate success. Students earned awards, secured internships, and obtained positions in top universities, industry, and public sectors, reflecting strong learning outcome mastery. Assessment data (qualifying exams and mentored research papers) confirm students meet expectations in research and communication. The program also improved assessment by shifting toward the mentored research paper as a primary milestone, aligning with best practices and reducing faculty burden. These changes are supported by assessment evidence and faculty capacity considerations, showing data-informed decision-making. The move toward applied, research-based assessment strengthens alignment with doctoral competencies. Future plans include continued curriculum and assessment streamlining. However, priorities should include restoring graduate funding and faculty capacity to support recruitment and sustainability. Ongoing monitoring of outcomes is recommended to ensure continued effectiveness.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

No information was provided for Q10.2 or Q10.3

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

If the program is not discontinued then it has work to do around assessment of learning, developing some form of external stakeholder group, and more meaningful post-graduate tracking of students.

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q9.3. Provide an explanation of follow-up action(s) that should be taken by the program, response expected to the Council (if any), and when.

The program should be discontinued as a full and dedicated major and, instead, have some its current coursework transitioned into an Area of Emphasis in another relevant PhD program in the Davis College. 1) By September 30, 2026, submit in CIM a program deactivation for the PhD in Natural Resource Economics. 2) By September 30, 2026, work with WVU Admissions to remove the program from the graduate application. 3) The college and school may submit an Area of Emphasis (or similar curriculum) in this area on whatever timeline is appropriate.

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

PhD in Natural Resources Science

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The program's mission is to prepare scholars, scientists, and leaders in their field. The program advances discovery and is grounded in the land-grant tradition, fostering interdisciplinary scholarship, research excellence, and meaningful engagement with stakeholders and resource managers. Students are prepared to contribute to research and advance stewardship of natural resources in West Virginia and beyond. It aligns with the mission of WVU.

Q1.8. Are there are any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program notes no issues with resources related to accessible infrastructure.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program notes adequate number of faculty to meet its mission. The program reports no negative effects on faculty during the reporting period to be productive in teaching, research, and service. All program faculty are qualified by their credentials. The PhD student to FTE ratio for the School was .9, below the 2.0 ratio suggested by the BOG review but a 16.5% increase over the 5-year campus baseline. The PhD/FTE ration has been historically low within the School of Natural Resources, likely because many of the grants awarded would not support PhD level research. There has been increasing emphasis on training PhD students and that along with the maturing of junior faculty lead the School to anticipate this rate to slightly increase in the future. Most PhD students were funded on assistantships with 83.4% of assistantships funded from external grants and contracts. An average of 20.8 publications per faculty member are reported for the review period and has increased over the past three years from 60 in 2023 to 91 in 2024 and 2025. External funding is an expectation of TT faculty. Total funding has remained relatively stable with a current decrease likely due to current federal funding landscape. 100% of TT faculty were listed as PI or Co-PI on funded external grants during the reporting period. There appears no issues with faculty adequacy, composition, credentials, and productivity.

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

Yes

No

Q5.2. Summarize the relationship between this program and the overall unit (department or school) profile in terms of enrollment, SCH production, and faculty FTE.

Also explain the program's projection within the academic industry and what the three-year outlook for the program is.

This program is the only doctoral degree in the School of Natural Resources. The program had enrollment of 22 in Fall 2025 and enrollment has been steady at 22-25 between Fall 2020 and 2025. As a terminal degree, the enrollment of the PhD program has little effect on overall enrollment in the School. The School has lost 20% of its undergraduate enrollment in the review period. It remains a strong program with strong academic market placement and industry need. The School SCH production is steady and its major-to-faculty ratio is within the norm.

### Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All  
 Some

### Q6.2. What was inaccurate or missing?

I did not see expected time to completion addressed nor are there any required courses published in the curriculum.

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

Enrollment has been steady since the last review and ranged from 22-25. Number of graduates was down to 2 in 2025, down 60% over five years. Other PhD programs in Natural Resources also show declines. Program attributes this to reductions in federal research funding and Covid. In the School, research funding increased from 2023 to 2024 and suggests that degrees awarded will be stable or increasing in the future. The program notes that the time to completion is 3.76 years. Program did not provide the raw data for this calculation. The program reports no classes with 30% of higher DFW. PhD students published 6-11 journal articles per year 2021-2025, and increased from 6 in 2021 to 11 in 2024 and 2025 while enrollment remained steady. Students have also been active in presenting at professional conferences and have received awards and scholarships.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q6.5. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program needs to publish its required courses in the Catalog.

