**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.

**College of Innovation and Design:**

Masters of Innovation and Design 50.0404

**Dorothy and Bill Cohen Honors College:**

Honors 30.9999

**Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences:**

BS Biological / Biochemistry 26.0101

BA Biological / Biochemistry 26.0101

MS Biological / Biochemistry 26.0101

BS Chemistry 40.0501

BS BioChemistry 40.0501

MS Chemistry 40.0501

PhD Chemistry 40.0501

BS Geology 40.0601

MS Earth, Environmental and Physical Sciences 40.0601

*\*Certificate in Environmental and Sustainability Studies*

BS Mathematics 27.0101

MS Mathematics 27.0101

PhD Applied Mathematics 27.0301

*\*Graduate Certificate in the Mathematical Foundations of Data Analytics*

BS Physics 40.0801

MS Physics 40.0801

**College of Engineering:**

BS Computer Science 11.0701

MS Computer Science 11.0701

MS Computing 11.0101

MS Data Science 11.0199

PhD Elect. Engineering and Computer Science 14.1099

*\*Graduate Certificate in Computational Data Science*

*\*Graduate Certificate in Computer Networking*

*\*Graduate Certificate in Information Assurance and Cybersecurity*

*\*Graduate Certificate in Software Engineering*

BS Aerospace Engineering 14.0201

MS Aerospace Engineering 14.0201

PhD Aerospace Engineering 14.0201

BS Biomedical Engineering 14.0501

MS Biomedical Engineering 14.0501

PhD Biomedical Engineering 14.0501

BS Computer Engineering 14.0901

BS Electrical Engineering 14.1001

MS in Electrical and Computer Engineering 14.4701

BS Engineering Technology 15.0000

*\*Certificate in Assistive Technology & Design*

*\*Certificate in Cyber Physical Systems*

*\*Certificate in Applied Data Analysis*

*\*Certificate in Sustainability with Water*

BS Industrial Engineering 14.3501

MS Industrial Engineering 14.3501

PhD Industrial Engineering 14.3501

MEM Engineering Management 15.1501

BS Manufacturing Engineering 14.3601

BS Mechanical Engineering 14.1901

MS Mechanical Engineering 14.1901

PhD Mechanical Engineering 14.1901

**INNOVATION AND DESIGN PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address:** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution** | Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty** | The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, 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. | 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 that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program. | Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program. |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students** | The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of 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. |
| **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. |
| **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 to the community. | The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community. | The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community. |
| **Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement** | The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs.  Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited 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: | Masters of Innovation Design |
| Triggered Programs: | New program but faculty, majors, graduates may be a concern for next review. |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs: | Last review not referenced |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes: | * Program Mission: Narrative does not clearly tie the missions and roles together, but potential for program to be educational and economic driver is clear. * Faculty: The three faculty may be fully qualified and highly productive, but as indicated in their self-study it is not clear that they will be able to sustain the program if enrollment grows as planned. Much of the curriculum is outsourced to other units on campus, which makes the program viable for the time being. Faculty appointments and affiliates need to be more clearly explained. * Curriculum quality: Core courses are aligned with program learning outcomes, but higher benchmarks seem to be required by Graduate School standards. * Need/demand: Employer demand is clearly indicated, but student need is less evident. Need for a G-PIPER plan is indicated. * Value: Program niche is clear, though overlap with many programs may make it less appealing/competitive. * Feedback loop: Program is fairly new, but self-monitoring. * After meeting with program chair, additional written info. was provided by program which moved section 3 to meet expectations with this note from the committee - “provide syllabi & assessment rubrics for core courses with appropriate standards” and the comment about higher benchmarks being required by graduate school standards (on page 12 of the self-study, all measures were “80% scoring 60% or better” and 100% of all students passed/exceeded expectations.) * After meeting with program chair, additional written info. was provided by program which moved section 4 to exceeds expectations – the added narrative clearly represents what the major/degree within this department can be used for * Section 6 will remain at partially meets - nothing is addressed about the goals/recommendations from the previous self-study; the program had students first enrolled in spring 2016, so it has been around 6-7 years, so they should have close to 5 years of data; using the SWOT analysis, which is from the old template; forward facing goals are vague and not SMART goals, have no measurement or when they would like to complete the goal. |
| Commendations: | Effective and efficient use of university resources to meet goals of interdisciplinary program.  Faculty are very active and engaged. |
| Recommendations Going Forward: | Provide syllabi and assessment rubrics for core courses with appropriate standards. See comments above regarding assessment and address these concerns prior to the next review.  Develop G-PIPER plan.  Develop plan for recruiting additional faculty a faculty succession plan. |
| General Feedback | Program is off to a good start.  Graduate Dean Letter: Encourages CID to establish a mechanism and incentive plan to allow the NTT faculty to submit proposals and manage grants. Grad. Dean noted CID requires additional resources, including additional faculty and the ability for more faculty to pursue research funding to increase the MID program, and to capitalize on its unique abilities.  PR Discussion with Dean & Grad Dean: |

