WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

Academic Affairs   Office of Assessment

Annual KBOR Program Review
Report 2016-2017

2016-2017 Program Review
Executive Summary

Overview

Wichita State University program review is organized around a year-long preparation and review of a self-study that is intended to create a thoughtful assessment of the quality of academic programs and to establish goals for improvements. The process of reviewing these studies (which includes faculty, the deans, the University Program Review committee, and the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs) is expected to strengthen the academic programs, identify program needs and campus priorities, and identify areas for reorganization.

On a 3-year cycle each academic unit prepares a self-study using a standard reporting template. These 3-year reports then feed into the required review by the Kansas Board of Regents (i.e., each program is required to be reviewed once during an 8 year period). Hence, there is a continuous review process of each academic unit.

The triennial reporting cycle, begins one year in advance of being due each November (on a staggered schedule so that college programs are reviewed together) when the Office of Academic Affairs offers a workshop for chairs and assessment coordinators, and continues until April 1st when the studies are submitted to the respective Deans. Thereafter the studies are reviewed by the Deans, Graduate School (as appropriate) and the University Program Review committee (consisting of the Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Strategic Enrollment Management; Director of the Office of Planning Analysis; the President, President-Elect, and Past-President of the Faculty Senate; and a Dean). Each unit is provided with an opportunity to discuss and clarify those reviews. The University committee submits its final report to the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs by November 1st.

Intensive Review of Selected Programs

The programs being reviewed and reported to KBOR are from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (mathematics and natural sciences). Programs in Business and Fine Arts were also reviewed as a part of their triennial reporting cycle, but not included for KBOR reporting purposes. Programs reviewed ranged from bachelor level to doctoral level programs.

To assist programs in writing their self-studies, departments/programs had access to:
- Program minima data provided by the Office of Planning and Analysis. These data were made available fall 2015.

- Data from exit surveys and other surveys collected by the University and within departments.
- External specialty accreditation reports (as appropriate).

Overall Outcome of Program Reviews reported to KBOR: For the mathematics and natural sciences programs, and as compared to their last review in 2013 where most were lacking in the area of student learning assessment, only one program fell into that category in 2016. It was apparent in the 2016 review materials that program faculty utilized their 2013 feedback to make improvements in the area of student learning assessment. All programs reviewed were recommended for continuance (reviews start on page 4).

Triggered Programs Monitored

Besides the programs that underwent intensive review this year (starting on page 4), the remaining low major/degree triggered programs were also reviewed for updates on plans to increase majors and degrees (using AY 2015 data, see below).

Program	Trigger from Minima Report	Status
School Psychology	GR Degrees	Continue – intensive review in 2018
Athletic Training	UG Majors/Degrees	Continue – intensive review in 2018
Arts/Studio Arts	GR Majors/Degrees	Continue – Intensive review in 2017
Manufacturing Engineering	UG Majors/Degrees	Continue – Intensive review in 2017
Engineering Technology	UG Degrees	Continue – New program
Chemistry	GR Majors/Degrees (MS)	Continue – Intensive review in 2016
Earth, Environmental, Physical Science	GR Majors	Continue – Intensive review in 2016
Philosophy	UG Degrees	Continue - Intensive review in 2018 Academic support program
Physics	UG Degrees	Continue – Intensive review in 2016 Academic support program
Forensic Science	UG Degrees	Continue - Intensive review in 2018
Sociology	GR Majors/Degrees	Continue - Intensive review in 2018
Spanish	GR Majors	Continue - Intensive review in 2018
Women's Studies	UG Degrees	Continue - Intensive review in 2018

Note: School psychology added, no programs were removed.

Potential Costs of Recommendations

None of the recommendations made will require any additional cost to the University.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM

Department: Biology Year: 2016 Department is expected to address:	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM

Degrees Offered – B.A. Biology, BS in Biology, MS in Biology

Triggers: None

Commendations:

- Program mission connects to university mission. However, the role of the program and relationship to the university mission could be better explained.
- Productive faculty in terms of publications and presentations.
- Students are engaged in research and outreach activities, which is in line with university mission.
- ETS Major Achievement test is used as an assessment tool which provides comparative results with respect to national average.
- Proposing creative ways to increase the capacity of the departmental courses via online courses and new lab/classroom designs

Needs Going Forward:

- Learning outcomes, and assessment tools should help assess and continuously improving the program. There are no learning outcomes which may measure communication and presentation skills of the students. Department should report and elaborate on results from several sources other than exit surveys. Grades from a course should not be used as target values.
- Assessment at graduate level should involve more comprehensive tools, not only through MS Thesis defense and student exit interviews.
- Faculty and staff resources are needed to increase the productivity and research of the department.
- Finding a better way to track graduate employment data would likely be helpful to inform the UG program for improvements.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM

