**2024-2025 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 Applied Studies:**

 B.A. Athletic Training 51.0913

B.A. Exercise Science 31.0505

B.A. Physical Education 31.0599

M.Ed. Exercise Science 31.0505

M.S. Athletic Training 51.0913

*\*Undergraduate Certificate in Human Performance Coaching*

*\*Undergraduate Certificate in Human Performance Fitness*

*\*Undergraduate Certificate in Human Performance Weight Training*

*\*Graduate Certificate in Functional Aging*

EdD in Educational Leadership 13.0401

EdS in School Psychology 42.2805

MEd in Educational Leadership 13.0401

MEd in Educational Psychology 42.2806

MEd Counseling 13.1101

MEd Special Education 13.1001

Master of Arts in Teaching (ECU-EEU) 13.1299

Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education 13.1202

*\*Graduate Certificate in Dyslexia and Literacy*

*\*Graduate Certificate in Child/Play Therapy*

*\*Graduate Certificate Higher Education Leadership*

*\*Graduate Certificate Engineering Education*

*\*Graduate Certificate Superintendency/District Leadership*

*\*Graduate Certificate Building-Level Leadership*

*\*Graduate Certificate Applied Behavioral Analysis*

*\*Graduate Certificate School Counseling to Clinical Mental Health Counseling*

*\*Graduate Certificate Clinical mental Health Counseling to School Counseling*

*\*Graduate Certificate Mentoring and Coaching*

*\*Graduate Certificate Reading Specialist Endorsement*

BAED Elementary Education 13.1202

BAED Middle/Secondary Education 13.1203, 13.1205

MA in Teaching (Transition to Teaching) 13.1299

MEd Learning and Instructional Design (LID) 13.0301

*\*Certificate in Online Learning and Educational Technology*

*\*Certificate in Interdisciplinary STEM Education*

B.A. Sport Management 31.0504

M.Ed. Sport Management 31.0504

B.A.S. Organizational Leadership & Learning 52.0213

*\*Undergraduate Certificate in Sport Leadership and Branding*

*\*Graduate Certificate in Professional Learning and Training*

 **College of Health Professions:**

Bachelor of Dental Hygiene (entry-level) 51.0602

Bachelor of DH (degree-completion) 51.0602

BS in Medical Laboratory Sciences 51.1005

Bachelor of Arts (BA-CSD) 51.0201

Master of Arts (MA-CSD) 51.0203

Doctor of Audiology (AuD) 51.0202

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) 51.0201

Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) 51.3801

Master of Science in Nursing (MSN) 51.3801

Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) 51.3818

Doctor of Physical Therapy 51.2308

MPA – Master of Physician Associate 51.0912

Bachelor of Science in Health Management 51.0701

Bachelor of Science in Health Science 51.0000

Master of Arts in Aging Studies 31.1101

Master of Arts in Health Administration 51.2211

*\*Graduate Certificate in Aging Studies*

*\*Graduate Certificate in Health Administration*

*\*Graduate Certificate in Public Health*

**Human Performance Studies PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**4 | **Meets Expectations**3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**1 |
| **Part 1a Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned. | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission. |
| **Part 1b Departmental (Program) Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to supporting the university strategic plan | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | The document *clearly reflects* that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.  | The program assessment plan, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning. | The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management**  |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook.  | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand. | The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need. | The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond  | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond.  | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | BA offered in Athletic Training, Exercise Science, and Physical Education; Masters offered in Exercise Science and Athletic Training. *\*Undergraduate Certificate in Human Performance Coaching**\*Undergraduate Certificate in Human Performance Fitness**\*Undergraduate Certificate in Human Performance Weight Training**\*Graduate Certificate in Functional Aging*  |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report:  | Physical Education undergraduate program was flagged by KBOR due to low enrollment in 2020-21, however this trend has significantly improved in 2022-2023 and now exceeds enrollment minimums after hiring a full-time faculty member for the program who has been engaged in outreach with prospective students.triggered programs with reason (majors/faculty/graduates).a) 2019-2020: Human Performance Studies: # of faculty at master level, and # of graduates in Athletic Training (bachelor)b) 2020-2021: Human Performance Studies: # of faculty at master level, and # of graduates in Athletic Training(bachelor) & Physical Education (bachelor)c) 2021-2022: Exercise Science: # of graduate faculty (currently have 3, needs 3 more) |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations:  | Work is continuing in all 4 goals from previous review. In regard to recommendations, for two of the recommendations Dept. notes outcome is unknown because brought forward when another faculty member was leading the dept. However, these are recommendations that should be owned and addressed by the department as a whole no matter who is in charge. Recommendation of the review committee to address the outcome of these in the next review or re-submit to current review committee with outcome identified. The two that need to be addressed are 1. Forward facing goals are missing metrics; 2. Examining ways to optimize assessments in a way where the assurance of learning is more compact.  |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | HPS launched the new Master of Science in Athletic Training (MSAT) program in June 2023 with a cohort of 3 students – focus on promoting & growing this program is imperative Forward facing goals: #3. Number of degrees issued isn’t the correct metric for measuring 6 year graduation rate. Explain the 60% in Table 7 (why are they keeping it that until 2030). |
