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In yellow highlighted areas, data will be provided

## Part 1: Departmental Purpose, Relationship to the University Mission and Strategic Plan (HLC Criterion 1)

The mission of Wichita State University is to be an essential ***educational, cultural and economic driver*** for Kansas and the greater public good.

## Overall Program Description: Provide an overall description of each program offered in the department/unit. Include any significant changes made since the last review.

## Purpose Statement: Provide the department/unit purpose statement. If purpose is different for each program, please list accordingly for each program. (formerly Mission statement)

## Relationship to University Mission: In looking at the department/unit purpose, what is the role of each program and its relationship to the University mission – specifically looking at how each program is an educational driver, cultural driver, and economic driver:

## Program 1:

## educational driver:

## cultural driver:

## economic driver:

## Program 2:

## educational driver:

## cultural driver:

## economic driver:

Add additional programs as needed.

## **University Strategic Plan:** How does ***each*** program support the university strategic plan?(<https://www.wichita.edu/about/strategic_plan/index.php> )

## Program 1:

1. Student Centeredness
2. Research and Scholarship
3. Campus Culture
4. Inclusive Excellence
5. Partnerships and Engagement

## Program 2:

1. Student Centeredness
2. Research and Scholarship
3. Campus Culture
4. Inclusive Excellence
5. Partnerships and Engagement

Add additional programs as needed

# Part 2: Faculty Quality and Productivity as a Factor of Program Quality

The quality of the program/certificate as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty in terms of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. (Refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review Instructions for more information on completing this section. Tables 4 (Instructional FTE), 6 (Program Majors) and 7 (Degree Production) from OPA can be used to help with this section.) **(HLC Assurance B.2.c; HLC Criterion 3.B item 4 and HLC Criterion 3.C)**

**This section can discuss faculty production of all faculty during the 4 years of the review, including faculty who are now retired.**

1. **Workload policy:** What is the workload policy for this department/unit? Provide the policy as a PDF in the appendices of this program review ***with a direct hyperlink to the document***. Provide a workload distribution table for the department with additional narrative.
2. Add direct hyperlink to workload policy in the appendices
3. Complete Table 1 with narrative added under the table.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 1 Departmental Workload** |
| # of Faculty | % of Teaching | % of Service | % of Scholarship | % of Administration |
| *Example: 5 faculty members* | *50%* | *10%* | *40%* | *0%* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. Table 1 Narrative:
2. **Teaching and Service:** Briefly explain the standards in place in the college/department for the evaluation of the faculty for teaching and service activity. Provide narrative to represent the teaching and service for the faculty within each program. Please add a table/visual as appropriate in the appendices.

Teaching Effectiveness:

**a.**Briefly explain the standards in place in the college/department for the evaluation of the faculty for teaching.

b. Based upon the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, how is this leading to program enhancements?

## Effectiveness of Service:

## a. Briefly explain the standards in place in the college/department for the evaluation of the faculty for service.

## b. Explain the service being completed by faculty within the department.

## c. How is this productivity (service) leading to program enhancements?

## C. Research and Creative Activity*:* Briefly explain the standards in place in the college/department for the evaluation of the faculty research/scholarship/creative activity*.* If an interdisciplinary program, please report on the program where faculty research has been recorded and provide narrative related to productivity.

**Table 2:** Complete the table below for the faculty who support the program(s) in the department/unit (all faculty who signed or should have signed the coversheet). Edit the table as needed to meet the departmental needs to represent Research & Creative Activity.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 2 Departmental Research & Creative Activity**  |
| Calendar Year | NumberJournal Articles | NumberPresentations | NumberConference Proceedings | Performances | Number ofExhibits | Creative Work | No.Books | No.Book Chaps. | No. Grants Awarded or Submitted | $ Grant Value |
|  |
|  | Ref | Non-Ref | Ref | Non-Ref | Ref | Non-Ref | \* | \*\* | \*\*\* | Juried | \*\*\*\* | Juried | Non-Juried |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\*Winning by competitive audition. \*\*Professional attainment (e.g., commercial recording). \*\*\*Principal role in a performance. \*\*\*\*Commissioned or included in a collection.

a. Brief assessment of faculty in program based on research and/or creative activity:

b. How has this productivity of faculty within research/creative activity led to program enhancements?

1. **Staff Contributions.** If appropriate, add additional narrative here to capture staff (i.e. lab coordinators) who support programs through *teaching, service, and/or research/creative activity*, and how their productivity leads to program enhancements.

# Part 3: Academic Program(s) and Emphasis

Analyze the quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students for each program (if more than one). Attach updated program assessment plan(s) as an appendix

## Undergraduate programs:

1. Please review Table 8 provided by the Office of Planning and Analysis. Is the ACT at admission for any program in the department below 20 (triggered by KBOR defined Minima)? [ ]  Yes [ ]  No

List programs that resulted in a yes answer above and narrative of why.

