

2011-2012 Program Review

Executive Summary

Overview

Wichita State University revised its program review procedures during the 2010-2011 academic year. This report reflects the first year of the revised procedure. Now 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, and the Provost) is expected to strengthen the academic programs, identify program needs and campus priorities, and identify areas for reorganization.

On a 3-year cycle each academic unit prepares a self-study using a standard reporting template. These 3-year reports then feed into the required 8-year report to the Kansas Board of Regents. Hence, there is a continuous review process of each academic unit.

The triennial reporting cycle, begins one year in advance of being due each November (on a staggered schedule so that college programs are reviewed together) when the Office of the Provost offers a workshop for chairs and assessment coordinators, and continues until April 1st when the studies are submitted to the Deans. Thereafter the studies are reviewed by the Deans, Graduate School (as appropriate) and the University Program Review committee (consisting of the Associate Provost for Quality Assurance and Accountability, Director of Institutional Research, the President, President-Elect, and Past-President of the Faculty Senate, and a Dean). Each unit is provided with an opportunity to discuss and clarify those reviews. The University committee submits its final report to the Provost by November 1st.

Intensive Review of Selected Programs

The programs undergoing intensive review this year were in two different colleges and ranged from bachelor level to master level programs: College of Health Professions (review starts on page 4) and Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (review starts on page 6). Each college was notified of the programs undergoing intensive review in November of 2010.

College of Health Professions: Program review within this College was part of a larger process of strategic planning. One graduate program was reviewed. Goals and objectives were developed by the department to integrate with the strategic directions of the college. In this

college, a college level review committee also assessed the program in the process before the self-study was forwarded to the Graduate Council and University for review.

Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences: Five bachelor and four master level programs were reviewed in this college. Self-Studies were developed by the department chair. The reports were sent to the Graduate Council (graduate programs only) and College Dean for review prior to them being submitted to the University Review Committee.

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

- Program minima data posted to a secured website by the Office of Institutional Research.
 - All department chairs/faculty had access to the data on Reporting Services. These data were made available to the University in the fall of 2010.
- Data from Career Services, Graduate School Exit Surveys, and other surveys collected within departments.
- External accreditation reports (as appropriate).

Overall Outcome of Program Reviews: All programs reviewed were recommended for continuance (reviews start on page 4).

Triggered Programs Reviewed in Prior Years

Besides the two triggered programs that underwent intensive review this year (Philosophy and Women’s Studies), the remaining low major/degree triggered programs were also reviewed (using FY 2011 data). These programs submitted three year enhancement plans in 2010.

Program	Trigger from Minima Report	Status
Athletic Training	UG Majors/Degrees	Continue - New Program
Bioengineering	UG Majors	Continue - New program
Engineering Management	GR Majors/Degrees	Continue - Scheduled for review in 2012
Engineering for Manufacture	UG Majors/Degrees	Continue - Scheduled for review in 2012
Art/Studio Arts	GR Majors	Continue - Scheduled for review in 2013
Nursing – DNP Program	Doctoral Degrees	Continue - New program
Health Science	UG Majors/Degrees/ACT	Continue - New program
Biological Sciences	GR Degrees	Continue- Scheduled for review in 2012
Chemistry	GR Majors	Continue - Scheduled for review in 2012
EEPS	GR Majors/Degrees/Faculty	Continue - Scheduled for review in 2012 Recent increases in majors/degrees
Geology	UG Degrees	Continue - Scheduled for review in 2012
Mathematics	Doctoral Degrees	Continue - Scheduled for review in 2012
Spanish	GR Majors	Continue - Outreach to University-wide programs to require courses
Philosophy	UG Majors/Degrees	Continue - Reviewed in 2011 Academic support program
Physics	UG Majors/Degrees	Continue - Scheduled for review in 2012 Moved to Mathematics Department in 2011 Academic support program
Forensic Science	UG Majors/Degrees	Continue - New program

