**2022-2023 Program Review**

**Executive Summary**

Institutional Overview of program review process

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, the senior associate vice president for institutional effectiveness/strategic enrollment management, and the senior executive vice president and provost) is expected to strengthen the academic programs, identify program needs and campus priorities, identify areas for reorganization and provide opportunities for both short and long-term goal setting.

On a four-year cycle each academic unit prepares a self-study using a standard reporting template. These four-year reports then feed into the required review by the Kansas Board of Regents. Programs that demonstrate the need for additional support are asked to complete interim reports. Hence, there is a continuous review process of each academic unit.

The quadrennial reporting cycle begins in December, one year in advance of being due, when the Office of Accreditation and Assessment within the Division of Academic Affairs offers a workshop for chairs and assessment coordinators and continues until April 1st when the studies are submitted to the respective Dean’s Office for review. After the self-studies are reviewed by the Dean, Graduate School (as appropriate) and the University Program Review committee (consisting of the senior associate vice president in Academic Affairs; representation from the Office of Planning Analysis; Faculty Senate executive team; faculty deans and department chairs), each unit is provided with an opportunity to discuss and clarify their reviews. The university committee submits its final report to the senior executive vice president/provost by January 30th.

All programs were reviewed including those at the bachelor, master, and doctoral level.

To assist programs in writing their self-studies, departments/programs had access to:

* Program minima data provided by the Office of Planning and Analysis.
* Past self-studies performed by past department chairs.
* Data from exit surveys and other surveys collected by the University and within departments.
* External specialty accreditation reports (as appropriate).

Program narrative

The programs being reviewed this year are listed below.