| Commendations of Program:  | Job placements in Kansas schools, fitness organizations, hospitals and clinics are excelling due to this department and the programs offered! In last 4 year, four tenure-track / tenured faculty are to be commended for their work to produce 31 refereed journal articles, engage in 58 refereed presentations and conference proceedings, and submit numerous grant proposals |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Need to focus on quantitative measures below for PE. In addition, focus on Masters in Athletic Training to ensure that after the first 4 years it is beginning to meet the threshold criteria identified by KBOR in quantitative measures listed below,  |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

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

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Quantitative Minimum Criteria

* Criteria for Number of Majors (Student Demand)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 25 or more – PE does not meet this criteria
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 20 or more – AT new program – not concern at this time
* Doctoral, four-year average of five or more -NA
* Criteria for Number of Graduates (Degree Production)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 10 or more – PE Program 7 is the average – does not meet criteria
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 5 or more - AT new program – not concern at this time
* Doctoral, four-year average of two or more - NA
* Talent Pipeline
* 51% or more graduates employed in Region within 1 year (four-year average) – met for all programs
* Student Return on Investment - Baccalaureate programs
* 2022 Five-Year Post-Graduation Median Salary $38,050 or more (280% or more of 2022 poverty level) - met for all programs

**Intervention Services & Leadership Education (ISLE) PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**4 | **Meets Expectations**3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**1 |
| **Part 1a Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned. | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission. |
| **Part 1b Departmental (Program) Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to supporting the university strategic plan | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | The document *clearly reflects* that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.  | The program assessment plan, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning. | The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management**  |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook.  | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand. | The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need. | The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond  | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond.  | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | BA-Elementary Ed; MA-Arts in Teaching (ECU-EEU); MEd Special Ed; MEd Counseling; MEd – Ed Psych; MEd – Ed Leadership; EdS – School Psych; EdD – Ed Leadership (also Ed Psych track). (Cert.x12; Bx1; Mx5; Specialistx1, Dx1)*Graduate Certificate(s) in Dyslexia and Literacy, Child/Play Therapy, Higher Education Leadership, Engineering Education, Superintendency/District Leadership, Building-Level Leadership, Applied Behavioral Analysis, School Counseling to Clinical Mental Health Counseling, Clinical mental Health Counseling to School Counseling, Mentoring and Coaching, Reading Specialist Endorsement* |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report:  | N/A |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations:  | Table 7 (p.30) |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | Did not provide a description of the EdD – Educational Leadership – Psychology Track Program in overall description. Faculty quality narrative could have been enhanced by providing specific examples of “how” faculty were meeting the criteria. Reference to policy and the Uniscope model, but no specific examples. No SLO data for EdD – Ed Leadership Psychology Track.  |
| Commendations of Program:  | The Department is to be commended for the proposed development of PhD program and all the other great work it has accomplished. This is a very large department with the size of programs it supports and the number of faculty within the department to manage these programs. This department has excelled in Research, creative activity, and service!  |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Next review focus on discussing the tracks within the degrees where applicable; Within the faculty quality narrative provide specific examples of “how” faculty were meeting the criteria.  |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