**KBOR Review:** Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle has been suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria are 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.

**University Program Review Committee recommendation(s), if any:**

No additional comments beyond what is listed above

**Honors College PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address:** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution** | Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty** | The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, 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. | 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 that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program. | Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program. |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students** | The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of 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. |
| **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. |
| **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 to the community. | The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community. | The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community. |
| **Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement** | The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs.  Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited 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: | Honors baccalaureate |
| Triggered Programs: | N/A |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs: | Part 8, Table 6 is not completed - AY19 review provided these recommendations going forward:   * Clear distinction between goals, curriculum, outcomes, results and analysis for students enrolled in the Honors Baccalaureate and students taking Honors College courses and/or Honors College students. * Review learning outcomes and diversity assessment tools. Enrollment in a specific course is highly relied upon for outcomes. * Develop outcomes and measures for applied learning. * Improve recruitment and retention of students – Triggered program. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes: | Evaluation categories marked “partially meets expectations” are primarily a reflection of documentation rather than serious concerns with the program itself.   * Mission: Program and university missions not aligned explicitly in statement. * Faculty: The only faculty documented are those with appointments in honors. These are not the faculty who actually teach the classes, and it isn’t clear from the program structure whether the faculty appointments are sufficient. * Quality:   + Assessment plan is in progress, i.e. learner outcomes pilot. (This really should count as meeting expectations.)  - Concentrations are not listed. Responsiveness to student demand in curriculum development could be part of curriculum assessment.   * Student need is well demonstrated by program growth.  * Employer demand is less clearly demonstrated.   After meeting with the program chair, additional written info. was provided by the program which moved parts 1-4 to meets expectations. The evidence presented represents a college that supports the university mission and focused on promoting multidisciplinary teaching and collaboration that promotes higher education for the 21st century. |
| Commendations: | Growing enrollment and outreach efforts are impressive. |
| Recommendations Going Forward: | Cover page is not signed. Program review and assessment should be a collaborative effort by all faculty.  Faculty with honors appointments should be teaching honors courses. |
| General Feedback | Because this program is not structured in the traditional way, it may be difficult for Regents or other external evaluators to understand how the program works, specifically how it efficiently served the university mission. Consequently, it may be important moving forward to focus the text of the review differently in some areas.  General concerns to potentially address in the text:   * Given the numbers, the honors college looks more like a program that should be triggered for low majors and low graduation. Why should it be a college in its own right? (Why shouldn’t it be absorbed into another program?) * This is an *honors* college, but there is very little in the text to indicate what that means. What distinguishes an honors course or an honors student from other courses/students? Is this a measurable difference? (Assessments are increasingly reduced to metrics and this may be one of those areas that requires careful articulation.) |

**KBOR Review:** Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle has been suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria are 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.

**University Program Review Committee recommendation(s), if any:**

No additional comments

**LAS-Biology PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address:** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution** | Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty** | The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, 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. | 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 that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program. | Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program. |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students** | The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of 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. |
| **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. |
| **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 to the community. | The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community. | The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community. |
| **Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement** | The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs.  Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited 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 Science (BS) in Biology, Bachelor of Arts in Biology (BA), Master of Science in Biology (MS) |
| Triggered Programs: | none |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs: | See pages 22 & 23 of self-study |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes: | NA |
| Commendations: | Strong qualified faculty (all tenure/tenure-track except 1 person), large amounts of external grant funding from top agencies (NSF, NIH, NASA, etc.); offers research & lab experiences, works with other departments for interdisciplinary programs (Biology for Biochemistry, Biomedical Engineering, and secondary Biology education in Applied Studies; students score higher than national average on national exam, decrease of DFW rate in BIOL 210 & 211 |
| Recommendations Going Forward: | Try to increase UG satisfaction (pg. 14); continue with URM recruitment & enrollment, perhaps revamp plan or strategy; look into mean scores for non-thesis students to see if they can be improved |
| General Feedback | Biology faculty are encouraged to speak with their department chair and dean on their aspirations to increase resources such number of faculty, GTA support, etc, which can be driven by the data collected within this report. |

**KBOR Review:** Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle has been suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria are 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.