**W. Frank Barton School of Business:**

BBA Accounting 52.0301

Master of Accountancy 52.0301

BBA-Business Administration 52.0201

BBA Economics 45.0601

MA Economics and Quantitative Analysis 45.0603

MBA – Master of Business Administration 52.0201

EMBA – Executive Master of Business Administration 52.0201

Bachelor – Finance 52.0801

Bachelor – Management Information Systems (MIS) 52.1201

MS in Business Analytics 52.1399

MS in Management Science and Supply Chain Management 52.0203

Bachelor in Marketing 52.1401

BBA – Management 49.0104

BBA – International Business 52.1101

BBA – Entrepreneurship 52.0701

BBA – Human Resource Management 52.1001

MS in Human Resource Management 52.1001

**College of Fine Arts:**

Bachelor of Art with concentrations in Art and Art History 50.0701

Bachelor of Fine Arts (Art) 50.0701

Bachelor of Fine Arts (Graphic Design) 50.0409

Master of Fine Arts in Art degree (Studio Arts) 50.0701

BAA – Media Arts 50.0102

MAALM: Master of Arts in Arts Leadership and Management 50.100120

Bachelor – Music, General 50.0901

Master – Music History, Literature, and Theory 50.0902

Bachelor – Music Performance 50.0903

Master – Music Performance 50.0903

Bachelor – Music Theory and Composition 50.0904

Master – Music Theory and Composition 50.0904

Master – Conducting 50.0906

Bachelor – Jazz/Jazz Studies 50.0910

Bachelor – Music Education 13.1312

Master – Music Education 13.1312

BA Performing Arts (Dance) 50.0301

BA Performing Arts (Drama & Dramatics/Theatre Arts) 50.0502

BFA Performing Arts (Dance) 50.0301

BFA Performing Arts (Drama & Dramatics/Theatre Arts) 50.0501

BFA Performing Arts

(Technical Theatre/Theatre Design & Technology) 50.0502

BFA Performing Arts with emphasis in Musical Theatre 50.0509

*\*Certificate in Commercial Dance*

*\*Certificate in Directing*

*\*Certificate in Physical Performance*

*\*Certificate in Stage Management*

*\*Certificate in Voice Acting*

*\*Certificate in Dance Choreography*

*\*Certificate in Dance and Digital Performance*

**Accountancy PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Part 1 Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission and Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution and support of the university strategic plan | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** 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, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.  Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | 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 but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show 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. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook. | 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. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond. | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied 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 use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | BBA Accounting and Master of Accountancy |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report: | **Academic year 2021-2022:**   * Accounting, # of graduate faculty |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: | Needs Going Forward from 2018 are addressed – concern is outcome states success - what does success mean? Make sure that this is clearly defined in future reviews. |
| Committee Notes for current review: | Part 3: SOA referenced SOA Accreditation report SA4.3 where measurement tools and results are in appendix – this appendix is provided -UPR committee was directed to certain pages to review and left to make on interpretations - no summative narrative is provided on the appendix as requested. Also concern that only CPA exam is used to measure SLOs based on part D of section 4 - no alignment of SLOs to this assessment are evident – need more than one assessment tool to measure student success throughout program – not single use of an assessment after student completes the program.  Part 4: Section B: No reference to strategic enrollment focus of students – discuss online program component - what data led to this decision – why did you know this needed added? What have been the quantitative results of this decision on student demand? What are at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan.  Part 4: Section C – what is SOA’s service to other disciplines, the university or the beyond – this should be service to students – not faculty service to committees – why are certain sections N/A – help reviewers understand the reason for N/A.  Part 5: FFO goals - Concern with only one source of evidence – comprehensive exam – triangulation of data to represent student learning of the learning outcomes.  Also need additional forward facing goals beyond SLO focus? Student Satisfaction – why is that not a FFG? |
| Commendations of Program: | Strong focus of service from the faculty at college level- Beta Alpha Psi Advisor and the Accounting and Auditing Conference Coordinator – and university level serving on various committees listed in 4B. |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | In the re-submission this area was moved to meet expectations, however, for future reviews the dept. is encouraged to focus on workload policy in alignment with university policy and then how that translates to expectations within the dept and the national accreditation standard (Part 2 section). As noted by review committee for this section, there is a concern with statement made on research/creative activity – states does not provide for quantifiable collective standards with regard to scholarship expectations – yet workload policy provided specifies research expectations based on faculty role – dept needs to address this area and encouraged to address how the faculty within their role meet research & also encouraged to utilize the Uniscope model within the discussion in this section if appropriate. |
| General Feedback to program: | Dept did a great job in sharing what an outstanding faculty who are experts in the field, however, serving students and maintaining a quality program also requires looking at data and making changes in the program to meet workforce needs and demands. Department is encouraged to focus on specific recruitment and retention efforts aligned to the university SEM plan and GEM plans, utilization triangulation of data to assess the students and programs throughout program to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs - not just with final exam after graduation, the service the program offers beyond the discipline and college. |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

Resubmit with focus on Targeted area(s) circled below (e.g. SMART Goals, additional data/narrative)

X

Recommendations/Feedback: Resubmitted and following areas highlighted do not meet expectations. Department should work on these the next 4 years and ensure they are fully addressed in the next university program review

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness. N/A for this review based on University PR data

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus: (highlights indicate areas met)

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness. N/A for this review based on University PR data

Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle was suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria were established. Kansas Board of Regents Systemwide Program Review will resume with new criteria with the 2023-2024 Review Cycle Year and the Program Review Report will be reported to BAASC and the Board in Spring 2025. In the meantime, Wichita State will continue with the University Program review for the 2023 and 2024 academic years.

