



HLC Accreditation 2016-2017

Evidence Document

Academic Affairs

Office of Assessment

Departmental Progress toward Assessment of Program: Evaluation Rubrics 2012-2016

Additional information: Assessment rubrics are available at the Office of Assessment website as part of the annual KBOR Program Review reports:
http://webs.wichita.edu/?u=shockerassessment&p=/kbor_prog_rev_11_12/

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

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.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

Department/Programs Reviewed: 15* Year: 2012 Departments were 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	----->15		
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	----->15		
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	-->2	-->2	----->11
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	-->2	---->4	----->9
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	----->15		
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	--->3	->	----->11

*College of Liberal Arts and Sciences – Community Affairs (CJ/FS); Communication; English; General Studies/Interdisciplinary; History; Liberal Studies; Philosophy; Social Work; Women’s Studies

*College of Health Professions – Dental Hygiene; Medical Technology; Nursing; Physical Therapy; Physician Assistant; Public Health Sciences

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. Major weaknesses were noted in the area of assessment of student learning, demonstrated need/employer demand for the program, and evidence of improvement
3. Programs with weaknesses outlined above were required to resubmit updated reports addressing weaknesses. All departments complied.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

Department/Programs Reviewed: 12* Year: 2013 Departments were 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		
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	----->12		
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	->1		----->11
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program		--->3	----->9
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	----->12		
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	->1		----->11

*College of Engineering – Aerospace Engineering; Bioengineering; Electrical Engineering and Computer Science; Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering; Mechanical Engineering

*College of Liberal Arts and Sciences – Biology; Chemistry; Geology; Mathematics, Statistics, and Physics; Social Work; General Studies/Interdisciplinary

*College of Health Professions – Physical Therapy

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. Major weaknesses were noted in the area of assessment of student learning, demonstrated need/employer demand for the program, and evidence of improvement.
3. Programs with weaknesses outlined above were required to resubmit updated reports addressing weaknesses. All departments complied.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

Department/Programs Reviewed: 10* Year: 2014 Departments were 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		----->10	
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	----->10		
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	->1	-->2	----->7
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	->1	-->2	----->7
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	----->10		
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	->1		----->9

*College of Fine Arts – Schools of Art and Design, Music, and Performing Arts

*School of Business – Accountancy; Business Administration; Economics; FREDS; Management; Marketing

*College of Health Professions – Nursing

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. Compared to 2012 and 2013, improvement has occurred in the overall process.
2. Weakness is still noted in the area of assessment of student learning, demonstrated need/employer demand for the program, and evidence of improvement. With the new University strategic plan, departments need to do a better job linking the mission of their department/program with the University plan.
3. Programs with weaknesses outlined above were required to resubmit updated reports addressing weaknesses. All departments complied.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Departments/Schools reviewed: Total = 26*	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Year: 2015 Department is expected to address:			
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	----->22	---->4	
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	----->18	----->6	
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	----->12	----->10	---->4
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	----->14	----->10	-->2
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	----->21	---->5	
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	----->15	----->8	--->3

*College of Education – Curriculum and Instruction; Counseling, Educational Leadership, Educational and School Psychology; Human Performance Studies; Sport Management

*College of Health Professions – Communication Sciences and Disorders; Dental Hygiene; Medical Laboratory Sciences; Nursing; Physical Therapy, Physician Assistant; Public Health Sciences

*Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences – Anthropology; Community Affairs; Communication; English; History; Interdisciplinary (BGS and MALS); Modern and Classical Languages; Philosophy; Political Sciences; Psychology; Sociology; Social Work; Urban Affairs; Women’s Studies

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. Compared to 2012, 2013, and 2014 improvement continues to occur in the overall process.
2. Weakness is still noted in the area of assessment of student learning, demonstrated need/employer demand for the program, and evidence of improvement, however, these are significantly improved from prior years.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Departments reviewed: Total = 10*	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Year: 2016 Department is expected to address:			
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	----->8	->1	->1
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	----->8	-->2	
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	-->2	----->7	->1
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	----->5	---->4	->1
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	----->6	--->3	->1
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	----->7	--->3	

*College of Engineering – Aerospace Engineering; Biomedical Engineering; Electrical Engineering and Computer Science; Engineering Technology; Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering; Mechanical Engineering

*College of Liberal Arts and Sciences – Biology; Chemistry; Geology; Mathematics, Statistics, and Physics

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 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015 improvement continues to occur in the overall process.
3. This is the first year where 90% of programs were on “target” or “meeting expectations” in all areas.