**University Program Review Committee recommendation(s), if any:**

No additional comments

**LAS Chemistry- PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address:** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution** | Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty** | The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, 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. | 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 that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program. | Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program. |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students** | The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of 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. |
| **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. |
| **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 to the community. | The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community. | The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community. |
| **Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement** | The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs.  Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited 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: | BS Chemistry, BS Biochemistry [Business Chemistry/ PreMed Chemistry], MS Chemistry, PhD Chemistry |
| Triggered Programs: | MS for number of majors & graduates |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs: | Yes. Department has made progress on 2/3 recommendations from prior review. Indicate plans to address the 3rd recommendation. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes: | MS has 12 students 2015-2019; need 20. MS has 4 graduates 2016-2020; need 5. |
| Commendations: | * 2 credit hours of independent research required for UG students * A DEI committee has been established * Colloquium series with focus on professional topics, diverse speakers, and industry-focused presentations offered; required at Grad level * Positive national accreditation review in summer 2021, with recommendation for continued approval |
| Recommendations Going Forward: | * Describe changes to curriculum and/or program as informed/recommended by the newly formed DEI committee; low ACS scores, etc * Continue to support faculty efforts to secure funding; encourage publication by junior and senior faculty; tie faculty scholarship to program enhancements * Report data/analysis of student outcomes "demonstrate ability to apply techniques and concepts of chemistry in a research project" * Clearly indicate employer need for UG graduate employment; consider as a forward-facing goal to obtain employer feedback. |
| General Feedback | Well-written report |

**KBOR Review:** Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle has been suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria are 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.

**University Program Review Committee recommendation(s), if any:**

* Develop a rubric to capture ACS scores and other learning outcome metrics, such as: research projects; a portfolio might be considered
* Use student/faculty research-focused projects as part of outreach/recruitment efforts

**LAS-Geology PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address:** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution** | Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty** | The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, 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. | 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 that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program. | Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program. |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students** | The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of 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. |
| **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. |
| **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 to the community. | The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community. | The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community. |
| **Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement** | The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs.  Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited 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: | Bachelors in Geology  Masters in Earth, Environmental and Physical Sciences  Certificate in Environmental and Sustainability Studies – new 2020 |
| Triggered Programs: | No – see note in committee notes |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs: | Yes |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes: | Did not include specific information of impact of facilities and resources on program  It was noted on page 5, item B there were 5 faculty for the Master’s program – based on KBOR minimum this is below the required minimum of 6 faculty with terminal degrees.  Page 7-9– it was noted that 100% of the students were meeting the targets in all areas- Is this 100% first attempt or remediation involved? Do the performance measures need to be adjusted – are they valid?  It was noted, in order to clearly align the program to our mission of being a cultural driver, we encourage the faculty to consider incorporating considerations of the impacts of geological work on local populations, communities, and cultures. For example, sustainability is in part a cultural matter. Work in hydrology can enable at-risk communities and populations like KS farmers. |
| Commendations: | Clear narrative to describe data and impact on program and industry. Good mix of assessments to assess student learning outcomes. |
| Recommendations Going Forward: | Monitor enrollment and impact of Certificate on workforce  Include specifics of how program is meeting university SEM and GEM(G-PIPER) |
| General Feedback | The program noted their concern with One Stop advising (p. 18). The program is encouraged to meet with One Stop (Aaron Hamilton & assigned One Stop advisor located on WSU campus) along with their department chair, Dean, & Provost to discuss their concerns. |

**KBOR Review:** Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle has been suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria are 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.

**University Program Review Committee recommendation(s), if any:**

Encouraged to consult with the Dean to determine resources for additional faculty, since currently below the minima - It was noted on page 5, item B there were 5 faculty for the Master’s program – based on KBOR minimum this is below the required minimum of 6 faculty with terminal degrees.