**BBA\_Business Administration PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Part 1 Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission and Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution and support of the university strategic plan | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** 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, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.  Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | 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 but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show 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. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook. | 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. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond N/A1 | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond. | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied 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 use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | BBA-Business Administration |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report: | N/A |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: | 2018: Needs Going Forward were fully met by current program review   * Provide the actual number of students assessed in the student learning assessment section *– Table 3 notes 20 BBA\_BADM majors for 2021 only* * Some learning outcomes are not measurable – *11 learning outcomes identified in Table D of review – concern with outcomes looking at identify and apply and only one source of measurement (comprehensive exam) being utilized to measure all 11 outcomes* * Provide follow-up on program goals in next report – *has provided 11 Program/Certificate goals focused on a national comprehensive exam – not using any other source of data to measure student outcomes*. * For the next review, align recruitment and retention efforts with the university’s strategic enrollment management plan. - *The BBA-BADM program focused on the SEM plan elements that were consistent with the program’s mission and focused in Part 4b on the numbers and not what actions the program is specifically doing for recruitment & retention to attract these level of majors.* |
| Committee Notes for current review: | Part 4.C.Program & Faculty Service: 1There is not designated faculty for this program. The faculty who teach in this program are representative of faculty from 5 other departments in the Barton School of Business. The faculty members who teach in the BBA-BADM program are members of the Barton School’s five departments – (a) Accounting, (b) Economics, (c) Finance, Real Estate, & Decision Sciences, (d) Management, and (e) Marketing. |
| Commendations of Program: | 2020-21, the Barton School of Business evaluated the BBA-BADM program evaluated program &  changed the degree name from BBA in General Business to BBA in Business Administration and in addition made 4 other changes focused on the curriculum within the program. |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | No Recommendations going forward. |
| General Feedback to program: | N/A |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

Resubmit with focus on Targeted area(s) circled below (e.g. SMART Goals, additional data/narrative)

X

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle was suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria were established. Kansas Board of Regents Systemwide Program Review will resume with new criteria with the 2023-2024 Review Cycle Year and the Program Review Report will be reported to BAASC and the Board in Spring 2025. In the meantime, Wichita State will continue with the University Program review for the 2023 and 2024 academic years.

**economics PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Part 1 Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission and Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution and support of the university strategic plan | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** 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, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.  Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | 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 but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show 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. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook. | 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. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond. | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied 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 use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | BBA Economics  MA Economics and Quantitative Analysis |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report: | N/A |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: | Yes |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | Part 2: Suggest including plan to support student research & increase grant production/research productivitiy  Part 3: Focus on Goal Analysis: If met targets – provide more explanation on how they were met and continuous monitoring to ensure targets continue to meet assessment criteria.  Part 4: Recruitment & Retention: Clarify asterisk on page 16 table. Pull out details in G-PIPER. Vague as presented in review – articulate increase in applications for grad program (numbers). Continue to encourage and support faculty service on University Committees and provide more detail on community service beyond the University. |
| Commendations of Program: | Part 1: Well written and excellent articulation linking program to university goals and strategic plan. Specifically how program supports tutors for students at no cost, mentoring activities to support student success (ISEG Program), partnership with middle and high schools as well as students globally, and diversity of faculty composition and strategy to increase international recruitment. Earned STEM designation for the MA – helps with recruitment of International enrollment. Focused on continuous improvement based on accreditation recommendations. |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Include strategies to promote enrollment related to STEM designation and international Co-Op programs.  Succinct analysis of learner outcomes and monitoring plan to continue excellence for goals that have met criteria. |
| General Feedback to program: | Very well written and narrative aligned well with appendixes. Continue to focus on 6 focus areas of program review and gathering data to support program narrative on student demand, degree production, talent pipeline, & economic impact. |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

Resubmit with focus on Targeted area(s) circled below (e.g. SMART Goals, additional data/narrative)

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

x

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle was suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria were established. Kansas Board of Regents Systemwide Program Review will resume with new criteria with the 2023-2024 Review Cycle Year and the Program Review Report will be reported to BAASC and the Board in Spring 2025. In the meantime, Wichita State will continue with the University Program review for the 2023 and 2024 academic years.