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

The program directly assesses learning outcomes through the candidacy exam and the dissertation defense using evaluation rubrics. The program notes that the assessment methods have been incompletely followed from 2018-2025, possibly due to the COVID pandemic and poor communication. From 2018-2025, 10 comprehensive examination rubrics were completed. The program set a target benchmark of 3.0 for success of each outcome based on a 1-4 scale with 4 representing mastery. On competency exams, 2 out of 10 students received a mean score below 3.0 with an overall mean score of 3.49. More data is available for dissertation defenses with a total of 22 rubrics completed. The target benchmark was again 3.0 for each learning outcome and the vast majority of students met the benchmark for each learning outcome (ranging from 86% to 100%). Learning outcome 3 related to statistical skills was the lowest at 86% meeting the benchmark. The program notes further examination is warranted to determine if changes are needed relative to this learning outcome.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The program notes that insufficient data exists to compare metrics over time. Council suggests addressing this in the next BOG cycle in order to demonstrate any program improvements over the cycle.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The program notes that PhD students often work closely with professionals in the field. No documentation is included regarding engagement with external stakeholders.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

### Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program needs to develop an assessment plan but that probably needs to come after it has determined what its required curriculum is. Then it needs to start conducting assessment of learning within the program. It also needs to develop some form of engagement with external stakeholders.

### Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

### Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of the follow-up action(s) that should be taken by the program, the response expected to the Council (if any), and when. Most often, follow-up reports are due one or two years after the self-study was submitted.

Follow-up reports to the Council may:

- 1) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts).
- 2) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence.**
- 3) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan.**
- 4) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.**

- By March 1, 2027, submit an assessment plan and curriculum map. Once those have been developed and approved, by March 1, 2028, submit evidence of assessment of learning and explanation of how it is used to inform program improvements. • By July 1, 2027, submit a report to the Provost's Office on the progress made to develop a stakeholder council. By March 1, 2028 submit a report to the University Council explaining how that body will be used to help the program identify core skills which can be reflected in changes to or the development of program learning outcomes as well as core curricula. • By Nov 31, 2026, publish the program's required curriculum in CIM / Catalog. By March 1, 2027, submit an update to the University Council.

Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

PhD in Nursing

Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

Q1.5. Explain why the program is not in good standing with its accrediting body. Provide a judgment on whether or not the program is taking adequate action(s) to return to good standing.

N/A

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The PhD in Nursing aligns with the Mission of WVU by advancing diversity, education, healthcare and prosperity for all. It aligns with the vision by involvement with purposeful research, academic learning, and practice.

### Q1.8. Are there are any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

### Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

### Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

### Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

No significant issues identified.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program has adequate faculty. Faculty are qualified by their credentials. GTAs assist faculty members who are delivering the course. The student to faculty ratio in 2026 was 1.55 : 1. No graduate students were funded on state dollars or external funding. Peer reviewed journal articles are the primary intellectual contribution of faculty. Over the 5 year review period they report 207 publications, resulting in an average of 13 publications per faculty member. This represents 2.65 publications per faculty member. (Note teasing out the exact number per faculty per year was not possible given the seemingly contrasting numbers. If there are 9 tenure-track faculty and they averaged 13 pubs per, I get N=117 publications).

Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

- Yes  
 No

Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All  
 Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

Over the 2020-2026 period, 1 to 5 new admits were made to the program. Total enrollment ranged from 13 to 18 students. Enrollment has generally declined since 2021-2022. Graduates number 1-5 per year but have declined each year since 2023-2024. Time to degree completion ranged from 3.3 - 7.7 years with a mean of 4.84 years. D/F/W classes were marked N/A.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

The 10 year reaffirmation by the Higher Learning Commission occurred in Spring 2025. Reviewers identified no significant issues or follow up actions.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The self study reports improvements in student support for conference attendance, curricular refinements, and gathering feedback from students.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

None

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes
- No

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes
- No

Q8.2. Should the program be awarded the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q.12.4, Q12.5, Q12.6, and 12.7 of the self-study.

- Yes
- Maybe
- No

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

Ph.D. in Plant and Soil Sciences

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The self-study clearly connects doctoral research to soil health, water quality, pest management, climate resilience, and stakeholder engagement, demonstrating alignment with WVU's mission of education, research, and service.