Program	Trigger from Minima Report	Status
Gerontology	GR Majors/Degrees	Continue - Reviewed in 2011 Moved to College of Health Professions 2011 Renamed Aging Studies Recent increases in majors/degrees
Sociology	GR Majors	Continue - Reviewed in 2010
Women's Studies	UG Majors/Degrees	Continue - Reviewed in 2011 Developing plan for a minor in women's studies for engineers Outreach to University community

Potential Costs of Recommendations

None of the recommendations made will require any additional cost to the University. Programs, for example Women's Studies, are being asked to consider greater collaboration with other campus units. This may create opportunities for cost savings or enhancement of their budget depending on the nature of the collaboration.

College of Health Professions

Department/Program (s): Physician Assistant

Degree (s) Offered: MPA, Master of Physician Assistant

Triggers: None

Brief Description of Each Degree: The Physician Assistant program is a master's level 2-year program with 42 credit hours in the first year and 40 in the second. It is designed to fill a critical and growing health care need that is reflected in the high number of applicants and the placement of its graduates. It can also be seen that applicants are highly motivated, as shown by the high retention rate of those admitted. One of the strengths of the program is its focus on providing qualified health professionals to rural and underserved areas, in which the Program far exceeds the national average.

The program prepares students for certification and licensure in the field and enrolls 48 incoming students per year. Student success is documented by the high rate at which graduates pass the national certification exam and move into the work force.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes: The program is to be commended for following national guidelines and best practices in their discipline. As a program with a rigorous accreditation process and measures that allow a comparison of WSU's program with national norms and expectations, it is clear that assessment is carried out in a manner to help ensure that the quality of the program will be maintained. The Program Review Committee has no concerns about the assessment process of this program but offers a few suggestions below that might strengthen future reporting of outcome data.

This graduate program prepares certified physician assistant professionals and the primary measure of its effectiveness is student performance on the NCCPA exam. The data show the program compares well with the national pass rates (*p. 6 of self-study cites a 93.2% pass rate*), but it is not clear from the report how PACKRAT scores are utilized to assess learning outcomes. Similarly it would be useful to know how, or to have examples cited that show how the preceptor evaluations have informed the faculty of about areas in need of improvement.

An important aspect of the program is its focus on providing qualified health professionals to rural and underserved areas. Since Kansas is an area with rural health care needs, it would be useful to have regional comparisons (Nebraska, Oklahoma, etc.), rather than a comparison with the national norms reported (or include both). A regional comparison would be a better indicator of the program's effectiveness in serving rural areas in the region and would satisfy those evaluating how beneficial programs are to Kansas.

The program has data from alumni that attests to their satisfaction and high regard for the quality of the Physician Assistant Program, which is commendable.

Placement of Graduates: In recent years the number admitted to each cohort group has been raised from 42 to 48 to meet the needs of the profession. The report includes data on the numbers of Kansans who are accepted as compared to those from out-of-state. It would be useful to know how many of its graduates are retained by the state as they move into the work force. Similarly it would be useful to have an estimate of the current needs in the state to identify whether the program needs to expand further.

The report indicates that there has been a steady rise in the salaries of Physician Assistants. The average salary of close to \$80,000, while somewhat and understandably lower than the national average, is an indication of the strong value of these professionals in our region and considerably higher than the university average. The employment rate of the programs graduates is very high.

Sources of External Support/Faculty Comments: The report shows that the faculty are highly productive, and engaged in professional development and research. Retention of faculty appears to be an issue that should be monitored, in order to determine if there are factors other than the marketplace that are having an influence.

Conclusions:

Commendations:

- The program seems to operate well despite recent turnover in faculty/staff.
- Student satisfaction is high and employer demand is very good.
- Learning outcomes are defined and are being assessed.
- Overall, the self-study was well written.