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

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Quantitative Minimum Criteria

X

* Criteria for Number of Majors (Student Demand)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 25 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 20 or more
* Doctoral, four-year average of five or more
* Criteria for Number of Graduates (Degree Production)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 10 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 5 or more
* Doctoral, four-year average of two or more
* Talent Pipeline
* 51% or more graduates employed in Region within 1 year (four-year average)
* Student Return on Investment - Baccalaureate programs
* 2022 Five-Year Post-Graduation Median Salary $38,050 or more (280% or more of 2022 poverty level).

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**4 | **Meets Expectations**3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**1 |
| **Part 1a Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned. | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission. |
| **Part 1b Departmental (Program) Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to supporting the university strategic plan | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | The document *clearly reflects* that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.  | The program assessment plan, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning. | The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management**  |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook.  | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand. | The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need. | The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond  | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond.  | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | BA in Elementary Education, Middle/Secondary education, Transition to Teaching, and Masters in Learning & Instructional Design. *\*Certificate(s) in Online Learning and Educational Technology; Interdisciplinary STEM Education* |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report:  | None  |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations:  | Addressed them and completed the table |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | Very well written |
| Commendations of Program:  | Successful accreditations, both from KSDE and CAEP; thorough assessment plans for each program |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Moving forward ensure you have data for all areas of quantitative measures noted below – there were areas where LID & T2T were marked as data unknown. These are highlighted yellow below. |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

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

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Quantitative Minimum Criteria

* Criteria for Number of Majors (Student Demand)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 25 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 20 or more – LID is right at 20 – continue to monitor this and ensure it meets required threshold
* Doctoral, four-year average of five or more -NA
* Criteria for Number of Graduates (Degree Production)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 10 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 5 or more
* Doctoral, four-year average of two or more NA
* Talent Pipeline
* 51% or more graduates employed in Region within 1 year (four-year average) – YES for BA programs – no data for T2T and LID
* Student Return on Investment - Baccalaureate programs
* 2022 Five-Year Post-Graduation Median Salary $38,050 or more (280% or more of 2022 poverty level). – YES for BA programs – no data for T2T and LID

**Sport Management PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**4 | **Meets Expectations**3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**1 |
| **Part 1a Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned. | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.   | Program Purpose:Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission. |
| **Part 1b Departmental (Program) Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to supporting the university strategic plan | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | The document *clearly reflects* that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.  | The program assessment plan, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning. | The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management**  |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook.  | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand. | The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need. | The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond  | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond.  | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | BA Sport Management; BAS, Organizational Leadership and Learning; Masters, Sport Management. *Undergraduate Certificate in Sport Leadership and Branding. Graduate Certificate in Professional Learning and Training.* |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report:  | 2020-2022: Sport management, # of Graduate Faculty; 2020-2022: OLL: # of majors (program was new program, created in 2019/2020. |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations:  | Yes, clearly responded to recommendations and met. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | The committee found that the programs presented here are valuable and well run. The committee noted that the SMGT and OLL programs were previously triggered, and a lot of the discussion focused on the trigger points. The committee noted that graduate faculty levels are now at an appropriate level for SMGT. However, we did have some discussion about the inclusion of the 2 100% admin positions in the reporting and wonder if that makes sense in the context of individual programs. The committee also noted that publication output was low but that presentation and performance were the major mode of scholarship engagement for the faculty. It would have been helpful to have the presentations described; specifically performance to help the review committee better understand this under the UniScope model..  |
| Commendations of Program:  | This committee found the level of rigor and detail in the academic outcomes excellent.  |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | In next review, disaggregate OLL and SMGT student demand and present the enrollment and degree trend separately as students access each of these programs separately.  |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