**MBA AND EXEC MBA ADMINISTRATION PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM –**

**OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Part 1 Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission and Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution and support of the university strategic plan | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** 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, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.  Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | 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 but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show 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. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook. | 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. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond N/A | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond. | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied 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 use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | MBA – Master of Business Administration; and EMBA – Executive Master of Business Administration |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report: | N/A |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: | Met all previous recommendations |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | Part 2 – provide narrative but need to pull in faculty info from 5 faculty members to chart for review to stand on its own. - don’t send reviewers to 5 other reviews – pull from those program reviews the faculty info reviewers should be reviewing in this review |
| Commendations of Program: | Focus on enrollment increase; Strong focus on improving the quality of the curricular program and engagement of students in the program. |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty (part 2); Annual tracking of program quality measures and show trends – part 3 (The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students)- Part 3 – need annual monitoring of student assessments and look at the trends – when not meeting 80% or higher expectation – should develop plan and expected outcome – this should be reflective in program review. |
| General Feedback to program: | Great recruitment goals for the future of the programs |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

Resubmit with focus on Targeted area(s) circled below (e.g. SMART Goals, additional data/narrative)

Recommendations/Feedback: Resubmitted and following areas highlighted do not meet expectations. Department should work on these the next 4 years and ensure they are fully addressed in the next university program review

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness. N/A for this review based on University PR data

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus: (highlights indicate areas met)

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness. N/A for this review based on University PR data

Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle was suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria were established. Kansas Board of Regents Systemwide Program Review will resume with new criteria with the 2023-2024 Review Cycle Year and the Program Review Report will be reported to BAASC and the Board in Spring 2025. In the meantime, Wichita State will continue with the University Program review for the 2023 and 2024 academic years.

**Freds PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Part 1 Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission and Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution and support of the university strategic plan | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** 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, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.  Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | 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 but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show 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. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook. | 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. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond. | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied 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 use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | FREDS – Finance. Real estate and Decision Sciences Department: Bachelor – Finance; Bachelor – Management Information Systems (MIS); MS in Business Analytics; MS in Management Science and Supply Chain Management |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report: | **Academic year 2019-2020:**  •Under FREDS, Management Science & Supply Chain Management, Master level, # of majors (fairly new program) |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: | Focus of program goals in last review was on Bachelor – Finance; Bachelor – Management Information Systems (MIS) only. No focus on two graduate programs in previous review– new programs as noted in review. Dept has completed the goals from previous review or making progress and continuing the work into this next review. Also has responded to previous review recommendations. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | Part 3: What is the improvement plan for MIS? Concern for areas below 80% or close to 80% - what is the plan moving forward for these areas. Data should be monitored annually with a focus on continuous improvement. Dept encouraged to create this focus in for the next 4 years prior to next review. |
| Commendations of Program: | Faculty within this department focus on ensuring each program is aligned to the university mission based on the curriculum they deliver, the programs they provide, and through their collaboration with university and community stakeholders. |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Focus on specific recruitment & retention activities beyond curriculum changes and being housed in a new building – actively recruit students through specific strategies and name these approaches with a focus on SEM & G Piper plans. |
| General Feedback to program: | UPR committee will work with OPA to ensure data is being collected for the two graduate programs – MSSCM majors and MSBA majors. |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

Resubmit with focus on Targeted area(s) circled below (e.g. SMART Goals, additional data/narrative)

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

X Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle was suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria were established. Kansas Board of Regents Systemwide Program Review will resume with new criteria with the 2023-2024 Review Cycle Year and the Program Review Report will be reported to BAASC and the Board in Spring 2025. In the meantime, Wichita State will continue with the University Program review for the 2023 and 2024 academic years.