Prior to the next review in 2014:

- Collect data that describes regional and local needs.
 - Consider expansion if data suggest there is a large amount of unmet needs in the state.
- Provide more insight during the next review on the results of internal course and clinical assessment.
- Improve documentation of changes made through assessment.
- Investigate hiring additional faculty and creating a faculty sustainability plan.
- New data now collected by the University should be evaluated in terms of student perceptions about the program. The University implemented an electronic graduate student exit survey in 2011 (by program) for this purpose.
- Data should be collected and evaluated from all program graduates to include salary, employment location, and employment in the field. The University is implementing an alumni survey (by program) for this purpose in 2012.

Fairmount College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

Department/Program (s): Elliot School of Communication (ESC)

Degree (s) Offered: B.A. in Communication and M.A. in Communication

Triggers: None

Brief Description of Each Degree:

B.A. in Communication – An integrated communication program composed of the speech communication and mass communications disciplines. Includes an integrated “core curriculum” required for all students, regardless of emphasis area, which combines the subfields of speech, journalism and mediated communications. The emphasis areas are: 1) Integrated Marketing Communications, 2) Strategic Communication, 3) Journalism, 4) Electronic Media, and 5) Open Emphasis.

M.A. in Communication – Requires completion of 36 hours of coursework in communication and related fields. Fifteen of these hours are in the graduate core, a set of five courses designed to provide the student a strong foundation in communication theory and research methodology.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes: The learning outcome statements listed in the self-study (on page 8, section 3c) are not tied to direct measure of student learning. Therefore, the assessment process described does not provide information on the level of achievement of the undergraduate and graduate program learning outcomes.

Placement of Graduates: No specific data on the B.A. or M.A. in Communication is presented regarding types of positions graduates obtain. However, the report states that “Students earning a degree in communication from the ESC are prepared for a wide variety of careers.” The BLS report suggests job growth, but with strong competition for entry-level positions.” The integrated program offered by the ESC plus the co-operative and work-based learning opportunities available to the ESC students appear to provide their graduate a competitive advantage. Average salary for graduates in 2009 was \$32, 500 while in 2010 this average went down to \$29,619.

Sources of External Support/Faculty Comments: The sources of external support include the Elliot Endowment, Kansas Health Foundation and individual donors. The School has five named faculty positions of distinction.

Conclusions:

Commendations:

- The analysis of strengths and weaknesses was well done.
- The short-term plan presented includes efforts to expand the School’s interdisciplinary initiatives which could strengthen both the B.A. and M.A. programs.

- The School has strong support from donors and the community.

By April 1, 2012 (send to the Office of the Provost):

- Efforts should be made to document that the program review process is a part of a continuous improvement approach involving all departmental faculty.
- The learning outcomes for both programs should be further developed and a revised assessment process needs to be implemented to include the following:
 - Learning Outcomes: Statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation. These relate to the skills, knowledge, and behaviors that students acquire through their program (e.g., graduates will demonstrate advanced writing ability).
 - Assessment Methods: Direct measures used to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., writing project evaluated by a rubric).
 - Targets: Expectations of students to achieve the desired outcome to demonstrate program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of students will demonstrate at least the benchmark performance on a writing project).
 - Results: Actual achievement on each measurement (e.g., 94% of the students achieved at least the benchmark performance on the writing project).
 - Analysis: An evaluation that 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 outcomes and consider whether the measurement and target remain valid indicators of the learner.

Prior to the next review in 2014:

- Data should be collected and evaluated in terms of student perceptions about the program. The University implemented an electronic undergraduate and graduate student exit survey in 2011 (by program) for this purpose.
- Data should be collected and evaluated from all program graduates to include salary, employment location, and employment in the field. The University is implementing an alumni survey (by program) for this purpose in 2012.