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

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Quantitative Minimum Criteria

* Criteria for Number of Majors (Student Demand)
	+ Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 25 or more
	+ Master’s programs. Four-year average of 20 or more - NA
* Doctoral, four-year average of five or more
* Criteria for Number of Graduates (Degree Production)
	+ Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 10 or more
	+ Master’s programs. Four-year average of 5 or more - NA
* Doctoral, four-year average of two or more
* Talent Pipeline
	+ 51% or more graduates employed in Region within 1 year (four-year average)
* Student Return on Investment - Baccalaureate programs
	+ 2022 Five-year Post-Graduation Median Salary $38,050 or more (280% or more of 2022 poverty level)

**Dental Hygiene PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**4 | **Meets Expectations**3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**1 |
| **Part 1a Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together. | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned. | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission. |
| **Part 1b Departmental (Program) Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to supporting the university strategic plan | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | The document *clearly reflects* that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.  | The program assessment plan, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning. | The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management**  |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook.  | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand. | The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need. | The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond  | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond.  | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | Undergraduate Degrees * Bachelor of Science in Dental Hygiene (entry level)
* Bachelor of Science in Dental Hygiene – degree completion (a fully online program)
 |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report:  | N/A |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations:  | Table 7 in review addresses the 4 recommendations from previous review & each are addressed with no further concerns by the current review team  |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | High workload hours in clinic and lab; program analyzed student outcome data & made necessary changes to the target/criteria based on data results.  |
| Commendations of Program:  | Graduates of the program consistently meet or exceed national averages for first-time pass rates on their national credentialing examination. Fully accredited by Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA), the only accrediting body for all dental education programs in the Unites States.Received CODA approval to increase enrollment from 36 to 38 for Fall 2024 studentsEnrollment growth focus with 3 articulation agreements and 1 dual enrollment agreementFocused work around all 5 goals of the strategic plan. Good job linking narrative to supporting documentation.   |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | No Recommendations  |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

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

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Quantitative Minimum Criteria

* Criteria for Number of Majors (Student Demand)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 25 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 20 or more - NA
* Doctoral, four-year average of five or more - NA
* Criteria for Number of Graduates (Degree Production)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 10 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 5 or more - NA
* Doctoral, four-year average of two or more - NA
* Talent Pipeline
* 51% or more graduates employed in Region within 1 year (four-year average)
* Student Return on Investment - Baccalaureate programs
* 2022 Five-Year Post-Graduation Median Salary $38,050 or more (280% or more of 2022 poverty level).

**Medical Laboratory Sciences PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**4 | **Meets Expectations**3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**1 |
| **Part 1a Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned. | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission. |
| **Part 1b Departmental (Program) Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to supporting the university strategic plan | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | The document *clearly reflects* that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.  | The program assessment plan, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning. | The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management**  |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook.  | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand. | The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need. | The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond  | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond.  | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | BS in Medical Laboratory Sciences |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report:  | NA |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations:  | Yes, clear responded and met. |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | Part 3,D does not represent program outcomes in column 1 – these are goals and should reflect assessment outcomes of students; Part 3D, question 2 is not addressed. Is the grant in 2023-2024, $2 million? Great description in part 4,B on your recruitment activities you are doing but do not discuss impact of these measures – how do you know if these are effective? Why the downward trend in your graduation/degree production? What is the admission capacity for each cohort – encouraged to look at this data and further discuss it to ensure program continues to meet KBOR requirements. Student demand section did not provide this detail. Not fully using data to drive change - The program discussed changes based on the data in an earlier section but did not complete the feedback loop for program improvement in section 5. Focus in section 5 on goals that will strengthen the program.  |
| Commendations of Program:  | Program offers a First Year Seminar course.Great use of multiple measures in Part 3  |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Focus on questions and discussions in committee notes to strengthen your work & review in the next 4 years.  |
|  |  |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

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

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Quantitative Minimum Criteria

* Criteria for Number of Majors (Student Demand)
	+ Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 25 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 20 or more - NA
* Doctoral, four-year average of five or more -NA
* Criteria for Number of Graduates (Degree Production)
	+ Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 25 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 5 or more - NA
* Doctoral, four-year average of two or more - NA
* Talent Pipeline - 85%
	+ 51% or more graduates employed in Region within 1 year (four-year average)
* Student Return on Investment - Baccalaureate programs – avg. salary $56,615
	+ 2022 Five-Year Post-Graduation Median Salary $38,050 or more (280% or more of 2022 poverty level).