**MARKETING PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Part 1 Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission and Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution and support of the university strategic plan | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** 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, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.  Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | 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 but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show 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. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook. | 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. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond. | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied 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 use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | Bachelor in Marketing |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report: | **Academic year 2021-2022:**   * Marketing, # of graduate faculty |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: | Program has worked hard to address recommendations from previous review – still a concern with addressing assessment outcomes to support program goals. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | Part 3 – concern with use of grading scale as assessment tool – this is not a fair & equitable approach and could be if explanation on how grading scale is used. 70% is a low target/criteria - why the one assessment tool & low criteria? |
| Commendations of Program: | Focusing on High DF courses in program & collaborating with appropriate colleges & faculty to address the concern. |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Address assessment outcomes to support program goals.  Continue to focus on monitoring high DF courses & implementing change as needed |
| General Feedback to program: | N/A |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

Resubmit with focus on Targeted area(s) circled below (e.g. SMART Goals, additional data/narrative)

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle was suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria were established. Kansas Board of Regents Systemwide Program Review will resume with new criteria with the 2023-2024 Review Cycle Year and the Program Review Report will be reported to BAASC and the Board in Spring 2025. In the meantime, Wichita State will continue with the University Program review for the 2023 and 2024 academic years.

**Department of management and entrepreneurship PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Part 1 Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission and Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution and support of the university strategic plan | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** 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, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.  Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | 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 but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show 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. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook. | 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. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond. | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied 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 use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | BBA – Management; BBA – IB; BBA – Entrepreneurship; BBA – HRM; MS in HRM |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report: | **Academic year 2019-2020:**  •Under Management, Human Resource Management, master level, # of majors (fairly new)  **Academic year 2021-2022:**   * Management Science master, # of graduates (new program, 2021) |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: | Addressed 6 recommendations and have focused activity around each of the recommendations with specific outcomes. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | Part 2. C – don’t tie the productivity to the programs, but have answered the prompt complete and responded to direct request to update the table.-  Part 3. 1- Student learning outcomes should be moved from the end of the report to this section and provided for all degrees. Please provide interpretation of results. In particular, the table in subsection D is missing. -Part 3 F – Mark Y on 4. The department provides GE courses and this needs to be addressed in program review.  Part 5 –what are the goals of the department for the next 4 years. Only provided a list of needs |
| Commendations of Program: | Clear focus on program and curricular development (New MS program, certificates etc.) |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Need to focus on the faculty quality and how this is linked to the productivity of the program(s) in the department. Need to develop forward facing goals for area of focus for the next 4 years. |
| General Feedback to program: | See recommendations above |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

Resubmit with focus on Targeted area(s) circled below (e.g. SMART Goals, additional data/narrative)

Recommendations/Feedback: Resubmitted and following areas highlighted do not meet expectations. Department should work on these the next 4 years and ensure they are fully addressed in the next university program review

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness. N/A for this review based on University PR data

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus: (highlights indicate areas met)

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness. N/A for this review based on University PR data

Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle was suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria were established. Kansas Board of Regents Systemwide Program Review will resume with new criteria with the 2023-2024 Review Cycle Year and the Program Review Report will be reported to BAASC and the Board in Spring 2025. In the meantime, Wichita State will continue with the University Program review for the 2023 and 2024 academic years.