Q1.8. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

- Yes  
 No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

Physical and technological resources are described as adequate.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

#### Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

Faculty capacity is a concern. The self-study explicitly states that the program does not have an adequate number of full-time faculty to meet its mission, noting reliance on two core graduate faculty after a 2025 departure and structural changes during Academic Transformation. While interdisciplinary collaboration across schools mitigates some risk, limited instructional redundancy and advising capacity constrain sustainability and contribute to enrollment and student-credit-hour declines. Faculty research productivity is described as solid, citing the average number of peer-reviewed publications per tenure-track faculty (2.6 per year), and the fact that 91% of tenure-track faculty served as PI or Co-I on externally funded grants during the review period, with total external funding estimated at \$27.7 million (2021–2025). This number, however, seems to include the faculty from the whole unit, not the 2-3 core faculty for the program. The two core faculty are not listed, in the document provided, as having received external funding. They further explain that while overall School funding has increased, Plant and Soil Sciences faculty experienced some reduction following the conclusion of a major award and a recent faculty departure, though recent funding levels have otherwise remained relatively consistent amid federal funding volatility.

#### Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

#### Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

- Yes  
 No

#### Q5.2. Summarize the relationship between this program and the overall unit (department or school) profile in terms of enrollment, SCH production, and faculty FTE.

Also explain the program's projection within the academic industry and what the three-year outlook for the program is.

The PhD in Plant and Soil Sciences is a small but structurally important component of the School of Agriculture and Food Systems. Although it does not drive overall enrollment due to its modest size, its enrollment and SCH declines closely mirror faculty reductions. The program anticipates stable enrollment moving forward. The School of Agriculture and Food has lost 50% of its SCH production at the undergraduate level and 25% overall. It has a low major-to-FTE ratio compared to the other Davis College Schools. It may need to plan for necessary attrition between this and its next program review cycle.

### Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All  
 Some

### Q6.2. What was inaccurate or missing?

There is no published curriculum for the program in the Catalog.

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

Enrollment in the PhD in Plant and Soil Sciences shows a 0% five-year change (13 students in Fall 2020 and Fall 2025), with a temporary peak of 22 students in Fall 2023 followed by a recent decline (-35% three-year change). The self-study attributes this fluctuation primarily to faculty reductions associated with Academic Transformation rather than reduced student interest. Degree production has remained stable at 1-2 graduates per year, and average time to completion (5.08-5.24 years) remains within expected doctoral norms, indicating stable student progression despite smaller cohort size.

### Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q6.5. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program needs to publish its required courses and curriculum in the Catalog.

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

Yes

No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

Assessment evidence is present but limited. Findings indicate that 20 of 22 students were assessed as competent or exemplary in disciplinary knowledge, with two identified for monitoring. Placement outcomes for recent graduates (2022–2023) were positive. However, the curriculum lacks required coursework, and the assessment process appears narrowly focused on one learning objective rather than a comprehensive, cyclical evaluation system.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

Improvements described include closer alignment of student experiences with learning outcomes and continued emphasis on intensive research mentoring leading to publications and conference presentations. While these efforts demonstrate commitment to quality, the self-study provides limited documentation of systematic assessment-driven curricular change. Continued formalization of assessment processes and structured curriculum requirements would strengthen evidence-based improvement.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

External engagement is active but informal. Faculty maintain collaborations with industry, non-profits, and public horticulture entities, and students participate in outreach and stakeholder communication. However, there is no formal advisory structure or documented feedback mechanism guiding program improvement.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q7.8. What are the University Council's recommendations for this section?

The program should figure out how it will engage with external stakeholders to ensure program quality and inform program improvements and changes.

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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

Q9.2. Provide an explanation of the follow-up action(s) that should be taken by the program, the response expected to the Council (if any), and when. Most often, follow-up reports are due one or two years after the self-study was submitted.

Follow-up reports to the Council may:

- 1) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts).
- 2) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence.**
- 3) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan.**
- 4) Request the program resubmit any section of weakness from the self-study (entire sections or particular prompts) **with additional supporting evidence as well as a comprehensive action plan with additional interim follow-up reporting.**

- By July 1, 2027, submit a report to the Provost's Office on the progress made to develop a stakeholder council. By March 1, 2028 submit a report to the University Council explaining how that body will be used to help the program identify core skills which can be reflected in changes to or the development of program learning outcomes as well as core curricula. • By Nov 31, 2026, publish the program's required curriculum in CIM / Catalog. By March 1, 2027, submit an update to the University Council.

### Q1.1. Program Review - Reviewers Form AY 2025-2026

This review and the accompanying recommendation have been prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Graduate or Undergraduate Council of WVU. The results of the review (including the recommended outcome) will be communicated to the WVU Board of Governors and the review itself will be provided to the dean of the unit in which the program is housed.

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

See Q1.3 of the self-study.

PhD Public Health Sciences

### Q1.3. What is the reason for this review? See 1.7 of the self-study.

- Regularly scheduled five-year Board of Governors program review
- Off-cycle Board of Governor's program review initiated by Provost's Office through annual academic unit review process
- Program review initiated by the Dean's office

### Q1.4. Specialized Accreditation

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

See Q2.2, Q2.3, Q2.5, Q2.6, and Q2.7 of the self-study.