Department: Chemistry Year: 2016 Department is expected to address:	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM
Degrees Offered – BS, BA, MS; PhD Chemistry; (Concurrent Enrollment)

Triggers – MS (Enrollment/Graduation numbers)

Commendations:
- The mission of each program is stated and is aligned with university mission in general.
- Faculty productivity is good in light of difficult economic circumstances affecting grant availability and support for positions. Department is to be commended for its efforts to address both concerns.
- The program is commended for the priority it places on student engagement in research and for providing and encouraging several opportunities for student participation in paper writing, presentation, and publication.
- The program shows a solid alignment with the needs of programs of programs across the university and addressing the needs of students in a broader context. The report documents wide-spread benefits to programs and colleges across the university. Program contributes to general education and offer service courses and essential instruction to several undergraduate majors and graduate programs.
- The program is recognized for its efforts to address difficulties associated with concurrent enrollment matters resulting from university administrative decisions.

Needs Going Forward:
- Recommend further clarification of program demand/needs via student data, employer data (in and out-of-state). In addition to information on pattern of employment among graduates, particularly at the undergraduate level, it is recommended that general post-graduation salaries at all levels of graduates be included as part of future program assessment for the purpose of strengthening program statement on need and general planning for departmental growth.
- MS program is triggered re: enrollment and students graduating. Need to provide further review of opportunities to strengthen both figures in the context of the overall program, overall needs and opportunities.
- Department on track to meet assessment expectations. They need to prioritize analysis and reporting of results/improvements of learning outcomes for undergraduate, MS and PhD level programs. Clarification of the nature and application of some current measures, exams and reports, is needed. Not clear how many students were evaluated.
- Prioritize the assessment of the Biochemistry option (Chem 661) on a continuing basis.
- Address "targets" set for PhD level efforts in accordance with graduate school expectation.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM

Department: Geology	On Target	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Year: 2016 **Department is expected to address:**	3	2	1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM

Degrees Offered – B.S. Geology, M.S. Earth, Environmental, and Physical Sciences (EEPS)

Triggers – Number of faculty, Master's level, Number of faculty are now at 5 tenure/tenure eligible all with doctoral degrees. (meets KBOR requirements)

Commendations:
- In 2014, despite having only two full time faculty and one visiting professor, faculty productivity in terms of scholarly activity including external grants and student credit hour production was exemplary.
- Faculty conducted their own survey to collect information from program graduates. Data indicate positive outcomes for program graduates in terms of employment and student satisfaction.
- Service to the university, given the number of faculty in the department.

Needs Going Forward:
- Use of course grades to measure outcomes should be refined by moving to identification of specific assignments accompanied by scoring guides or rubrics that are clearly aligned to learning outcomes.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM

Department: MSP	On Target	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Year: 2016	3	2	1
Department is expected to address:			
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM

Degrees Offered – BS, MS Math; PhD Applied Math; BS Physics; (Concurrent Enrollment)

Triggers – BS Physics (graduates)

Commendations:
- The mission of each program is clearly defined and tied directly to the mission of the educational, social and economic mission of the university.
- The document clearly reflects that faculty members are highly qualified and in full support the program goals and objectives. Faculty productivity is linked directly to program enhancement and student success.
- The program assessment report clearly shows a solid alignment of all programs with the university mission and a positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.
- Modifications to the program(s) included restructuring of measuring instruments to more appropriate assesses proficiency during the past review period. This resulting in documented enhancement of program outcomes. Learning outcome targets for math (BS-Math, MS-Math, and MS-Math) and statistics (BS) were met (1) or exceeded (4) for each of the five learning outcomes. Target scale should be defined.
- The physics program (BS-Phys) exceeded the expectation of students thereby meeting their overall targets. Report focus very strongly on program enhancements facilitating growth (already showing sign of promise). Further defining learning outcomes would be helpful.
- The MS (Math) program assessment was also modified in 2012. The report documents how the department continues to address the outcomes of the program assessment thus, keeping on target with the program mission and that of the university. Target scale should be defined along with numbers of students evaluated.
- The PhD program (Applied Math) meets two of the program targets and exceeds four. The program also documents the success of the graduates in research (# publications w/in 4 years of graduation). Student satisfaction 100%. Target scale should be defined along with numbers of students evaluated.
- The concurrent enrollment program in math is well reported and along with continuing modification and re-alignment with the public school system appears to be in compliance with KBOR policies.
- Demand for program(s) very apparent and is documented throughout the report. Data is very inclusive: program, employment/placement and program recognition. Also strong documentation of ACT scores above university average.
- The report documents wide-spread benefits to programs and colleges across the university. SCH production exceeds that of three colleges. All programs provide essential foundation to general education and many undergraduate majors and graduate programs.
- BS undergraduates generally hired within State of Kansas. This aligns with University mission. MS and PhD graduates to a lesser degree. Still, program remains in alignment with University and program mission, especially in light of the State's revenue/funding priorities.
- The report reflects a dynamic or living assessment plan. Responses to data collected pertaining to learner outcomes are addressed continuously and across all programs.
- Report includes a strong plan for faculty replacements, student support and research space.