**Art, Design and Creative Industries PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 | **Committee notes** |
| **Part 1 Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission and Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution and support of the university strategic plan | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. | UPC – AL, JD, KK, TF, SC, AJ:  Agree it now meets expectations based on the additional narrative provided. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** 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, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.  Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. | N/A |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | 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 but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show 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. | UPC – AL, JD, KK, TF, SC, AJ:  Stays as is – program must address this in the next 4 years. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |  |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook. | 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. |  |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | N/A |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond. | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. | N/A |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied 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 use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | UPC Feedback:  Goals are focused on actions outside of their assessment data, student performance, and efficiency of courses/programs - next report in 4 years should have at least 3 years of data & FFG should reflect on key areas that impact students, courses, & the program. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | Bachelor of Art with concentrations in Art and Art History  Bachelor of Fine Arts (Art) concentrations in Art Education and Studio Art  Bachelor of Fine Arts (Graphic Design)  Master of Fine Arts in Art degree in the area of studio arts |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report: | MFA Studio Art, majors and graduates. |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: | Assessment plan for each of the programs is still an area of concern that needs to be addressed before the next review (in 4 years). This assessment plan includes addressing the learning outcomes. Aligning recruitment and retention efforts with the university’s strategic enrollment plan is still an area that needs addressed before the next review. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: |  |
| Commendations of Program: | BFA in Studio Art - Art Education does have assessment plan and results due to their involvement with College of Applied Studies (CAS). CAS has a strong assessment system and platform for collecting data & CFA is encouraged to adopt a similar platform. |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Part 1: Discusses the program purpose but does not align it to the mission and/or strategic plan (5 university goals)  Before next review in 4 years, this program needs to develop a way to track assessment data and review this data at minimum, annually in all areas (Part 3). Why does **BA in Art** note that a rubric will be developed? Did this program not have an assessment plan prior to this review? Why? Exit survey data: Program faculty need to come together with Dean and stakeholders (professionals in field, current students, and graduates) and develop an action plan to address concerns as noted in the exit survey or this will only impact recruitment and retention in this area of the college.  In addition, before the next review, this department needs to focus on specific recruitment and retention efforts for each of its degree programs. |
| General Feedback to program: |  |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

Resubmit with focus on Targeted area(s) circled below (e.g. SMART Goals, additional data/narrative)

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle was suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria were established. Kansas Board of Regents Systemwide Program Review will resume with new criteria with the 2023-2024 Review Cycle Year and the Program Review Report will be reported to BAASC and the Board in Spring 2025. In the meantime, Wichita State will continue with the University Program review for the 2023 and 2024 academic years.

**School of Digital Arts PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Part 1 Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission and Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution and support of the university strategic plan | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** 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, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.  Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | 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 but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show 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. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook. | 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. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond. | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement. N/A first review. | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied 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 use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | BAA – Media Arts |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report: | NA |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: | This is first program review. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: |  |
| Commendations of Program: | Excellent job describing program relevance to industry. Good job describing data related to underrepresented students’ demographics. Aso did a good job with narrative describing continuous monitoring of student satisfaction and response to DFW legal course. Program to be commended for innovative model to acquire funding and resources needed to maintain program integrity. Even though faculty not expected to do research, there is evidence of faculty scholarly activity with creative work. Great job with grant development to support student projects. |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Part 2: Explore resources to increase dedicated TT faculty for HLC and KBOR requirements. Unsure if adjunct faculty are full time workload – if so, these faculty should be NTT faculty at a minimum.  Part 3: Enhance narrative to justify one course measurement for student assessment.  All assessment data related to one course MART 499. Include other courses that are included in the curriculum.  Part 5: Consider including forward facing goals related to NASAD recommendations and DFW course plan – cohort reduction. |
| General Feedback to program: |  |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

Resubmit with focus on Targeted area(s) circled below (e.g. SMART Goals, additional data/narrative)

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

X Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle was suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria were established. Kansas Board of Regents Systemwide Program Review will resume with new criteria with the 2023-2024 Review Cycle Year and the Program Review Report will be reported to BAASC and the Board in Spring 2025. In the meantime, Wichita State will continue with the University Program review for the 2023 and 2024 academic years.

**Fine Arts Multi-disciplinary PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 | **Committee Feedback** |
| **Part 1 Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission and Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution and support of the university strategic plan | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. | N/A |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** 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, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.  Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |  |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | 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 but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show 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. |  |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |  |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook. | 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. |  |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |  |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond N/A Program structure doesn’t provide service beyond the program | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond. | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. | N/A |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement N/A this is the first review | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied 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 use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | N/A |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | MAALM: Master of Arts in Arts Leadership and Management |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report: | Academic year 2020-2021 and 2021-2022:   * Arts Leadership & Management, number of majors (master, fairly new) |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: | N/A - new program, was not reviewed in 2018 |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | This is the first review of a program that began 2018. |
| Commendations of Program: | Value of the program and its aspirations are very clear. It is a spectacular vision by the director to want to grow MAALM program to be the nation’s premiere online arts leadership program, known to train workforce-ready arts executives to adapt, grow, and thrive in this changing, diverse field!! |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Focus on your forward facing goals the next 4 years and achieving your vision to grow the MAALM program. The University Program Review committee looks forward to reading the results in your next review! |
| General Feedback to program: | See comments above. |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