## Graduate programs:

1. Please review Table 9 provided by the Office of Planning and Analysis. Is the GPA for each program in the department below the university average at admission? [ ]  Yes [ ]  No

List programs that resulted in a yes answer above and narrative of why.

## C. Accreditation status: (HLC Assurance A.7 item a-c; HLC Criterion 4.A. item 5)

## If accreditation is previously noted, please add:

1. Name of accrediting body:
2. Identify program(s) accredited by this accrediting body:
3. Add in appendix, latest review from accrediting body (letter of confirmation) and hyperlink to this letter
4. Current accreditation status:
5. Next Review Date:
6. Commendations and concerns from the last review that program is addressing for continuous improvement:

## D. Assessment of Learning Outcomes (HLC Criterion 4.B. items 1-3)

1. Complete the table below with program-level data. Identify the principal learning outcomes (i.e., with what skills the Program expect students to graduate) and provide aggregate data on how students are meeting those outcomes. **Provide a table of learning outcome assessment for each program within the department/unit.**

Add an appendix to provide more explanation/details as needed. (If specialty accreditation has been **conferred within 18 months of this process**, programs can append the information from the accreditation document to this self-study and cite, with page number, the appropriate information. **If link to appendices, provide narrative of the conclusions the university program review team should take away from this presentation of data**. If specialty accreditation **has not been affirmed within 18 months**, please complete the table or submit an updated version of the accreditation information. If not accredited, please complete the table below.)

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3 Learning Outcome Assessment** |
| Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes) | Assessment Type (e.g., portfolios, exams) | Assessment Tool (e.g. rubrics, grading scale) and benchmark of tool | Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement) | Results | Analysis |
| *Students will have a basic understanding of human anatomy.* | *Comprehensive Exam* | *Rubric/each student will score 80% or higher* | *80% of students will score 80% Or <* | *90% of students scored 80% or better.* | *Proficient knowledge of anatomy has been demonstrated.* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Definitions:* 1. *Learning Outcome: Learning that should result from instruction.*
2. *Assessment Type: Type of assessment used to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., a writing project evaluated by a rubric).*
3. *Assessment Tool: Instrument used to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes.*
4. *Criterion/Target: Percentage of students expected to achieve the desired outcome for demonstrating program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of the students will demonstrate satisfactory performance on a writing project).*
5. *Result: Actual achievement on each learning outcome measurement (e.g., 95%).*
6. *Analysis: Determines the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved and leads to decisions and actions to improve the program. The analysis and evaluation should align with specific learning outcome and consider whether the measurement and/or criteria/target remain a valid indicator of the learning outcome as well as whether the learning outcomes need to be revised*
 |

1. Provide an analysis and evaluation of the data by learner outcome with proposed actions based on the results listed in the section D tables above. Data should relate to the goals and objectives for each program as listed above. Provide further analysis on results close to the identified benchmark – a) how is the program continuing to monitor this student outcome to ensure proficiency of the benchmark is met? For example, if the benchmark is 80% or higher and current results represent 81%, how is the program continuing to monitor this student outcome to ensure proficiency of the benchmark is increased and met.

## E. Assessment of Student Satisfaction (HLC Criterion 4.B item 1-3)

1. Use OPA Table 10 to provide analysis and evaluation using student majors’ satisfaction (e.g., exit surveys from the Office of Planning and Analysis), capstone results, licensing or certification examination results (if applicable), employer surveys or other such data that indicate student satisfaction with the program and whether students are learning the curriculum (for learner outcomes, data should relate to the outcomes of the program as listed in section D tables above) to illustrate student satisfaction with the program and perceptions of program value. *Complete this table as applicable for each program within the department. Provide a table for each program within the department/unit.*

**Table 4 Assessment of Student Satisfaction and Success**

|  |
| --- |
| **Aggregate data supporting student success, by year, for the last four years (e.g., capstone, licensing/certification exam pass-rates)**  |
| Year | N | Name of Exam/Capstone/Activity | Program Result | National Comparison± |
| 2019-20 | 225 | Praxis | 80% of 225 were proficient | 75% of testers are proficient |
| 2020-2021 | 321 | University Exit survey | 72% of 321 participants highly satisfied/satisfied with program  | NA: no national comparison available  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## F. General Education (HLC Criterion 3.B items 1-3)

General Education Course Requirements: <https://www.wichita.edu/academics/generaleducation/>

Assessing General Education: <https://www.wichita.edu/academics/generaleducation/genedassessment.php>