Department/Program (s): English and Creative Writing

Degree (s) Offered: B.A. and M.A. in English Language and Literature; M.F.A. in Creative Writing

Triggers: None

Brief Description of Degree Programs: The department offers degree programs in creative writing, literature, and English teaching, as well as a range of courses in linguistics. Students who combine an English major with substantial work in other disciplines will find the knowledge and communication skills acquired in their work in English a valuable asset as they seek entrance into a wide range of fields that include communication, education, government, law, and even business.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes: The learning outcome statements listed in the self-study (on page 9, section 3c) are limited and not tied to direct measure of student learning (grades are not considered direct measures). Likewise, for the evaluation of general education goals/skills (on page 10, section 3e) there is no direct measure of student learning, except course grades.

Placement of Graduates: Data is provided on the undergraduate program in terms of employment, although there is no discussion on the response rate and how that data was gathered. No data is available on the two master programs.

Sources of External Support/Faculty Comments: There is a qualified faculty. Two small grants were awarded to the department in 2008 and 2009. Scholarly productivity is evident.

Conclusions:

Commendations:

- Mission and role are clearly stated and correspond to the University and College missions.
- Scholarly productivity is clear.
- Strong faculty.

By April 1, 2012 (send to the Office of the Provost):

- Efforts should be made to document that the program review process is a part of a continuous improvement approach involving all departmental faculty.
- The learning outcomes for all degree programs should be further developed and a revised assessment process needs to be implemented with the following components:
 - Learning Outcomes: Statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation. These relate to the skills, knowledge, and behaviors that students acquire

through their program (e.g., graduates will demonstrate advanced writing ability).

- Assessment Methods: Direct measures used to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., writing project evaluated by a rubric, administering the CLA to students in the new capstone course).
- Targets: Expectations of students to achieve the desired outcome to demonstrate program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of students will demonstrate at least the benchmark performance on a writing project).
- Results: Actual achievement on each measurement (e.g., 94% of the students achieved at least the benchmark performance on the writing project).
- Analysis: An evaluation that 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 outcomes and consider whether the measurement and target remain valid indicators of the learner.
- General education expectations should be further developed (and assessed) for both program majors and non-majors.
 - To measure student learning, assess a representative sample of student assignments (e.g., for writing or critical thinking abilities) using a rubric from selected courses (pre, at the beginning of semester and post, at the end).
 - Utilize processes listed above to evaluate the outcomes.

Prior to the next review in 2014:

- Data should be collected and evaluated in terms of student perceptions about the program. The University implemented an electronic undergraduate and graduate student exit survey in 2011 (by program) for this purpose.
- Data should be collected and evaluated from all program graduates to include salary, employment location, and employment in the field. The University is implementing an alumni survey (by program) for this purpose in 2012.

Department/Program (s): History

Degree (s) Offered: M.A. in American or European History. B.A. in History, Public History.

Triggers: None

Brief Description of degree programs: The purpose of WSU's Department of History is to illuminate the forces that have shaped our world and to provide a historical perspective for the future. While students may focus on a specific area of concentration, the program introduces them to a variety of classes that assures them a foundation for an integrated liberal education. Combined with courses in other disciplines, the history major prepares students for entrance into a wide variety of career opportunities, including business, government, law, journalism, teaching, communication, and public affairs. The degree programs require the student to possess knowledge of American, European and World History and geography.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes:

1. Each student will achieve a passing score of a "C" or better in all survey and upper division courses, based on each faculty member's grading system, but within the overall grading rubric of the department. Student academic progress folders (with grades included) are reviewed twice a year.
2. Students will research, write, and submit for their file a research paper that addresses the particular topic within the context of comparative analysis and change over time. Students will also prepare and submit a book review. Copies of research papers and book reviews are collected and stored in a locked file.

With the exception of grades and submission of reports/paper, measurements of learning outcomes are not specified. Outcomes are reported as folder reviews and grades.

Placement of Graduates: Minimal information is provided on some BA graduates in that they are employed and go on to pursue graduate work at well-known schools.

Sources of External Support/Faculty Comments: Two small grants were received over the last 3 years. Scholarly productivity has been consistent, despite cuts in faculty travel budgets. Student credit hour production has decreased slightly with a decrease FTE (1.0 FTE since 2005). The report mentioned that the Department has secured generous donations from history Alumni who have entered more lucrative endeavors like business or law.

