

**Wichita State University
Program Review – Reporting Year 2022**

Program	CIP	Degree Level	Recommendation*	Notes**
				KBOR approved in December 2021 a change in name of the department to reflect a change in emphasis of the degree program: from <i>Women's Studies</i> to <i>Women's, Ethnic, and Intersectionality Studies</i> . Program will be reviewed next year for improvements made.
Women's Studies	05.0207	B	Additional Review	
Modern And Classical Languages & Literature / Spanish	16.0101	B, M	Continue	
English Language and Literature	23.0101	B M	Continue	
Creative Writing	23.1302	M	Continue	
Honors Baccalaureate	30.9999	HB	Continue	Will be fully reviewed in 2022.
Philosophy	38.0101	B	Continue	
Psychology	42.0101	B, M, D	Continue	
Anthropology	45.0201	B, M	Continue	
Political Science	45.1001	B	Continue	
Sociology	45.1101	B, M	Continue	
History	54.0101	B, M	Continue	
***Criminal Justice	43.0104	B, M	Continue	
***Public Administration	44.0401	M	Continue	
***Social Work	44.0701	B, M	Continue	

M= Masters; B=Bachelors; D= Doctorate

Highlighting indicates these programs were a part of the University's Strategic Program Alignment Report on Low-Enrollment Programs last year. However, please go ahead and provide information on these programs for this report.

***Recommendation options are: Continue, Additional Review, Enhance, Discontinue**

****Notes are only required for programs that have a Recommendation other than "Continue"**

*****Added by Sam C-D to this table 3/4/22 because they reviewed these additional programs!**

The Notes field should contain information on Academic Support Program, etc., as well as information on programs with designation other than "Continue."

Wichita State University
Status of Programs Needing Additional Review
Reporting to Board AY 2018-2021

Program	Year of Report to Board	CIP	Degree Level	Recommendation*	Explanation of Recommendation**
No programs were found to need additional review during this period.					

2022 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 vice president for strategic engagement and planning, and the 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 (i.e., each program is required to be reviewed twice during an 8 year period). 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 November, one year in advance of being due, (on a staggered schedule so that college programs are reviewed together) 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 vice president for Strategic Engagement and Planning; assistant director of the Office of Planning Analysis; the president, president-elect, and past-president of the Faculty Senate; and a dean appointed by the executive vice president/provost), each unit is provided with an opportunity to discuss and clarify their reviews. The university committee submits its final report to the executive vice president/provost by December 1st.

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. These data were made available fall 2020.
- 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 in the Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Science include:

Women's Studies	05.0207
Modern And Classical Languages & Literature / Spanish	16.0101
English Language and Literature	23.0101
Creative Writing	23.1302
Honors Baccalaureate	30.9999
Philosophy	38.0101
Psychology	42.0101
Anthropology	45.0201
Political Science	45.1001
Sociology	45.1101
History	54.0101
*Criminal Justice	43.0104
*Public Administration	44.0401
*Social Work	44.0701

*Indicates programs moved to this cycle to support university alignment. KBOR Program Inventory will be updated.

Overall Outcome of Program Reviews reported to KBOR

All programs in the Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences are recommended to continue, with the exception of Women's Studies, for which additional review is recommended. As noted earlier, Women's Studies has undergone steering committee review and has changed the department name to Women's, Ethnic, and Intersectional Studies to encourage interdisciplinary study and increased enrollment. Programs were found to either exceed, meet, partially meet, or not meet expectations in six different categories (See pages 5-6). Rubrics for each program are included in pages 7-29 and are available on the university website. Goal setting and interim reporting were included in the process as continuous improvement measures.