Resubmit with focus on Targeted area(s) circled below (e.g. SMART Goals, additional data/narrative)

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle was suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria were established. Kansas Board of Regents Systemwide Program Review will resume with new criteria with the 2023-2024 Review Cycle Year and the Program Review Report will be reported to BAASC and the Board in Spring 2025. In the meantime, Wichita State will continue with the University Program review for the 2023 and 2024 academic years.

**School of Music PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Part 1 Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission and Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution and support of the university strategic plan | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** 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, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.  Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | 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 but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show 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. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook. | 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. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond. | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied 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 use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | Bachelor – Music, General ; Master – Music History, Literature, and Theory  Bachelor and Master – Music Performance ; Bachelor and Master – Music Theory and Composition  Master – Conducting ; Bachelor – Jazz/Jazz Studies ; Bachelor and Master – Music Education |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report: | **Academic year 2019-2020:**  •Music Teacher Education number of majors & graduates (bachelor)  •Music Teacher Education number of majors (master)  **Academic year 2020-2021:**  •Music Teacher Education number of majors (master)  **Academic year 2021-2022:**   * Music Teacher Education number of majors (master) |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: | Met previous recommendations |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | Part 3 – Need to present student learning outcomes for all UG and graduate programs in the School of Music. Even if there is a low N in each program resulting in no data, the program’s student learning assessment plan must be presented with narrative that there is no data to assess due to no enrollment. Help the reviewer better understand how you measure full artistic potential? This is not clear within your current use of the table. Feel free to add narrative. |
| Commendations of Program: | Will be completed after re-submission |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | No Recommendations |
| General Feedback to program: | N/A |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

Resubmit with focus on Targeted area(s) circled below (e.g. SMART Goals, additional data/narrative)

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle was suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria were established. Kansas Board of Regents Systemwide Program Review will resume with new criteria with the 2023-2024 Review Cycle Year and the Program Review Report will be reported to BAASC and the Board in Spring 2025. In the meantime, Wichita State will continue with the University Program review for the 2023 and 2024 academic years.

**performing arts PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Part 1 Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission and Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution and support of the university strategic plan | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** 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, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.  Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | 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 but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show 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. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook. | 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. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond. | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied 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 use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | * BA Performing Arts with emphasis in Dance * BA Performing Arts with emphasis in Drama & Dramatics/Theatre Arts * BFA Performing Arts with emphasis in Dance * BFA Performing Arts with emphasis in Drama & Dramatics/Theatre Arts; * BFA Performing Arts with emphasis in Technical Theatre/Theatre Design & Technology * BFA Performing Arts with emphasis in Musical Theatre   Certificate (s): Certificate in Commercial Dance, Certificate in Directing, Certificate in Physical Performance, Certificate in Stage Management, Certificate in Voice Acting, Certificate in Dance Choreography, Certificate in Dance and Digital Performance |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report: | N/A |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: | This is evident in the number of improvements and advancements for the future noted in the program review, section 5. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | Great job on implementing e-portfolios in 2022 – we look forward to seeing the results of this initiative. |
| Commendations of Program: | Program has a clear purpose and vision and these are both evident in the collaborative efforts this program puts forward in the performing arts community in Wichita while providing applied, creative learning and experiences for degree-bound students all while enriching the arts and the cultural education at WSU and in the community. SPA is very focused on the university strategic plan and this has impacted the courses offered in SPA and improving course materials and content. In addition, the School is focused on supporting the university HSI initiative.  Great use of tables and narrative throughout the review document. Analysis was very helpful to the review of this department and its programs. Excellent use of metrics to tell the story and the impact of what the programs in this department are doing. |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | The Department chair of SPA is encouraged to talk with the Dean to discuss the faculty concerns, hiring of Production Manager and balance of faculty service expectations, as discussed in the review and by specialty accreditation board. |
| General Feedback to program: | Great forward facing goals for the next review. Continue to focus on goals from previous review that are noted as in progress or continuing. |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