1. Do any courses in the department support the university's General Education program (<https://www.wichita.edu/academics/generaleducation/>)? [ ]  Yes [ ]  No
	1. If yes, list which course(s) and the corresponding program:
2. Do any courses in the department support one of the foundation courses (Bucket 1, 2, 3) as outlined within the General Education Course Requirements (<https://www.wichita.edu/academics/generaleducation/>)? [ ]  Yes [ ]  No
	1. If yes, list which course(s) and the corresponding program(s):

## G. Undergraduate Dual and Concurrent Enrollment (HLC Criterion 3.A item 3; and 4.A item 4)

## 6. Do any programs in the department offer concurrent enrollment courses? [ ]  Yes [ ] No

If yes, list which course(s) and the corresponding program(s):

## Do any programs in the department offer dual enrollment courses? [ ]  Yes [ ] No

If yes, list which course(s) and the corresponding program(s):

## H. Credit Hours Definition (HLC Assumed Practice B)

8. Does each program in the department assign credit hours to courses according to [Wichita State University Policy 4.08](https://www.wichita.edu/about/policy/ch_04/ch4_08.php)? [ ]  Yes [ ] No

If no, provide an explanation.

## I. Overall Assessment of Program (HLC Criterion 3.A, 3.B, 4.A, 4.B)

1. Define the overall quality of each academic program based on the above information and other information collected, including outstanding student work (e.g., outstanding scholarship, inductions into honor organizations, publications, special awards, academic scholarships, student recruitment and retention).

# Part 4: Enrollment Management (HLC Criterion 4.C. items 1-4)

Refer to student need and demand for the programs in the department using the data in OPA Tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning and Analysis to complete this section.

# Student Need and Employer Demand (HLC Criterion 4.A)

*Analyze the student need and employer demand for each program/certificate by completing the table below. (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).*

1. Summarize the available data on student demand with a focus on the diversity of candidates for the majors in each level program (OPA & college data). Use the narrative and/or use of tables to reflect on the data and address: (KBOR Review)

* + 1. The **student demand** (OPA Table 11) for the CIP degree using the data from the table as appropriate. What is the current number of majors within the program for each academic year since the last review? In looking at the race/ethnicity data provided, make sure to discuss the diversity in the enrollment in the program.

**KBOR 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

**Student Demand by academic program:** (OPA Table 11)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Academic Program  | Years |
|  |  |  |  | Year-Year4 Year Average |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**URM (Underrepresented Minorities)** (OPA Table 12)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| URM Category | Dept URM (%) | College URM (%) | University URM (%) |
| Freshman |  |  |  |
| Sophomore  |  |  |  |
| Junior |  |  |  |
| Senior |  |  |  |

* + - * 1. **Student Demand:** Specifically address in narrative programs that are falling below KBOR minima and how the department is addressing this deficit:
		1. **Degree production** (OPA Table 7 & 14) for the CIP degree using the data from the table as appropriate. What is the number of graduates for each of the academic years since the last review?

**KBOR Criteria:**

* 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

**Degree Production (number of graduates) by academic program:** (OPA Table 7& 14 )

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Academic Program  | Years |
|  |  |  |  | Year-Year4 Year Average |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**URM (Underrepresented Minorities)** (OPA Table 15)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| URM Category | Doctoral (%) | Masters URM (%) | Bachelor URM (%) | Associates URM (%) |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Total URM |  |  |  |  |
| White non-hispanic |  |  |  |  |
| Black non-hispanic |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian non-hispanic  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native |  |  |  |  |
| Foreign |  |  |  |  |
| Hawaiian |  |  |  |  |
| Multiple Race |  |  |  |  |
| Unknown  |  |  |  |  |

i. Degree Production: Specifically address in narrative programs that are falling below KBOR minima and how the department is addressing this deficit:

* + 1. **Employment demand (talent pipeline)** for students. For each program cite placement data including positions secured, starting salaries, proportion of graduates placed at graduation. What is the % of students employed in the region within 1 year after graduation? Number or percentage of graduates who go on to enroll in graduate degree programs.

**KBOR Criteria:**

* 51% or more graduates employed in the Region within 1 year (four-year average)

### Complete the table below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 5. Employment of Majors**  |
| **Program Name**  | **Avg.****Salary** | **Employment****In state (%)** | **Employment****in the field (%)** | **Employment related to the field (%)** | **Employment outside the field (%)** | **Pursuing graduate or professional education (N)** | **Projected growth from BLS\*\***  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* <https://ksdegreestats.org/program_search.jsp> and U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Website: <https://www.bls.gov/bls/blswage.htm> are good resources to view job outlook data and salary information (if the Program has information available from professional associations or alumni surveys, enter that data).

