



HLC Accreditation 2020-2021

Evidence Document

Academic Affairs

Office of Assessment

Program Review Instructions

Additional information: Program review instructions and related documents are available online: <https://www.wichita.edu/administration/assessment/ProcessforProgramReview.php> (Accessed March 23, 2021.)

Program review is organized around the 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, the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Provost) is expected to strengthen the academic programs, identify program needs and campus priorities, and identify areas for reorganization.

On a four (4) -year cycle each academic unit prepares a self-study (see *Program Review: Annual Timeline*). The process: Begins in November 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 Deans. Thereafter the studies are reviewed by the Deans and the University Program Review committee. 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 by December 1st.

Deans and chairs will have access to a statistical overview of each program based on the KBOR format and prepared by the Office of Planning and Analysis. This includes: student credit hours, faculty load data, numbers of majors, graduation numbers, and ACT data. In preparing the self-study the academic units need to be aware of the Board of Regents program standards for the number of majors, number of degrees granted annually, number of faculty supporting a program, and the quality of undergraduate students as determined by the standardized test scores. Programs that are triggered for not meeting program minima will need to address those concerns in parts 4, 6 and 7 of the report.

Other types of information, however, are more directly related to measuring program quality and improvement, and provide information that enables academic units to develop specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-bound goals. These include: student learning assessment data, data on placement of graduates, recommendations from accreditation reports, the efforts and results for recruiting and retaining faculty and students, an assessment of faculty research, teaching and service, and sources of external support. These types of information are created and employed at the unit level.

Kansas Board of Regents Program Review

The goals of assessing programs at the system level include ensuring that programs are consistent with institutional missions and roles; ensuring optimal student access and use of resources; minimizing duplication; and encouraging institutional cooperation.

The Board of Regents criteria for review are as follows:

- *Centrality to the university mission*
- *Strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty*
- *Curriculum and impact on students*
- *Student need and employer demand*
- *Service provided by the program*
- *Overall program quality*

The work of the University Program Review committee is to produce an evaluation of programs for each of these criteria. Based on the four (4)-year reviews, the Office of Academic Affairs reports to the Board of Regents following an eight (8) -year cycle. The report summarizes the findings of the four (4) -year reviews and makes recommendations on whether a program should be enhanced, maintained, monitored for improvement, or discontinued. Modifications to programs, such as mergers can also be recommended. The schedule for the current and next eight (8) -year cycle (2018-2026) can be found in *Program Review: Cycle for Reporting* (<http://wichita.edu/assessment>).

For the remainder of the current KBOR eight (8) -year cycle (2015 - 2023), the four-year schedule for program review will be set to accommodate accreditation cycles as much as possible.

The Self-Study

Departments are asked to report using a standard template to enable the university to develop consistency in the process as well as to promote a thoughtful analysis of data for making decisions. **The narrative should be concise: not more than a total of 20 pages (not including appended materials).** Tables are provided for reporting standard data but departments are encouraged to append additional charts and tables to succinctly present the results of their study within the 20 page limit.

The template consists of ten parts. Each part consists of the relevant data and charts and a narrative. The following instructions should be followed to complete the template most effectively.

Coversheet:

The coversheet includes information that identifies the academic unit and should be completed thoroughly. The dates of last review and accreditation should be included along with each of the degrees offered by the department.

All faculty should print and sign their name and indicated their status related to tenure. The self-study should be signed by the submitting department chair. **Forms not completed properly should be returned to the sending department by the responsible Dean.**

Part 1. Departmental Purpose, Relationship to the University Mission and Engagement with the Strategic Plan (what the unit does, why it does it, and how its work relates to the university mission and strategic plan)

- 1a. Insert the program's purpose (formerly mission) statement.
- 1b. Describe in a few paragraphs the purpose/role of the department and how it relates to the university's mission, as well as, the role of the institution, college, and community. If you have a different purpose for each program, please state that here.
- 1c. Describe changes (if any) to the department or program mission/role since the last review.
- 1d. Describe the programs engagement with the university strategic plan.
- 1e. Describe the degrees (and emphases) offered by the unit – the major instructional responsibilities of the Department. Example: BA in Anthropology; MA in Anthropology. Describe the objectives of the program and address how progress toward those objectives are measured. Comment on facilities and equipment; any special resources and services; instructional services to students outside the department, including General Education; and include a description of interdisciplinary programs where appropriate.

Part 2. Faculty Quality & Productivity (how and how well the Program accomplishes teaching, research, and service objectives)

A table for scholarly production is included and should be populated. Each unit should add, where relevant, quantitative data that measures scholarly productivity. Recognizing the differences among academic disciplines, append tables, charts, or descriptions that summarize discipline-specific information. If different faculty teach in different programs, complete additional tables as appropriate for each program. If most faculties teach at all levels, and only one table is needed.

The Office of Planning and Analysis provides tables reporting instructional FTE, Program Majors and Degree production. This data should provide context for the productivity discussion.

Consider:

- How the department (discipline) determines the quality and productivity of its faculty.
- What data and criteria are most useful to the department for creating improvements?
- Efforts to recruit and retain faculty and the success of those efforts.
- Faculty loads and how they are determined.
- Commenting on the meaning of the data presented in the data fields.