**LAS - Math & Statistics PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address:** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution** | Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty** | The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, 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. | 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 that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program. | Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program. |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students** | The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of 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. |
| **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. |
| **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 to the community. | The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community. | The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community. |
| **Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement** | The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs.  Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited 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: | BS in Mathematics and Statistics, MS program in Mathematics, PhD program in Applied Mathematics, and Graduate Certificate in the Mathematical Foundations of Data Analytics |
| Triggered Programs: | N/A – Since this review the Math program is triggered for master majors – this program should have 20, the 5-year average 13.8. |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs: | From 2018-19 review, Math/stats set 5 goals. The program represents the outcome of the goals and whether they are continuing, complete, or ongoing. These were not SMART goals, but the program was able to provide outcomes for each. Moving Forward, the program is encouraged to create SMART Goals to ensure their objectives are attainable. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes: | * Clear purpose statement & objectives for each program. * Strong faculty base with 18 tenured faculty focused on research in areas related to their PhD – this is an area of growth for this program since 2011- there is no evidence presented on how the research productivity including publications, grants, and presentations is directly linked to program enhancements. * Grades & GPA are used to measure each of the learning outcomes. When using grades as the assessment score for the BS program, it is not clear if this is the overall course grade or grade on a specific assignment/unit aligned with the outcome. Assessment via capstone course is not clear for the certificate. Is this based on a scoring rubric? * The program documents the success of its candidates after graduation but does not clearly look at data to address student needs or employer demands.   After meeting with program chair, additional written info. was provided by program which moved part 6 to meet expectations. The evidence presented represents a department that focuses on the feedback loop and provides justification on changes made or not made based on the assessment results. The department is strong in focused review of assessment data for the degree majors within their programs. |
| Commendations: | The Math/Stat program provides strong service to the other colleges. Nearly 94% of the student credit hours generated in this department are for general Wichita State students who are not math majors. Clear purpose statement & objectives for each program. Strong faculty base. |
| Recommendations Going Forward: | Program encouraged to revisit the model used for delivering math/stat courses to non-math majors and utilizing the data to determine an approach that yields 80% or more of the candidates finding success.  Based on previous review, the program did make some changes based on their assessment even though there is additional work needed with the use of assessments and data within this program.  Strong faculty base with exceptional research – the program is encouraged to focus in on this research for program enhancements. |
| General Feedback | The Math/Stat program provides a strong service to other colleges. It was noted in the report that these 20,000 + student credit hours taught each semester are by instructors, short term lecturers, and graduate teaching assistants. When looking at the general education outcomes data (Table 3, pg. 16) it is concerning the results within each of these courses delivered to non-math majors. In the 36 points of data provided, only 19% (n=7) of these data points represent 80% or more of the candidates passing to meet two of the general education outcomes - Think critically and independently, and employ analytical reasoning and problem-solving techniques. No documentation or discussion is provided in how this assessment data is being used to implement the change needed. These math courses are key in recruitment and retention. |

**KBOR Review:** Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle has been suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria are 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.

**University Program Review Committee recommendation(s), if any:**

No additional comments

**LAS - Physics PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address:** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution** | Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty** | The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, 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. | 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 that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program. | Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program. |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students** | The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of 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. |
| **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. |
| **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 to the community. | The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community. | The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community. |
| **Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement** | The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited 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: | BS Physics and MS Physics |
| Triggered Programs: | No not at time review was completed. See Committee notes below |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs: | From 2018-19 review, Physics set 4 goals and analyzed WSU OPA data to meet two of these goals (complete restart of MS program & feed physics MS students into applied math PhD program). The program noted the utilization of the PhD program has been very successful - of the about 33 current Math PhD students, 7 are on the Physics track. Data is not being used for the other two goals. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes: | Great job on describing their role (centrality); could provide more info. on their community service/external service (Qualification of faculty); assessment material need improved, program uses course grades & GPA – need brief narrative of what they are trying to assess with their choice of assessments and provide reason for the assessments they have chosen, weak assessment measures and narrative (impact on students); project growth is a highlight, not clear on student need or employer need (student/employer). At time review was completed by program this program was not triggered, however it was noted in the review meeting that based on # of bachelor’s degree the KBOR minima is 10 and the current 5 year average is 5.8; masters KBOR minima for majors is 20 and the Physics MS has 8. In addition, the KBOR minima for masters degrees is 5 and the 5 year average for the Wichita State program is 3.3.  After meeting with program chair, additional written info. was provided by program which moved parts 3 & 4 to meet expectations. The evidence presented the program’s analysis of the learning outcome results. It should be noted that the Assessment tool and Target Criteria is not addressed on student outcome 2 for undergraduate program so it is hard to determine how the proficiency analysis was provided. Program provided a descriptive assessment on the employment, specifically at the national level. Program did a great job explaining the overall need/demand of Physics, but stated they were not tracking graduates and are encouraged to look at an approach to track their graduates after graduation. Program did not discuss the need/demand in Kansas, which there is some demand. |
| Commendations: | Highly valuable program to the rest of the university and to the external community – this needs to be a key focus of discussion within the report. |
| Recommendations Going Forward: | Program encouraged to discuss how their coursework provides service to other programs; % of student credit hours for other majors; and overall university student demand/academic needs. Program needs to focus on discussion looking at the full scope of what majors can do with their BS or MS in Physics – tie back to university mission. Work on providing justification for the Physics program. Based on previous review, program did make some changes based on their assessment even though there is additional work needed with use of assessments and data within this program. Outreach is a focus area for the program & they are encouraged to use data to drive goals focused on this area. Program should do additional work on assessments used within the program to focus on measuring learning outcomes. A focus on SMART goals is recommended – currently the Forward Facing goals are not SMART goals. |
| General Feedback | Comment of page 20 in report provided by the program does not address how the program provides service to other university programs. |