Resubmit with focus on Targeted area(s) circled below (e.g. SMART Goals, additional data/narrative)

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle was suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria were established. Kansas Board of Regents Systemwide Program Review will resume with new criteria with the 2023-2024 Review Cycle Year and the Program Review Report will be reported to BAASC and the Board in Spring 2025. In the meantime, Wichita State will continue with the University Program review for the 2023 and 2024 academic years.

**Art, Design and Creative Industries PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Part 1 Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission and Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution and support of the university strategic plan | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission.  Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** 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, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.  Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | 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 but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show 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. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook. | 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. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond. | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied 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 use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | Bachelor of Art with concentrations in Art and Art History  Bachelor of Fine Arts (Art) concentrations in Art Education and Studio Art  Bachelor of Fine Arts (Graphic Design)  Master of Fine Arts in Art degree in the area of studio arts |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report: | MFA Studio Art, majors and graduates. |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations: | Assessment plan for each of the programs is still an area of concern that needs to be addressed before the next review (in 4 years). This assessment plan includes addressing the learning outcomes. Aligning recruitment and retention efforts with the university’s strategic enrollment plan is still an area that needs addressed before the next review. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | Resubmitted review with additional clarity |
| Commendations of Program: | Great detail in faculty activity and the alignment of the research and creative activity in faculty productivity and its alignment to student/program impact. Grant work – positive increase and an area the faculty is encouraged to continue to focus on. Table 1 – detail on who or # of faculty members making this impact would be positive and help review team. |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Part 5: Readdress new goals with specific, measurable goals –if enrollment – then what specific measure do you want to achieve? Specifics on 3 of rubrics developed and being deployed. Goals marked as continuing from previous review/recommendations should be in the new forward facing goals.  BFA in Studio Art - Art Education does have assessment plan and results due to their involvement with College of Applied Studies (CAS). CAS has a strong assessment system and platform for collecting data & CFA is encouraged to adopt a similar platform. Before next review in 4 years, this program needs to develop a way to track assessment data and review this data at minimum, annually in all areas (Part 3). Why does **BA in Art** note that a rubric will be developed? Did this program not have an assessment plan prior to this review? Why? Exit survey data: Program faculty need to come together with Dean and stakeholders (professionals in field, current students, and graduates) and develop an action plan to address concerns as noted in the exit survey or this will only impact recruitment and retention in this area of the college.  In addition, before the next review, this department needs to focus on specific recruitment and retention efforts for each of its degree programs – more detail in recruiting effort for each degree program. How are grad programs engaging with the schools (K-12 students) to increase student demand in these programs through the community exhibitions (solo or group) – these are both a major source of recruitment (you mention 22 of them earlier in your review)? |
| General Feedback to program: | Encourage to focus on Assessment plan for each of the programs to ensure continuous improvement |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any: Items in red still a concern after resubmission

Resubmit with focus on Targeted area(s) circled below (e.g. SMART Goals, additional data/narrative)

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness. N/A for this review based on University PR data

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus: Items highlighted are met

(1) Market demand for the program;

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness. N/A for this review based on University PR data

Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle was suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria were established. Kansas Board of Regents Systemwide Program Review will resume with new criteria with the 2023-2024 Review Cycle Year and the Program Review Report will be reported to BAASC and the Board in Spring 2025. In the meantime, Wichita State will continue with the University Program review for the 2023 and 2024 academic years.