Women's Studies

Department: Women's Studies Year: 2020	Exemplary 4	Meets Expectations 3	Partially Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are fully qualified to sustain the program.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.	The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning.	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand and the national job outlook.	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.	The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Degrees Offered:	Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Women's Studies
Triggered Programs:	Number of majors and number of graduates
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	Addressed on page 21 of self-study; revised mission statement, incorporated Uniscope; creation of first-year seminar; reorganization of department with help of steering committee
Committee Notes:	
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Embracing change as department is restructured, emphasizing diversity & interdisciplinary courses in curriculum •High percent of URM students compared to total university •Programs such as Global Village Assembly, Diverse Women's Summit, Plaza of Heroines Scholarships •Incorporation of Uniscope •SCH for other departments/programs (electives/general education)
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Continue working with steering committee to restructure the department •Consider ways to recruit high school students •Be more specific on forward-facing goals (page 24), mainly on "measurable" column, says yes but not how
General Feedback	<p>Faculty signatures appreciated</p> <p>Forward-facing goals should be submitted in the SMART format to help ensure accountability and ease of reporting during the next cycle.</p>

Modern Classic Languages and Literature/Spanish

Department: MCLL Year: 2020	Exemplary 4	Meets Expectations 3	Partially Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are fully qualified to sustain the program.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.	The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning.	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand and the national job outlook.	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.	The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Degrees Offered:	Certificate: Spanish for the Professions; Bachelor of Arts (BA)-concentrations in Spanish & French; Master of Arts (MA) in Spanish
Triggered Programs:	MA for number of faculty, number of majors, & number of graduates
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	Addressed in Table 6 on page 27 of self-study (4 recommendations, took action on all 4 and provided outcomes)
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair number of presentations, publications & grant funding for size of TT faculty (6) • Have incorporated Uniscope; received teaching awards; participated in Latinx Cluster Hires • Using recommended best practices from EAB for recruitment & retention • SCH for other programs/majors & foreign language requirement for LAS majors
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent mission statement tying to WSU mission statement • Interdisciplinary work with other departments (example: Italian for Opera majors; Arabic for courses with Middle Eastern content)
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be more specific on SMART goals (some items on “measurable” and “attainable” need more detail) • Assessment plan could be explained in more depth & tied to learning outcomes in the narrative • Keep adjusting GEM plan as needed in effort to lift the 3 triggers from KBOR at the MA level
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forward-facing goals should be provided in SMART format to ease reporting responsibilities during the next cycle. • Faculty signatures should reflect the department faculty have reviewed and opined about the self study.

English & Creative Writing

Department is expected to address:	Exemplary 4	Meets Expectations 3	Partially Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are fully qualified to sustain the program.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.	The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning.	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand and the national job outlook.	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.	The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Degrees Offered:	BA English Language and Literature, BA Creative Writing MA English Language and Literature, MFA in Creative Writing Graduate Certificate in English Literature and Composition Studies
Triggered Programs:	NA
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	None
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission does not explicitly state the mission of any of the programs in the department. An overview is provided, and there are limited connections to the strategic plan. • The information related to the quality of faculty lacks enough content to meet the standard. Using the provided tables would have strengthened the self-study submission. • The only assessment information provided is for the MA in English Literature. English 101 data is from 2013/2015. Not sure that this session was updated from the last submission. • Student employment information is lacking. It isn't clear which program is referenced. • Service limited to one of the included programs.
Commendations:	
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the self-study.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty signatures are required in order to ensure that all faculty have seen and opined on the self-study. Please adhere to the instructions. • Using the given format is preferred to a re-worked version.

Philosophy

Department: Philosophy Year: 2020	Exemplary 4	Meets Expectations 3	Partially Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are fully qualified to sustain the program.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.	The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning.	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand and the national job outlook.	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.	The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Degrees Offered:	Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Philosophy
Triggered Programs:	Number of faculty & number of majors
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	Addressed on page 2 & 13 of the self-study; working on 2 of the items, did not incorporate Uniscope
Committee Notes:	
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Highly productive faculty in terms of scholarly activity & teaching •Large number of SCH for other programs/majors •Hiring of UG Coordinator for recruitment & retention efforts •Academically prepared students (higher ACT scores compared to total university) •High acceptance of students to graduate or law school
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Consider incorporating Uniscope, or provide an explanation/alternative model for faculty assessment •Be more detailed on student learning outcomes, assessment tools, & results, for both majors & general education •Consider offering a high school course to introduce younger students to the study of Philosophy •Monitor student satisfaction with program (dropped to 66.7% in 2019, was 85% or higher 6 previous years) •Expand on service to the community •Forward-facing goals are not SMART goals
General Feedback	<p>Forward-facing should be presented in the SMART goal format</p> <p>Faculty signatures should indicate that department faculty have reviewed and opined about the self-study prior to submission.</p>