Needs Going Forward:
- The program documents growth in undergraduate programs (4-8% so far; 20% projected long-term). Yet, all programs enroll recognizably fewer students than were actually admitted, while inquiries are also on the increase. This is the case for all three BS program. Capacity and funding is well documented as one important issue in the eventual resolution of this matter. But the department is also encouraged to revisit alternative strategies to strengthen enrollments among inquiries and among admitted students. Reactivating the MS in physics may be helpful in this regard.
- The Physics program should revisit the instruments used to measure program success and clarify target (generic vs. program).

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM

- Post-graduation salaries for past students is in decline, this may have an impact on future enrollment patterns and should be considered in planning/projection for departmental growth.
- The programs are in need of funding for faculty, student, and space. The report documents the need for additional tenure-track math and physics faculty (2 each) and for an additional tenure-track statistics faculty.
- Programs remains highly dependent on internal (and possibly external) funding to address much needed growth as expressed in report.

College of Business

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department: Accountancy Year: 2017 Department is expected to address:	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered – BBA and MAAC

Triggers – None

Commendations:
- Noteworthy scholarly activity.
- CPA pass rate exceeds national rates in 2 out of 3 years.
- Evidence of assessment of student learning and corrective action plans in place. Defining target expectations would be helpful for each outcome
- Student satisfaction rates exceeds college and university rates for both UG and GR program.

Needs Going Forward:
- Consider incorporating the newly approved UNISCOPE model into the department's assessment of scholarship.
- For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university's strategic enrollment plan.
- Develop program goals and report on results next evaluation period.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department: Economics Year: 2017 Department is expected to address:	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION
Degrees Offered – Bachelor and Master in economics
Triggers – None

Commendations:
- Noteworthy and encouraging that there publications are increasing, but improvements in publishing, presenting, and grant writing is needed.
- Discussion on program demand and need was excellent.
- Assessment highlights corrective action is taken when goals are not met. Just because targets are met, does not mean that further improvements are possible.

Needs Going Forward:
- For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university's strategic enrollment plan.
- Incorporate mission narrative explanation into the mission statement.
- Consider incorporating the newly approved UNISCOPE model into the department's assessment of scholarship.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department: Entrepreneurship	On Target	Meets Expectations	**Does Not Meet Expectations**
Year: 2017	3	2	1
Department is expected to address:			
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered –BBA-Entrepreneurship

Triggers – None

Commendations:

- Program aligns well with innovation campus concept.
- Accredited programs, meeting accreditation standards.
- Productive faculty in terms of publications and awards.
- Closed feedback loop in student learning assessment for continuous improvement of the programs.
- Average program satisfaction of students is higher than the university.

Needs Going Forward:

- While student learning assessment demonstrates students are learning the content and performing better than non-entrepreneurship degree students, it is unclear how many students are assessed for each outcome, and there is limited information on how the data is used in terms of students not meeting the outcome. There's no target criteria for any of the learning outcomes.
- It is important to support outcome by data in the analysis. For example, data analysis on how objective of spreading entrepreneurship education at WSU campus is missing.
- For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university's strategic enrollment plan.
- Further analysis of alumni data and its relationship to student success would be helpful in the future.
- Consider incorporating the newly approved UNISCOPE model into the department's assessment of scholarship.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department: FREDS Year: 2017 Department is expected to address:	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered – BBA Finance; Bachelor in Management Information Systems
Triggers – None

Commendations:
- Noteworthy scholarly activity
- Excellent analysis of quality of program for majors and non-majors
- Excellent summary of improvements and changes made for MIS 395 class
- Implementation of summer mobile application camp
- Increased applied learning through co-ops and internships
- Assessment highlights corrective action is taken when goals are not met. Just because targets are met, does not mean that further improvements are not possible.