**Communication Science Disorder PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**4 | **Meets Expectations**3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**1 |
| **Part 1a Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned. | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.   | Program Purpose:Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission. |
| **Part 1b Departmental (Program) Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to supporting the university strategic plan | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | The document *clearly reflects* that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.  | The program assessment plan, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning. | The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management**  |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook.  | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand. | The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need. | The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond  | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond.  | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | BA-CSD, MA-CSD, Doctor of Audiology, Doctor of Philosophy |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report:  | PhD program: Number of graduates AY2019-2020; 2020-2021; 2021-2022. Program has not had an average of 2 or more graduates over the most recent 5 year period (graduates 2015-2023 were 3,1,1,0,2,1,1,1) Audiology Program: Number of doctoral graduates AY2019-2020 only – was not concern with 5 year avg. which was 6 based on # of graduates the last 5 years: 5,5,8,6,6 -  |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations:  | Table 7 reflects response to recommendations from previous review  |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | The Communication Sciences and Disorders program exemplifies Wichita State University's mission by serving as a vital educational, cultural, and economic driver through its commitment to preparing highly competent scholar-practitioners in speech-language pathology and audiology. With a strong emphasis on applied learning, interdisciplinary collaboration, and community engagement, the program empowers students to address real-world challenges in both educational and medical settings. Through its nationally recognized clinic and innovative curriculum, CSD fosters leadership, research, and service that directly benefit the people and communities of Kansas and beyond. |
| Commendations of Program:  | Dept is focusing on growth in each of the programs, specifically with the BA-CSD program. |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Make sure you address UG program in future reports to help reviews understand why that data might not be present – for instance Student/employer demand – reviewers need to know employment data is not present because BA-CSD degree is is for students to be competitive applicants for graduate school (AuD or MA/MS education programs). In addition, all programs should have a way of tracking student data post-graduation (e.g. completing a survey or other mechanism for all graduates to share their future plans upon graduation.)  |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

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

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Quantitative Minimum Criteria

* Criteria for Number of Majors (Student Demand)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 25 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 20 or more
* Doctoral, four-year average of five or more - Audiology yes; PhD no
* Criteria for Number of Graduates (Degree Production)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 10 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 5 or more
* Doctoral, four-year average of two or more - Audiology yes; PhD no
* Talent Pipeline
* 51% or more graduates employed in Region within 1 year (four-year average) (Yes Masters & Doctorate programs)
* Student Return on Investment - Baccalaureate programs
* 2022 Five-Year Post-Graduation Median Salary $38,050 or more (280% or more of 2022 poverty level). – yes for Master’s and Doctorate programs –Bachelor’s program leads to graduate school not employment in the field

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**4 | **Meets Expectations**3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**1 |
| **Part 1a Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned. | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.   | Program Purpose:Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission. |
| **Part 1b Departmental (Program) Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to supporting the university strategic plan | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | The document *clearly reflects* that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.  | The program assessment plan, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning. | The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management**  |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook.  | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand. | The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need. | The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond  | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond.  | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | Undergraduate degrees * Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)
* Accelerated BSN program
* Licensed Practical Nurse (LPN) to BSN
* Registered Nurse (RN) to BSN degree completion program (fully online)