**KBOR Review:** Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle has been suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria are 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.

**University Program Review Committee recommendation(s), if any:**

No additional comments provided

**COE – School of Computing PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address: School of Computing** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution** | Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty** | The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, 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. | 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 that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program. | Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program. |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students** | The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of 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. |
| **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. |
| **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 to the community. | The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community. | The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community. |
| **Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement** | The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs.  Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited 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: | BS Computer Science  MS Computer Science  MS Computing  MS Data Science  PhD Electrical Engineering and Computer Science  Certificate (s): Graduate Certificate in Computational Data Science, Graduate Certificate in Computer Networking, Graduate Certificate in Information Assurance and Cybersecurity, Graduate Certificate in Software Engineering |
| Triggered Programs: | N/A |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs: | No previous PR recommendations were given. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes: |  |
| Commendations: | * Undergrad and graduate curricula updated to meet discipline trends and employer needs; utilizes feedback from ABET accreditor (undergraduate program) and an advisory board. * Faculty are highly engaged in research and scholarship activities; have funding support. * UG Program re-accredited through 2027. – Graduate program learner outcomes met. * Ongoing curricular changes and new assessments instituted upon review of learner outcome data. |
| Recommendations Going Forward: | * Implement strategies to obtain post-graduation data of MS and PHD alumni. * Investigate sources of low student satisfaction ratings. * Consider Director of DE&I position to assist with recruitment of URM students, particularly at the graduate level. * Develop plan to recruit and retain faculty, to meet program(s) needs; especially if starting a new cybersecurity program. * Develop additional learning outcome metrics for graduate program. |
| General Feedback | Well-written report |

**KBOR Review:** Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle has been suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria are 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.

**University Program Review Committee recommendation(s), if any:**

N/A

**Aerospace Engineering PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address:** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution** | Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty** | The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, 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. | 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 that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program. | Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program. |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students** | The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of 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. |
| **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. |
| **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 to the community. | The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community. | The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community. |
| **Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement** | The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs.  Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited 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 Science (BS) in Aerospace Engineering, Master of Science (MS) in Aerospace Engineering, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Aerospace Engineering |
| Triggered Programs: | Number of graduates in PhD program (need 2, have 1.4) |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs: | Addressed all 7 previous recommendations on page 32 |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes: | After meeting with program chair, additional written info. was provided by program which moved part 5 to exemplary. The evidence presented represents a department that provides service to the discipline and university community through student credit hours as well as faculty who contribute to the University, Professional Organizations/Societies, Industry, and Community through various activities. |
| Commendations: | Creation of degree program where students can earn PhD without getting master’s first; work with local industry; COOP/applied learning/research experiences for students; sophisticated labs and technical equipment; UG program fully accredited through ABET (with one concern about # of faculty); high average salary for students once they graduate; higher student satisfaction than rest of College of Engineering and total university |
| Recommendations Going Forward: | Examine possible causes and solutions to decline in PhD enrollment and degree attainment (does some on page 35); make GR assessment plan more mature/inclusive like the UG assessment plan; expand more on faculty section – they are qualified but section is sparce; include more on service provided to university (besides SCH for other ENGR majors) and community |
| General Feedback | NA from Program Review Committee  Graduate Dean: Attrition Rate is not present; Employment data incomplete for graduate program – strong for undergraduate program; Encouraged to submit G-Piper plan.  It was noted by Tiffany Franks that this 4 year review ended with 2020 and that is the reason for no 2021 data as noted in the graduate dean’s letter. |

**KBOR Review:** Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle has been suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria are 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.