* + - * 1. Provide an explanation of the most common types of positions, in terms of employment graduates can expect to find for each program.
				2. Employment Demand: Specifically address in narrative programs that are falling below KBOR minima and how the department is addressing this deficit:
		1. **Median salary** (Student ROI)– what is the median salary 5 years after graduation?

**KBOR Criteria:**

* 2022 Five-Year Post-Graduation Median Salary $38,050 or more (280% or more of 2022 poverty level).
	+ 1. Median salary: Specifically address in narrative programs that are falling below KBOR minima and how the department is addressing this deficit:
		2. Provide any additional information from the **alumni or employer surveys** about placement, salary, needs, etc. for the different programs and program levels that you did not address above.

# B. Recruitment and Retention (HLC Criterion 4.C)

## 1. Briefly describe how the department and faculty have engaged in undergraduate strategic enrollment management for each undergraduate program through specific recruitment and retention/persistence activities to support the Strategic Enrollment goals of the university ([www.wichita.edu/sem](http://www.wichita.edu/sem)) and provide an assessment of successes, challenges, and deficiencies with those activities.

2. Briefly describe how the department and faculty have engaged in graduate strategic enrollment management (GEM (G-PIPER Graduate Program Investment Plan for Enrollment and Research)) for each graduate program through ***specific*** recruitment and retention/persistence activities including recruitment and retention activities and provide an assessment of successes, challenges, and deficiencies with those activities.

# C. Program Service (HLC Criterion 3.C)

Analyze the service each program/certificate in the department provides to the **discipline, other programs at the University, and beyond**. Complete for each program.  **Data tables 1, 2, 3 and 5a, b and c, and 16 provided by the Office of Planning Analysis (covering SCH by FY and fall census day, instructional faculty; instructional FTE employed; program majors; and degree production) can be used to partially address this section.** Brief assessment can be provided quantitative and/or qualitative.

## 1. Provide a brief assessment of the service each program provides using SCH by majors and non-majors.

## 2. Provide a brief assessment of the service each program/certificate in the department/unit provides to other university programs.

## 3. Provide a brief assessment of the service and SCH workload of service each program/certificate in the department/unit provides to the institution and beyond (e.g. community courses, badges, microcredentials, industry credentials).

4. Provide a brief assessment of SCH workload of the service each program/certificate **in the department/unit** provides through **interdisciplinary opportunities** (cross list, team teach, etc.)

## **Part 5 Summary and Recommendations: (HLC Criterion 4.A.1)**

**Program Goals from Last Review:** During the program review, four years ago, each program developed a set of goals. Please list the goals for each program and the progress made towards achievement, including the data used to analyze progress and the outcomes. List the goal(s), data that may have been collected to support the goal, and the outcome. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section)

### Complete the table. (add lines as needed)

Table 6 Results of Goals from Last Review

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **(For Last 4 FYs)** | **Goal(s)** | **Assessment Data Analyzed** | **Outcome** | **Status****(Continue, Replace, Complete)\*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

\*If continue, they should be in the Forward Facing Goals, Table 8 below.

For each program, describe where the program has been and where it is going. What are the plans to advance the program, how will future progress be evaluated?

Impact of Previous Self-Study Recommendations: At the conclusion of the last program self-study performed, the committee provided recommendations for improvement for the department. Please list those recommendations and note the progress to date on implementation.

### Complete the table. (add lines as needed)

Table 7 Changes made based on Previous Recommendations by University Program Review Committee

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation | Activity  | Outcome |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Additional narrative, as appropriate:**

**Forward-Facing Goals:** Identify goal(s) (aspirational and measurable) for the program to accomplish in time for the next review. Consider use of SMART goals (**Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Time-bound)** when appropriateand should be tied to the university and college strategic plans. ***In addition to any goals continuing from Table 6, please bring forward new, additional goals for the next 4 years.***

### Complete the table. (add lines as needed)

Table 8 Forward Facing Goals for Program Review Period

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program/Certificate Goal** | **Specific - State how the department/unit will achieve this goal.**  | **Measurable –State how the department/unit measure this goal.** | **Attainable – State how the department/unit attain this goal.** | **Realistic – State how the department/unit will know this goal is realistic.** | **Time-bound – What is the timeline department/unit will follow to achieve this goal?** |
| *Ex. To decrease the number of students receiving a D/F in Chemistry 210.*  | *Add supplemental instruction to 4 of the 7 sections offered each semester.*  | *Look at # of students who are enrolled in the SI sections and of these students, how many of these students passed vs received a failing grade (D/F)* | *Department resources support the addition of 4 additional SI graduate assistants.* | *This goal is measurable, we have the resources, and it is specific.*  | *Goal will be assessed each year and changes will be implemented as needed to best serve the students. Full assessment of the goal will be discussed in the next review, Fall 2028* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

### Provide any additional narrative covering areas not yet addressed.