 Graduate degrees * Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)
* Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)
 |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report:  | N/A |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations:  | Has responded to recommendations from previous review.  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | **Th**e academic program demonstrates exemplary quality through a fully implemented and well-aligned assessment plan that clearly illustrates the positive impact of its curriculum on student learning. With clearly defined measures and thoughtfully selected populations, the program ensures continuous improvement and meaningful outcomes, reinforcing its commitment to academic excellence and student success. |
| Commendations of Program:  | Faculty productivity within the program is a cornerstone of student success, as evidenced by robust scholarly activity, community-engaged research, and innovative curriculum development. Through active research, publication, and professional presentations—particularly by tenure-track faculty—students benefit from enriched course content, hands-on research opportunities, and exposure to cutting-edge practices. Faculty-led initiatives, such as interdisciplinary simulations and quality improvement projects, not only enhance student learning but also foster mentorship, professional development, and community impact. This dynamic environment cultivates a culture of inquiry, collaboration, and continuous improvement that elevates both student outcomes and faculty retention. |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Low return on alumni & employer surveys – focus on goals/strategies to increase the return. It appears anecdotal conversations are occurring on job/clinical sites – how can you leverage these relationships & conversations to have surveys completed?  |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

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

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Quantitative Minimum Criteria

* Criteria for Number of Majors (Student Demand)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 25 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 20 or more
* Doctoral, four-year average of five or more
* Criteria for Number of Graduates (Degree Production)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 10 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 5 or more
* Doctoral, four-year average of two or more
* Talent Pipeline
* 51% or more graduates employed in Region within 1 year (four-year average)
* Student Return on Investment - Baccalaureate programs
* 2022 Five-Year Post-Graduation Median Salary $38,050 or more (280% or more of 2022 poverty level).

**Physical Therapy PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**4 | **Meets Expectations**3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**1 |
| **Part 1a Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship with University Mission:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned. | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.   | Program Purpose:Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission. |
| **Part 1b Departmental (Program) Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to supporting the university strategic plan | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | The document *clearly reflects* that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.  | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning. | The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management**  |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook.  | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand. | The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need. | The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan**.** | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond  | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond.  | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on data and has systematically studied the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement because 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: | Doctor of Physical Therapy  |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report:  | N/A |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations:  | Fully addressed the 4 recommendations from previous review.  |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | Appendices were out of order making it difficult to find the correct one; part 4c had no narrative and appendix was more of a list - 4C: appendix 7 missing, no specific examples in this area, many listed in other sections. The Doctor of Physical Therapy program at Wichita State University exemplifies excellence in service to the discipline, university, and beyond through its accredited, interdisciplinary curriculum, robust interprofessional education initiatives, and impactful community engagement. Faculty and students actively collaborate across health, engineering, and community sectors—contributing to innovative learning experiences, pro bono clinical services, and externally funded research projects that advance healthcare outcomes and educational equity. These efforts not only elevate the program’s academic rigor and societal relevance but also position it as a vital contributor to the university’s mission and the broader field of physical therapy. |
| Commendations of Program:  | Exciting that program will now be able to enroll 60 rather than 40 students; successful accreditation from CAPTE; high pass rate of national PT exam (higher than national average) |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | No recommendations for next review – stay focused on the positive growth happening.  |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

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

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program.

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

(3) Centrality of the program to fulfill the mission and the role of the institution.

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program.

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Quantitative Minimum Criteria

* Criteria for Number of Majors (Student Demand)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 25 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 20 or more
* Doctoral, four-year average of five or more
* Criteria for Number of Graduates (Degree Production)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 10 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 5 or more
* Doctoral, four-year average of two or more
* Talent Pipeline
* 51% or more graduates employed in Region within 1 year (four-year average)
* Student Return on Investment - Baccalaureate programs
* 2022 Five-Year Post-Graduation Median Salary $38,050 or more (280% or more of 2022 poverty level).