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

### Q1.7. Program Mission

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

If the program has been out alignment with the mission, vision, or values, are adequate action(s) being taken to return to alignment with the mission and/or values?

See Q3.2 of the self-study.

The program's mission statement aligns nicely with the university mission statement, particularly in providing rigorous training in the practice and research of public health (relating to the "success is earned" aspect of university mission) and in preparing students to help improve the health of West Virginians (consistent with the land-grant aspects of the university's mission).

Q1.8. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q2.1. New Programs

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

See Q4.2 of the self-study.

Yes

No

Q2.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

Q3.1. Program Resources

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q6.2, Q6.3, and Q6.4 of the self-study.

The program reports no issues with program resources.

Q3.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

Yes

No

#### Q4.1. Faculty

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

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q7.2, Q7.3, Q7.4, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, and Q7.8 (and Q7.9 through Q7.18, for doctoral programs) of the self-study.

The program reports that as a result of Academic Transformation, a department was eliminated along with the associated concentration in the PhD program. The program also lost four key faculty members through Academic Transformation and resignation. In response, the program worked to help students in the discontinued concentration to complete their degrees, while replacing leadership role vacated by departing faculty with existing faculty members and reassigning students to new dissertation chairs and mentors. Due to the smaller faculty size, the program is limiting new enrollment to "right-size" the program with current faculty resources.

#### Q4.2. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes
- No

#### Q5.1. Did the self-study have questions added by the program's dean's office?

- Yes
- No

#### Q6.1. Student Success

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for links to Catalog page and program webpage.

- All
- Some

Q6.3. Provide a brief summary of student enrollment trends, number of graduates, time to completion, high D/F/W courses, and other indicators of student success (creative or research endeavors, presentations, publications, grants or scholarships, recordings, exhibitions, performances, etc.).

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q8.2, Q8.3, Q8.4, Q8.5, Q8.6, Q8.7, Q8.8, and Q8.9 of the self-study.

During the review period, program enrollments grew from 37 in 2020, cresting at 52 in 2023, and settling at 41 in 2025. The program aims for a "right-sized" enrollment of 20 students, given the elimination of a department and associated PhD program concentration. The program reports graduating 9 students (1.8 per year) and 8 students (1.6 per year) across the two remaining PhD concentrations. Although these numbers are somewhat smaller than the national averages for comparable programs, the program notes that they are appropriate given their smaller faculty size. The average time to completion was 4.72 and 4.36 respectively across the two program concentrations. The program provides a detailed overview of student success indicators, reflecting placements at various research organizations and universities nationwide.

Q6.4. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes  
 No

Q7.2. Are the program's learning outcomes clear and appropriate to the degree level and type?

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.1. Assessment and Program Improvement

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

See Q1.6 of the self-study for link to program's Catalog page.

- Yes  
 No

Q7.4. Provide a brief summary of the program's evidence of student learning assessment, and relevant assessment findings from this cycle.

If the program has had issues in this area, briefly explain that/those issue(s), what steps have been taken to address that/those issue(s), and whether the issue(s) appear(s) have been adequately resolved.

See Q9.5, Q9.6 (for curriculum map), and Q9.7 of the self-study.

The program provides a description of how each program learning outcome is assessed with a a specific student activity or program requirement.

Q7.5. Provide a brief summary of any improvements the program has made during this review cycle AND how those changes are related to student learning assessment and/or evaluation of progress towards program goals. Areas of improvement may include (but are not limited to): faculty productivity and contributions, student outcomes (retention, persistence, and completion, DFW rates, learning outcome mastery, accomplishments, or post-graduate outcomes), curriculum change (program or course-level), or assessment of learning.

Were the changes made to the program supported by evidence acquired through sound assessment and evaluation practices?

Has the program initiated plans for any future improvements? If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for areas of future improvement, include those here.

See Q10.1 of the self-study.

The program provides an overview of specific improvements made during the review cycle. However, the program does not specifically describe whether the improvements resulted from evidence acquired through assessment and evaluation.

Q7.6. Does the program have any formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders?

If the Council would like to provide recommendations to the program for engagement with external stakeholders, include those here.

See Q10.2 or Q10.3 of the self-study.

The program reports no formal/structured mechanism for engaging with external stakeholders.

Q7.7. Are there any recommendations for this section?

- Yes
- No

Q8.1. Program of Excellence

Is the program seeking the Program of Excellence distinction?

See Q12.2 of the self-study.

- Yes
- No

Q9.1. Recommendation

What is the recommended outcome for this program?

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