Part 3. Academic Program(s) and Emphases (the overall quality of each program offered by the department as it relates to the curriculum and its impact on students.)

This section should be prepared for each CIP degree. Cover all levels of the CIP degree:

Undergraduate, Master's and Doctoral. An updated copy of the program assessment plan should be included as an appendix.

3A. Data will be provided that compares the average ACT scores of your undergraduate program with University averages ACTs or with those of similar programs (e.g. humanities, health programs, etc.).

3B. For graduate programs, data will be provided comparing your entering GPAs with other graduate programs.

3C. For programs that are accredited only – List concerns from the last program review.

3D. Present the major student learner outcomes for each program and how you measure those outcomes. Describe briefly the results for the past three years. Present what program changes were made as a result of the assessment (feedback loop.)

3E. List any student satisfaction surveys, alumni surveys, or employer surveys done in the past three years that have provided your program with feedback. With each survey, please indicate the number of respondents, response rate, and the overall results. Also in this section, describe the results of any licensing or certification exams your graduates take (percent passing compared to national passing rates).

3F. For undergraduate programs: Describe any assessments you have done to evaluate any of the general education goals and KBOR's Foresight 2020 initiatives such as writing, critical thinking, collaboration, and so on with the students in your major or if you offer a general education course, how you assess these skills in your general education course. Describe how you have measured these skills (case studies, standardized tests, rubrics, capstone courses, senior projects, etc.) and how well your students have performed on these skills. Especially describe any deficiencies or outstanding performance areas.

3G. For programs who offer concurrent enrollment only – Describe assessment activity over the last four years. Activities should address grading standards, course management instructional delivery. Provide assurance that content meets or exceeds those in regular campus sections.

3H. Describe the process used to assign credit hours to courses. Responses should refer to WSU policy 2.18.

3I. In the narrative provide an overall quality of the academic program using the data in this section and elsewhere. Suggested items for inclusion are:

- Describe the quality of those admitted to the program and how admission requirements are determined, for example, standardized test scores.
- Include a description of: student awards; students presenting or publishing original research or creative work; co-op work experiences; participation in professional societies and development opportunities; teaching evaluations of GTAs.
- Describe accreditation, if appropriate, the review cycle and any concerns from the last review.
- Regional, national, or international ranking among comparable degree programs if appropriate.
- Reflect on the learner outcomes. What data are most useful to your unit for improving learner outcomes?

Part 4. Student Need and Employer Demand for the Program

Summarize the available data within the table. Race/ethnicity data will be provided for the majors in each level program. Use the narrative to reflect on the data and address:

- The student need for the CIP degree using the data from the table as appropriate.
- Employment demand for students. For each program cite placement data including positions secured, starting salaries, proportion of graduates placed at graduation.
- Provide information on alumni or employer surveys about placement, salary, needs, etc. for the different program levels.
- Number or percentage of your graduates who go on to enroll in graduate degree programs.
- Average time from admission to graduation.
- Retention and completion rates.
- Enrollment, retention, and completion rates by race/ethnicity.

Part 5. Program

The table will include the percentage of student credit hours generated by your department as taken by your majors and the percentage taken by non-majors. This will provide you with data about the level of service you provide to students outside your specific programs.

In the narrative, reflect on the data and present:

- The service provided to other programs.
- A description of interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary teaching done by your faculty.
- A description of collaborative research, internal and external

- An analysis of SCH by majors and non-majors.
- A description of the sources and amount of external financial support for the program as well as the purpose of that support. For example, program grants, research grants, faculty development, etc.
- Program uniqueness that would account for the amount of monies needed, such as teaching methods, accreditation limitations, and so on.
- Activities that support retention of majors (student organizations, clubs, service projects)
- Activities that support the public good portion of the university mission (summer camps, school presentations, community lectures, community service)

Part 6. Graduate Enrollment Management

For each graduate program, include progress made on the GEM plan.

Part 7. Undergraduate Graduate Enrollment Management

For each undergraduate program, reflect on activities undertaken in the department to support the Strategic Enrollment goals of the university. Specify success undertaken with special populations, (minoritized students, first-gen, and women in STEM). Highlight faculty who have served as recruitment or retention fellows.

Part 8. Impact of Previous Self-Study Recommendations

Recommendations provided by the University Program Review Committee during the last self-study, activities and outcomes should be noted in this section. Progress towards implementing recommendations or enhancements made as a result of this feedback loop is to be noted.

Part 9. Program Goals from Last Review

During the program review, four years ago, the program developed a set of SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, time bound) goals. Please list your goals and the progress made towards achievement, including the data used to analyze progress and the outcomes.

Part 10: Forward-facing Goals

Describe where the Program(s) have been and where they are going. What are the plans to advance the program(s), how will future progress be evaluated?

- Evaluate the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT analysis) for the program based on the data available to you.
- List recommendations from previous reviews and accreditation reports and describe progress on implementing those recommendations.
- Describe unique opportunities, comparative advantages, and future research opportunities.
- Address the adequacy of resources.
- If the program is being monitored for not meeting KBOR minima criteria; explain low numbers of graduates, low graduation rates, retention problems, etc. plans to address
- Establish SMART goals for the next four (4) years