**University Program Review Committee recommendation(s), if any:**

No additional comments beyond what is listed above

**Biomedical Engineering PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address:** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution** | Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty** | The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, 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. | 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 that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program. | Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program. |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students** | The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of 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. |
| **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. |
| **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 to the community. | The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community. | The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community. |
| **Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement** | The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs.  Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited 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: | BS BME; MS BME; PhD BME |
| Triggered Programs: | No |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs: | Yes, addressed six recommendations – p. 29 |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes: | * Focus on utilizing language from university mission in narrative on how the program meets the drivers within the mission – it could be a lot clearer in connecting to the university mission vs. leaving the reviewer to make an interpretation of the connection. * Encouraged to work with Dean on faculty recruitment based on level of programs offered & feedback from the ABET accreditation review as this could be a future concern. * If ABET concerns on facilities (e.g. lab space) has not be addressed, discuss with dean for future development – this c |
| Commendations: | * Improved assessments of student outcomes with rubrics and course mapping. * Active engagement in SEM and G-PIPER (formerly GEM) strategies. * Applied learning, UG research and student service to community (3D prosthetics & Prenatal Hope) |
| Recommendations Going Forward: | * Revise purpose statements to link more clearly to WSU mission * Encouraged to work with Dean on faculty recruitment based on level of programs offered & feedback from the ABET accreditation review as this could be a future concern. * Revise the program review document to include student outcome data instead of referring to ABET document – import the tables and narrative as was done in other sections of the review. This is in alignment with concern addressed by ABET. |
| General Feedback | Program Review Committee - encouraged to look to current KPI goals of 70% and increase to at least 80%  Graduate Dean – Focus on employment data and Graduate School recruitment (G-PIPER plan); Focus more on data to look at growth & progress. Research Funding is impressive. |

**KBOR Review:** Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle has been suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria are 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.

**University Program Review Committee recommendation(s), if any:**

University Program Review Committee does not have any further recommendations beyond the comments listed above.

**Electrical and Computer Engineering PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address:** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution** | Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty** | The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, 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. | 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 that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program. | Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program. |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students** | The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of 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. |
| **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. |
| **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 to the community. | The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community. | The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community. |
| **Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement** | The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs.  Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited 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 Science (BS) in Electrical Engineering, Bachelor of Science (BS) in Computer Engineering, Master of Science (MS) in Electrical and Computer Engineering, |
| Triggered Programs: |  |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs: | Newly formed department (ECE) in 2021. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes: | BS program aligned to the 3 main areas of the university mission – MS program response is focused on economic & educational driver. MS program provides critical knowledge to pursue a PhD in Electrical  Engineering  Quality of faculty productivity – narrative to understand MS faculty. BS faculty stated to reference ABET p36 & 37 but this accreditation review was not attached to the program review  Assessment – 1 outcome for MS – is this enough to measure quality of program and impact on students? BS programs referenced appendix and this was not provided. |
| Commendations: | College faculty and staff are highly engaged in SEM with faculty fellows, high school visits, developing a first year seminar course. Faculty are working on improving the curriculum to incorporate design and applied learning-based courses based on student & stakeholder feedback. The focus on recruitment and retention is also a positive focus at the graduate level. The dept. has a comprehensive list of strong goals & focus to grow all 3 programs. Good set of forward-facing goals; good explanation of employer demand and the need for the program; good analysis of need for recruiting, especially international students. |
| Recommendations Going Forward: | Program encouraged to work with Dean to address ABET concern regarding not having a faculty member to teach electronics related classes for BS in Electrical Engineering.  Utilize more than one assessment outcome for each program to measure the quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students  Examine possible causes and solutions to lower-than-expected learner outcomes for MSECE program; provide more details/specifics on service to university and the discipline; provide additional narrative on assessment by integrating material for ABET into self-study. |
| General Feedback | This program is doing a great job in listening to feedback & implementing changes for growth. The ECE Dept. is new (2021) and already making an impact with number of majors, SCH production, and the involvement of the faculty at the university, the college, and the department level. The ECE faculty are involved in shared governance, and committees that serve the greater good. |

**KBOR Review:** Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle has been suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria are 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.