Psychology

Department is expected to address:	Exemplary 4	Meets Expectations 3	Partially Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are fully qualified to sustain the program.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.	The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning.	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand and the national job outlook.	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.	The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Degrees Offered:	BA Psychology Ph.D Community Psychology Ph.D Community Clinical Psychology Ph.D Human Factors Certificates Community Psychology and Human Factors
Triggered Programs:	NA
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	Recommendations were reviewed and a response provided. Continued improvements have been made. Forward-Facing goals from last cycle seem to have been met.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working on uniformity of curriculum will strengthen program, especially when learning outcomes are assessed. Employer need only provided for UG students. Perhaps counseling could be considered as an occupation to get broader view of employment opportunities. Considerable SCH for majors and non-majors. Not much reporting of student community involvement. Programs undersold their service contributions. Feedback loop was present. Forward-facing goals are beyond the departments control.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programs have retained their accreditation Remarkable scholarly productivity. Notable that research labs work with UG students.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue alignment of assessment of learning outcomes and curriculum uniformity. Graduate student service to the community is known to be exceptional. Please include in future reports. Reconsider some of the forward facing goals as they are outside the control of the department.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forward-facing goals could be more specific. Narrowing the metrics early will help with responding about progress next cycle. Faculty signatures are appreciated.

Anthropology

Department is expected to address:	Exemplary 4	Meets Expectations 3	Partially Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.		Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are fully qualified to sustain the program.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.	The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning.	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand and the national job outlook.	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.	The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Degrees Offered:	B.A. Anthropology (online) Minor Anthropology Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Certificate (Undergrad; new) M.A. Anthropology Museum Studies Certificate (Graduate)
Triggered Programs:	M.A. for faculty
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	Impact of previous self-study recommendations reflect that substantial work has taken place to address the trigger for enrollment. Satisfaction scores have improved, and data collection efforts have been enhanced.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong programs with good oversight. • Difficult to discern from faculty section how many/which faculty support each area – cultural, archaeological, biological anthropology – and their crossover, thus difficult to determine adequacy beyond “reestablishing pre-2017” numbers. • Could be a little clearer as to how faculty are involved in listed “economic drivers” such as NGOs, Corps of Engineers. • Could make more effective use of national job data. • In areas where 100% of students meet program goals, this raises a pink flag. Context would be helpful. • Adding information about service in the service section would be helpful. The reformatting of the form cut out a section of the content where this program has substantial evidence of effort
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They found a CITY! • Clearly addressed program contribution to all three pillars of the WSU mission. • Impressive financial support and applied learning experiences for undergraduates. • Effective strategy for improving MA satisfaction through feedback loop, which likely contributes to increasing enrollment and removal of trigger. • Extensive appendices were helpful to clarify performance measures.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forward facing goals are appropriate general goals, but not SMART goals. • GIS Certificate is now approved, so program targets could be included in FF goals. • Financial support for MA students may need improvement based on feedback collected, e.g. training grants or GAsheps funded through the Graduate School.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forward facing goals could be strengthened by adding metrics and timelines. Doing so allows for greater ease of reporting in the next cycle. • Faculty signatures appreciated.

Political Science

Department is expected to address:	Exemplary 4	Meets Expectations 3	Partially Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are fully qualified to sustain the program.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.	The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning.	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand and the national job outlook.	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.	The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Degrees Offered:	B.A. Political Science
Triggered Programs:	M.A. for faculty
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	Evidence that the recommendations from last program review cycle were considered and implemented.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program purpose noted, given the programs potential impact on culture, and frequent commentary in public media, it could have been used to support the tie to the mission. Well-stated ties to the university strategic plan. • Noted changes in faculty make up with some moves to administration and one retirement. The majority of faculty members are tenure-track with varied levels of scholarly productivity as a result. • Solid assessment plan including various different tools including the AAC&U rubric. • Student satisfaction is solidly and above university averages. • Participates in gen ed program • Program serves greater than average number of URM students. • Solid production of SCH and service to non-majors. • Service to university and beyond is exemplary, especially for a small faculty.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The department implemented UNISCOPE in 2018. • Solid job supporting employer demand. • Record of service is strong. • Increase in majors as a result of connecting to the SEM plan.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forward facing goals are appropriate and many focus on assessment and address student needs.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forward facing goals could be strengthened by adding metrics and timelines. Doing so allows for greater ease of reporting in the next cycle. • Faculty signatures appreciated.