**Physician Associate PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**4 | **Meets Expectations**3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**1 |
| **Part 1a Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned. | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission. |
| **Part 1b Departmental (Program) Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to supporting the university strategic plan | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | The document *clearly reflects* that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.  | The program assessment plan, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning. | The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management**  |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook.  | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand. | The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need. | The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond.  | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | MPA - Master of Physician Associate  |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report:  | N/A |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations:  | Completed all work around 4 goals from the last review and fully addressed the 2 recommendations.  |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | There are no concerns with this review as evident with the scores in the rubric above. The program is encouraged to fully meet the 5 goals they have set as the focused work for the next 4 years.  |
| Commendations of Program:  | This program is doing great work and is impactful as a cultural and educational driver. It is making a positive impact in healthcare throughout Kansas and is an economic driver for Kansas with the number of successful graduates entering the workforce.  |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | No recommendations  |

Faculty Signatures page 2 \_\_X\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

Academic Dean Review page 3

 Letter \_\_X\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

 Signature \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_X\_ No

Graduate Dean Review page 3

 Letter \_\_\_\_ Yes \_X\_\_ No

 Signature \_X\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

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

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Quantitative Minimum Criteria

* Criteria for Number of Majors (Student Demand)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 25 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 20 or more
* Doctoral, four-year average of five or more
* Criteria for Number of Graduates (Degree Production)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 10 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 5 or more
* Doctoral, four-year average of two or more
* Talent Pipeline
* 51% or more graduates employed in Region within 1 year (four-year average)
* Student Return on Investment - Baccalaureate programs
* 2022 Five-Year Post-Graduation Median Salary $38,050 or more (280% or more of 2022 poverty level).

**Public Health sciences PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**4 | **Meets Expectations**3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**1 |
| **Part 1a: Program(s) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.   | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned. | Program Purpose:Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  | Program Purpose:Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission. |
| **Part 1b Departmental (Program) Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to supporting the university strategic plan | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Strategic Plan:The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | The document *clearly reflects* that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.  | The program assessment plan, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning. | The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management**  |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook.  | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand. | The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need. | The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond  | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond.  | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: | Bachelor of Science in Health Management (BS-HM); Bachelor of Science in Health Science (BS-HS): Master of Arts in Aging Studies; and Master of Arts in Health Administration. *\*Graduate Certificate in Aging Studies, Graduate Certificate in Health Administration, Graduate Certificate in Public Health* |
| Triggered Programs as noted in Part 4 of the report:  | NA |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations:  | Previous goals were completed based on Table 6 in Part 5 of the report.  |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: | The PHS program aligns seamlessly with Wichita State University's mission as an educational, cultural, and economic driver. Through inclusive curriculum design, community partnerships, and strategic enrollment initiatives, PHS fosters student success, workforce development, and health equity—advancing both regional impact and global relevance. PHS faculty demonstrate high productivity in teaching, research, and service, contributing over 25 publications, 131 presentations, and securing more than $3.4 million in grant funding. This scholarly activity directly enhances curriculum quality, student learning outcomes, and program reputation, while supporting continuous improvement and accreditation readiness. |
| Commendations of Program:  | Part 3 – great level of detail & use of action plans in majority of this section.  |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: | Implement a survey at time of graduation to monitor employment data. Focus on student demand and degree production in Master’s program.  |

Faculty Signatures page 2 \_\_X\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

Academic Dean Review page 3

 Letter \_\_X\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

 Signature \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

Graduate Dean Review page 3 – Ashlie Following up with grad Dean

 Letter \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_X\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ N/A

 Signature \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_X\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ N/A

University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

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

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program;

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

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

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

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

(6) The program’s cost‐effectiveness.

Quantitative Minimum Criteria

* Criteria for Number of Majors (Student Demand)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 25 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 20 or more (current avg. is 21.5 – should be monitored)
* Doctoral, four-year average of five or more - NA
* Criteria for Number of Graduates (Degree Production)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 10 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 5 or more (current avg. is 5 – should be monitored)
* Doctoral, four-year average of two or more - NA
* Talent Pipeline
* 51% or more graduates employed in Region within 1 year (four-year average)
* Student Return on Investment - Baccalaureate programs
* 2022 Five-Year Post-Graduation Median Salary $38,050 or more (280% or more of 2022 poverty level).