Needs Going Forward:
- For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university's strategic enrollment plan.
- Consider incorporating the newly approved UNISCOPE model into the department's assessment of scholarship.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department: General Business Year: 2017 Department is expected to address:	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty			
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond			
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area. Areas in black, not available to evaluate as this is an interdisciplinary program

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered – Bachelor (BBA)
Triggers – None

Commendations:
- Program is doing a good job analyzing assessment data and making changes as needed, or is planning on making changes
- No triggers from the Kansas Board of Regents
- High student satisfaction on Exit Survey
- Program now offered online to meet needs of students and grow enrollment

Needs Going Forward:
- Provide the actual number of students assessed in the student learning assessment section
- Some learning outcomes are not measurable
- Provide follow-up on program goals in next report
- For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university's strategic enrollment management plan.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department: HRM Year: 2017 Department is expected to address:	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION
Degrees Offered – Bachelor (BBA)
Triggers – None

Commendations:
- Strong involvement and participation in the Society of Human Resource Managers (SHRM)
- No triggers from the Kansas Board of Regents
- High percent of under-represented graduates
- Course offerings for all Business majors (as well as some non-Business majors)
- Creating a HRM minor

Needs Going Forward:
- Modify learning outcomes to be measurable, e.g., define, differentiate, evaluate, etc.
- Expand more on scholarly productivity and provide grant amounts awarded
- Elaborate more on next 3 year goals
- Examine decline in student satisfaction from the Exit Surveys (2012=95.2%, 2013=86.7%, 2014=66.7%)
- For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university's strategic enrollment management plan.
- Consider incorporating the newly approved UNISCOPE model into the department's assessment of scholarship.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department: International Business Year: 2017 Department is expected to address:	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered – BBA in international business
Triggers – None

Commendations:
- Faculty scholarship is noteworthy.
- Learning objectives are clear and measurable.
- The Barton International Group and World Trade Council are notable examples of service.

Needs Going Forward:
- For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university's strategic enrollment plan.
- For student learning outcomes, more description of how individual students are evaluated is needed, and a description of the evaluation tool.
- Consideration of using more than one assessment is warranted.
- The committee cannot tell if the assessment is actually demonstrating student learning.
- Realistic program objectives are needed.
- Evidence is needed in closing the loop in terms of overall program evaluation, as well as student learning.
- Consider incorporating the newly approved UNISCOPE model into the department's assessment of scholarship.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department: Management Year: 2017 Department is expected to address:	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION
Degrees Offered – Bachelor (BBA)
Triggers – None

Commendations:
- Department is doing a good job analyzing assessment data and making changes as needed, or is planning on making changes
- No triggers from the Kansas Board of Regents
- High number of tenure/tenure track faculty
- Course offerings for all Business majors (as well as some non-Business majors)
- High student satisfaction on Exit Survey
- Planning to offer courses or program online to meet needs of students

Needs Going Forward:
- Expand more on the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty in section 2 (grants awarded and amount)
- Provide the Watson Glaser scores in learner outcomes in section 3 in order to compare to national average
- For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university's strategic enrollment management plan.
- Consider incorporating the newly approved UNISCOPE model into the department's assessment of scholarship.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department: Marketing Year: 2017 Department is expected to address:	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered – BBA in Marketing

Triggers – None

Commendations:
- Overall enrollment trend: returning to pre 2015 numbers
- ACT scores above university level
- Student satisfaction at or above university level

Needs Going Forward:
- Review of faculty/student teaching ratio and formalize "succession" document for faculty/program structure necessary to sustain program in the future.
- Address more descriptively aspect of program review for further communication of responses (program description, learning objectives, program quality)
- Address assessment outcomes (need to be measurable) to support program goals. Identify number of students assessed and target outcomes
- Consider incorporating the newly approved UNISCOPE model into the department's assessment of scholarship.
- For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university's strategic enrollment plan.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department: MBA & Executive MBA	On Target	Meets Expectations	**Does Not Meet Expectations**
Year: 2017	3	2	1
Department is expected to address:			
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty			
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond			
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered –Master-Business Administration, Executive Master-Business Administration

Triggers – none

Commendations:

- Executive MBA's new focus on innovation leadership
- Very high student satisfaction
- Very high Kansas employment
- Accredited programs, meeting accreditation standards.
- Closed feedback loop in student learning assessment for continuous improvement of the programs.

Needs Going Forward:

- The MBA demonstrates the quality of the program using data, but the number of actual students evaluated is missing. Target criteria for the learning outcomes needs to be better defined.
- It is important to document services to other departments by data
- Although there were no program goals, during the last review, it is important to list some initiatives which led changes in the program as a result of feedback through different means such as program assessment, industry feedback, etc.
- For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university's strategic enrollment plan.
- Consider incorporating the newly approved UNISCOPE model into the department's assessment of scholarship.