Sociology

Department is expected to address:	Exemplary 4	Meets Expectations 3	Partially Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are fully qualified to sustain the program.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.	The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning.	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand and the national job outlook.	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.	The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Degrees Offered:	B.A. Sociology M.A. Sociology
Triggered Programs:	M.A. for Graduates
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantive work to address previous PR Recs, discussed in several sections.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unclear until Part 11 (FF goals) whether this “small department” has enough regular faculty to deliver both the teaching and research expected for a program of its size. The faculty section seemed apologetic about research productivity measures, but it wasn’t entirely clear whether the remedy is UNISCOPE or a new hire and workload change. Part 4, changes to assessment of learning outcomes for undergraduates seem to focus on changing the rubric rather than changing pedagogic strategies to help students meet standards. Since sociologists study things like how rubrics can be biased or unjust, it would be helpful to have this more clearly explained where applicable. General Education outcomes are exit survey self-assessments. UG learning outcomes from GenEd Sociology courses might be more compelling. Forward-facing goals are not in the SMART format. Should include the measures of success and a timetable.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantive program changes and outreach efforts (e.g. addition of MA internship option, diversity outreach) and these are clearly described. Program mission narrative goes beyond the university mission to include WSU priorities and initiatives. Program goals/outcomes are well described, especially the Part 4 Graduate program goals. Faculty section makes effective use of UNISCOPE to describe a highly active faculty in a small department.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As implied in the self-assessment, offering more competitive graduate support would likely improve graduate enrollment and degree completion.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forward facing goals could be strengthened by adding metrics and timelines. Doing so allows for greater ease of reporting in the next cycle. Faculty signatures appreciated.

History

Department is expected to address:	Exemplary 4	Meets Expectations 3	Partially Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are fully qualified to sustain the program.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.	The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning.	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand and the national job outlook.	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.	The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Degrees Offered:	BA History MA History
Triggered Programs:	MA for Grads
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of employer demand was well done, especially in light of limited or no BLS data or direct job market information. • The inclusion of the rubric was useful as evidence of learning outcome evaluation
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a feedback loop is strong as is the culture of assessment and continuous improvement.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of just one course which is the same assessment used for the Gen Ed program. Consider strengthening assessment of student learning outcomes by reviewing additional courses.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forward-facing goals could be more specific. Narrowing the metrics early will help with responding about progress next cycle. • Faculty signatures are appreciated.

Criminal Justice

Department is expected to address:	Exemplary 4	Meets Expectations 3	Partially Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are fully qualified to sustain the program.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.	The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning.	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand and the national job outlook.	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.	The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Degrees Offered:	B.A. Criminal Justice, BS Forensic Science, BS Homeland Security, M.A. Criminal Justice
Triggered Programs:	Homeland Security is a new program so triggered for majors and graduates Forensic Science for majors and graduates
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	Three goals submitted in previous program review. None completed. The impact of the previous self-study recommendations is moderate due in part to leadership transitions. There is evidence of work on the GEM and SEM plans, the closer alignment of the program purpose and Uniscope adoption. Noted plans to improve communication and coordination with leadership transitions.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each program purpose is clearly outlined and the connection to the university mission is noted. The faculty noted the creation of the Homeland Security program as an example of meeting community needs and the public good. Heavy reliance on NTT faculty The numerous partnerships of the reporting programs would have been an excellent example of a direct connection to the strategic plan. Limited scholarly productivity due to focus on service and reliance on tenure track faculty. SCH was reported as stronger than university totals. The five-year rolling average of SCH per FTE is 40 SCH higher than university averages, this speaks to the teaching responsibilities of NTT faculty. Interesting note that UNISCOPE is not in best interest of tenure track faculty and the scholarship productivity is modest. Assessments of learning outcomes seem dependent upon grades and no rubric is referenced. The provided assessment plan was from 2008-2009. Should be updated. CJ Capstone project is scored by peers, but no rubric is referenced. The MA appears to use graded assessments to evaluate student learning outcomes. FSP Uses anecdotal observations to evaluate basic integration skills and integrity. FSP also uses exams, and project, scored with rubrics, as assessment tools, HSP only notes the use of grades as an assessment tool. The programs support general education across the spectrum of outcomes. The self-study does not include the rubric although the AAC&U rubric was noted in the Dean's cover letter. No explanation of the assessment of General Education offerings are noted. Satisfaction for CJ is nearly 90%. FSP is lower, but so is the "N". HSP graduate population is still very small. They had no respondents to the question. Other data is limited so it's difficult to determine the overall satisfaction, particularly of FSP and HSP. Focus on growth, perhaps concurrent enrollment opportunities could prove fruitful. Applications for the MA program are declining over three years so are graduates. Employer demand noted for each of the three programs including job outlook and salaries.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graduation rate for FSP has more than doubled.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CJ and HSP programs serve more URM than the university average and produce more graduates. But the URM for FSP is slightly lower. HSP does not have graduates yet due to age of the program. • New GEM program in 2019 with short term and long-term goals. Additional goals created with new Graduate Coordinator. • Creation of the WSU Crime Gun Intelligence Center for Excellence result of multi-partner relationship.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore concurrent enrollment as a growth strategy. • Update the assessment plan for each program. • Graduate program (CJ-MA) GPA is below the university average. The minimum GPA for admission is 3.0. Explore the implications, if any.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty signatures appreciated.