**University Program Review Committee recommendation(s), if any:**

No additional comments beyond what is listed above

**Engineering Technology PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address:** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution** | Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty** | The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, 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. | 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 that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program. | Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program. |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students** | The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of 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. |
| **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. |
| **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 to the community. | The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community. | The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community. |
| **Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement** | The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs.  Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited 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 Science (BS) in Engineering Technology; 4 Certificates: Assistive Technology & Design; Cyber Physical Systems; Applied Data Analysis; Sustainability with Water\*  \*also available online |
| Triggered Programs: | None |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs: | Addressed all 7 previous recommendations with outcomes on page 22 |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes: | Noted that all faculty are NTT; curious how that works with KBOR minima that bachelor’s degree programs must have at least 3 T/TT faculty  After meeting with the program chair, additional written info. was provided by the program which moved part 1 to meets expectations. The evidence presented represents a department that has a clear program purpose and that is generally aligned with the university mission. As an educational driver, it is not clear if this is for the student or industry partners. The other statements provide general alignment with no specific examples or further detail to clarify the statement.  Feedback loop – in looking at Table 4 (pg 21 of PR report) the activity & outcome were lacking clarity and detail to help the review committee to fully understand how the program is using evidence for program improvement. This is also evident within the goals addressed in Tables 5 & 6. Many of the goals are procedural tasks and not goals focused on continuous program improvement. |
| Commendations: | ABET accredited; clearly state teaching/research/service expectations of the department; place a high value on teaching; participate in some research and applying for grants even though not required/expected; saw an increase in student satisfaction with program; creating stackable degree program for more flexible options for students; great examples of service to university & community; enrollment has grown almost every year |
| Recommendations Going Forward: | Include more examples or narrative about creative work done with students; consider increasing assessment standard to 80% instead of 70% since all are passing at higher than 70% currently; look at Exit Survey questions with lowest satisfaction and see if can be addressed; list all certificates offered on the cover page along with the bachelor degree; create goals that are mainly under departmental control/don’t rely on things outside your control in order for achievement of goals to happen |
| General Feedback | NA |

Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle has been suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria are 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.

**University Program Review Committee recommendations, if any:**

No additional comments/recommendations beyond what is listed above in the comment boxes

**Industrial, Systems, & Manufacturing Engineering PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address:** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution** | Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty** | The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, 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. | 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 that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program. | Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program. |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students** | The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of 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. |
| **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. |
| **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 to the community. | The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community. | The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community. |
| **Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement** | The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs.  Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited 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: | BS Industrial engineering, BS Manufacturing Engineering  MS Industrial engineering, MEM engineering Management  PhD Industrial engineering |
| Triggered Programs: | NA |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs: | Previous Rec. that still need to be addressed that are still concerns in this review:   * Include all sections of the template when completing the program study and indicate “not applicable” when necessary. * Include narrative to interpret the content in tables as related to the outcomes, assessment tools, target/criteria, results, and analysis.   Did address area from previous review that were do not meet expectations - Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes: | * Great use of the feedback loop in the assessment process; program goals are assessed on an annual basis with a clear level of expected level of attainment. * How do you know the overall satisfaction with the programs is strong for both undergraduate and graduate programs.? You did not complete the table in Section 3, part E or provide any additional data or narrative to support this statement. * Need to provide explicit narrative to support tables addressing strengths, productivity, and qualifications of faculty * Appears use of own assessment tool on student satisfaction. Encouraged to use OPA exit survey data. If using own assessment tools, need to provide survey in appendices and provide narrative on how assessment is administered and additional information to provide assurance on data provided.   After meeting with program chair, additional written info. was provided by program which moved part 5 to meets expectations. The evidence presented represents faculty, students, and the program as a whole actively supporting the discipline and industry partners (community). |
| Commendations: | * The graduate program enrollment is one of the highest in the Midwest for IE programs and the undergraduate program is increasing enrollment. The redesign of the manufacturing program has increased the number of students in the program significantly. * From Previous review, committee had goal/plan to increase lab and problem based learning will be a significant component of the pedagogical approach employed by the department. ISME Department has invested in three new labs (Robotics Lab, Industry 4.0 Lab, and Work Systems Lab) to enhance students’ ability to learn, and provide applied learning opportunities. These labs are utilized in both IE and PDME programs. |
| Recommendations Going Forward: | Table 8 goals show status as continue (1. Continue to increase lab and problem based learning will be a Significant component of the pedagogical approach employed by the department; 2. Continue to increase research funding for the departments.) these should be in your forward facing goals in part 10 & status on these goals addressed in your next review.  Encouraged to focus on the DEI plan within their GPiper & SEM plans (e.g. recruitment of diverse candidates including females) and to create goals that require development (program improvement) not with just a focus to maintain current practices. |
| General Feedback | Include all sections of the template when completing the program study and indicate “not applicable” when necessary. |