College of Fine Arts

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department: Art and Design	On Target	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Year: 2017 **Department is expected to address:**	3	2	1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered – BA of Arts; BFA (Art), BA Art Education; BFA (Studio Art/Design), MFA

Triggers – Art Education; MFA number of majors and graduates

Commendations:
- The School's mission statement establishes a clear connection to the community with a strong focus on culture and education.
- Department faculty are to be commended on large number of exhibits and creative works, which have increased in recent years, as well as the grants received and many community service activities. Nice full narrative of these contributions.
- The School seems to be responsive and creative in determining new course designs to meet student needs with the "Quick Fire" (1 Cr) and "Slow Burn" (6 Cr) options.
- Good anecdotal evidence of employment for majors, particularly in the area.
- Very connected to the community as well as actively engaged in innovation campus collaborations
- Future goals and plans are solid with regard to increasing MFA enrollments; also further development of assessment rubrics at programmatic checkpoints.

Needs Going Forward:
- The assessment of Learning Outcomes for each of the programs is weak. While there are numerous lists of clear, measurable learning outcomes for each program, the assessment tools and target criteria do not appear to align fully with the learning outcomes.
  - Example:
    - Pre-Art objectives (p. 10) > Multiple Assessment tools (portfolio, presentation, written description, review survey) Faculty review and evaluate these works. (It would be helpful to include the rubrics for this assessment in the Appendix.) > the Target is acceptance into the degree program. This does not actually set a measurable target. Is the goal 100% acceptance, or something short of that? It might make more sense to disaggregate the different tools (portfolio, presentation, etc) and have a target for each of them. In this way, you could tell where they might be falling short and make appropriate adjustments. This becomes more difficult with a simple number of "total accepted". (This is reflected a bit more in the BFA p. 14 with regard to curricular adjustments after reviewing portfolios).
- Multiple programs include a target/criteria of "a grade of C or better" as the goal. This is not a rigorous assessment mechanism. It reflects performance overall in a course, but does not indicate whether a particular skill or competency was acquired.
- Consider incorporating the newly approved UNISCOPE model into the department's assessment of scholarship.
- For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university's strategic enrollment plan.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department: Music Year: 2017 Department is expected to address:	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered:

- Bachelor and Master of Music
- Bachelor and Master of Music Education

Triggers:

- Master of Music Education for too few majors (actual = 19.4, whereas target = 20)

Commendations:

- Including the NASM response and SNAAP institutional report as appendices was helpful and productive
- Providing peer info data regarding SCH, majors, etc. (cf. page 16) was very helpful
- The collective accomplishments of School of Music alumni are impressive

Needs Going Forward:

- Exhaustive documentation, but difficult to find appropriate info (it was akin to search through the accumulated stuff in the attic to find a specific item)
- Consider redefining the two-part mission statement to be more focused
- Relative to the peer institutions included on page 16, the WSU School of Music does not compare well with respect to SCH/faculty and number of majors
- Consider incorporating the newly approved UNISCOPE model into the department's assessment of scholarship.
- For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university's strategic enrollment plan.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department: Performing Arts	On Target	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Year: 2017 **Department is expected to address:**	3	2	1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered:
- Bachelor of Fine Arts – Performing Arts
- Bachelor of Arts – Performing Arts

Triggers:
- None

Commendations:
- In depth documentation of program mission, strategic goals and objectives
- In depth documentation of applied learning experiences
- Well defined learning outcomes

Needs Going Forward:
- Align outcomes with target criteria.
- Consider incorporating the newly approved UNISCOPE model into the department's assessment of scholarship.
- For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university's strategic enrollment plan.

Appendix

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Departments/programs reviewed: Total = 13* Year: 2017 Department is expected to address:	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	------------>12	->1	
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	-------->9	->1	->1
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	------>6	----->5	-->2
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	-------->9	---->4	
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	------->7	---->4	
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	----->5	------->7	->1

*College of Fine Arts – Art, Design, and Creative Industries; Music; Performing Arts
*College of Business – Accounting; Economics; FREDS; General Business; Management (Entrepreneurship, HR management, International Business) Marketing; MBA
(General business and MBA are interdisciplinary programs, therefore, faculty and their service are not evaluated in these programs)

Notes:
1. The Program Review Committee provided feedback to each unit in terms of their overall assessment of how the unit completed their assessment report.
2. Compared to the 2014 review, improvement continues to occur in the overall process.
3. 85% of programs were on "target" or "meeting expectations" in the area of assessment and 92% in other areas.