Public Administration

Department is expected to address:	Exemplary 4	Meets Expectations 3	Partially Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are fully qualified to sustain the program.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.	The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning.	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand and the national job outlook.	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.	The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Degrees Offered:	Master of Public Administration (MPA)
Triggered Programs:	NA
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	Strong evidence that progress has been made on both the goals from last cycle and recommendations from the committee.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission/Purpose is an overview of the program rather than a true purpose statement. • 2:2 teaching load is noted as high. • 66% of students are meeting standard with a goal of 80%. Sample size is unclear. Assessment types span the curriculum. Satisfaction is consistently high. • Employer need based on BLS. Provided clear job outlook. • Not much in the way of discussion related to service provided which could be expanded given the focus on community engagement. • Narrative on forward facing goals was helpful. Goals could be more specific.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciate the inclusion of a logic model.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen the purpose statement such that it is clearer the connection to the university mission. • Strengthen the discussion related to service. This is a slam dunk for Public Admin due to the community engagement priority.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forward-facing goals could be more specific. Narrowing the metrics early will help with responding about progress next cycle. • Faculty signatures are appreciated.

Social Work

Department is expected to address:	Exemplary 4	Meets Expectations 3	Partially Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission and the narrative ties the missions and roles together.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are fully qualified to sustain the program.	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.	The program assessment plan, inclusive of metrics, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning.	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand and the national job outlook.	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program demonstrates value to the one of the following: discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.	The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Degrees Offered:	BA Social Work Master of Social Work (MSW)
Triggered Programs:	NA
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	Addressed recommendations via accreditation. Also made progress on each of the forward-facing goals from last cycle.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program purpose statements are clearly tied to the university mission. • Student learning outcomes are national standards. • Assessments span the curriculum. • Scholarly productivity has decreased over the span of this cycle as tenure track faculty assume administrative responsibilities. • Practicum program has contracted with over 100 agencies in service to the community. • SCH has increased for summer sessions and year to year. • GEM plan was based on former strategic plan.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation was reaffirmed this year • Well-written connection of programs purpose to the university mission and significant emphasis placed on the support provided to move the strategic plan forward. • Diversity of program above that of the university average. • Strong assessment plan with action plans for change based on current outcomes. • Satisfaction results are high. • Employer demand was substantiated. • Substantial service is provided in SCH, to the campus and broader communities.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue working with the accreditation agency to explain/correct the concerns brought about during the reaffirmation process.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty signatures appreciated.

Fiscal Implications from the Program Review Process
Wichita State University

Fiscal implications of the recommended program changes for each fiscal year from 2017-2021

FY – 21	No recommendations led to any significant fiscal changes
FY – 20	No recommendations led to any significant fiscal changes
FY – 19	No recommendations led to any significant fiscal changes
FY – 18	No recommendations led to any significant fiscal changes
FY – 17	No recommendations led to any significant fiscal changes