**KBOR Review:** Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle has been suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria are 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.

**University Program Review Committee recommendation(s), if any:**

University Program Review Committee does not have any further recommendations beyond the comments listed above.

**Mechanical Engineering PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address:** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution** | Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission. | Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty** | The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, 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. | 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 that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program. | Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program. |
| **Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students** | The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of 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. |
| **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. |
| **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 to the community. | The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community. | The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community. |
| **Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement** | The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs.  Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited 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: | BS, MS, and PhD in Mechanical Engineering |
| Triggered Programs: | NA for KBOR; did identify ABET triggers specific to curriculum & insufficient faculty. |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs: | Table 6 clearly addresses changes made based on previous recommendations |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes: | Pg. 20 did not address brief assessment of student need and demand using the data from the tables; did not discuss most common types of positions, in terms of employment graduates can expect to find – used section to discuss lack of two faculty members. |
| Commendations: | BS faculty has maintained research needed while focusing on teaching – The number of BSME awarded annually has more than doubled from 32 to 71 from FY2016 to FY2021. Faculty has received over $2 Million in grant funding. The faculty also produced funding for students support and engaged both undergraduate and graduate students in their research activities. In addition, many faculty members lead professional student organizations on campus. The report appears to represent a highly productive faculty, but does not explicitly state the workload expectations or distribution. Also notes throughout the report is the need for 2 additional faculty members. However, the it is noted in section 6, program is recognized for offering many program courses in hybrid mode to maintain student needs and program goals due to COVID and the resulting travel constraints.  After meeting with the program, a supplement was provided for further narrative on parts 3 & 4. In regard to Part 3, the rating was moved to meets expectation. The supplement narrative does further explain the ABET tables that were used for this section & brief discussion that 100% of the graduates met the program’s expectations for the outcomes. The program still does not fully explain how the measures and populations integrated into the program or detailed discussion on the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning by fully discussing the results and a analysis of the data outcomes. Program should further address the two ABET concerns presented in Part 3 with the Dean.  Part 4 supplemental narrative addressed student need and employer demand for the program. The use of data to better understand student need is still a concern as this is not fully addressed with the use of data from tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning and Analysis and Table 5 Employment of 2020-2021 majors. The narrative in the program report and supplement provided does not discuss the most common types of positions, in terms of employment graduates can expect to find or brief assessment of student need based on applications, admits and enrollment (OPA Table 11) and minimal discussion on URM students (OPA Tables 12-13) and discussion on degrees conferred (OPA tables 14-15).The supplemental narrative provided does do a much better job in looking at the employer demand and the importance of the program based on this demand. |
| Recommendations Going Forward: | Focus on assessment of student need and demand as represented in the data table(s). Provide a clear, focused narrative on student need and employer demand. Clearly report the metrics to represent quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students. Current plan represents the alignment of the curriculum the metrics reviewed by the department assessment team or graduate team are not apparent in the program review – this was also noted as a concern by ABET. Program did not fully meet previous FFG (e.g. GTA training) and this should be reflected in the new FFG. |
| General Feedback | The BSME is experiencing great growth & resulting in a number of graduates each academic year. There are ABET accreditation concerns that need to be addressed as noted throughout the report, specifically 2 additional faculty members for the BSME program. |

**KBOR Review:** Based on KBOR approval in September 2022, the 8-year review cycle has been suspended for Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 until new criteria are 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.

**University Program Review Committee recommendation(s), if any:**

University Program Review Committee does not have any further recommendations beyond the comments listed above.