Conclusions:

Statements/Commendations:

- The History Department appears to be doing a commendable job at performing the functions expected of it by the University despite losing faculty.
- The Department shares a common "threat" to many departments on the Wichita State campus in that it has lost FTEs over the past few years. This situation is not

unique to the history department, and will have to be addressed at the Dean's or Provost's level, in terms of prioritizing resources (see Dean's review).

By April 1, 2012 (send to the Office of the Provost):

- Efforts should be made to document that the program review process is a part of a continuous improvement approach involving all departmental faculty.
- The learning outcomes for both programs should be further developed and a revised assessment process needs to be implemented to include the following:
 - Learning Outcomes: Statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation. These relate to the skills, knowledge, and behaviors that students acquire through their program (e.g., graduates will demonstrate advanced writing ability).
 - Assessment Methods: Direct measures used to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., writing project evaluated by a rubric, consider administering the CLA to all seniors).
 - Targets: Expectations of students to achieve the desired outcome to demonstrate program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of students will demonstrate at least the benchmark performance on a writing project).
 - Results: Actual achievement on each measurement (e.g., 94% of the students achieved at least the benchmark performance on the writing project).
 - Analysis: An evaluation that 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 outcomes and consider whether the measurement and target remain valid indicators of the learner.
- General education expectations should be further developed (and assessed) for both program majors and non-majors.
 - To measure student learning, assess a representative sample of student assignments (e.g., for writing or critical thinking abilities) using a rubric from selected courses (pre, at the beginning of semester and post, at the end).
 - Utilize processes listed above to evaluate the outcomes.

Prior to the next review in 2014:

- Data should be collected and evaluated in terms of student perceptions about the program. The University implemented an electronic undergraduate and graduate student exit survey in 2011 (by program) for this purpose.
- Data should be collected and evaluated from all program graduates to include salary, employment location, and employment in the field. The University is implementing an alumni survey (by program) for this purpose in 2012.

Department/Program (s): Philosophy

Degree (s) Offered: B.A. in Philosophy

Triggers: Low majors and degrees

Brief Description of degree programs: The Philosophy Department offers a traditional major emphasizing epistemology, metaphysics, value theory and the history of philosophy. The program serves three categories of majors:

1. Students desiring to pursue post-graduate education.
2. Students planning to attend law school.
3. Students seeking a well-rounded broad liberal education.

The students enrolled in the Philosophy program have significantly higher average ACT scores than the general Wichita State Undergraduate population. In addition, over the past twenty years, all program graduates that have applied to graduate programs have been successful in the quest for admission, being admitted to some of the most prestigious international PhD programs and law schools.

Beyond the major it provides in philosophy, the Department provides an important service to the University in terms of providing specific philosophy courses to professional colleges (e.g., logic, engineering ethics, bioethics) and teaching a wide variety of courses that meet general education requirements.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes: There are three major learning outcomes for the program. These are:

- a. Development of knowledge of philosophical traditions, issues and positions.
- b. Development of critical reading, writing and analytical reasoning skills.
- c. Preparations of students to pursue post graduate education.

Assessment of the first two outcomes is accomplished by departmental members reading and reviewing approximately twenty writing samples and exams for students per year. Assessment of the third outcome is based on successful admission to graduate programs.

The outcomes reported on the first area indicated that those papers reviewed were at the “superior” level. The outcomes reported for the second area indicated “mastery” of the concepts involved. Regarding outcome three, during the three years covered by the review, all nine students who applied for post graduate programs were accepted.

At the present time, the Department does not use any post-graduation satisfaction measures.

The Department also tracks the performance of students in the classes that are taught as a part of the General Education program. A similar method of assessment is used as is found in the

review of philosophy majors. Departmental reviewers indicate that the general education courses are performing as expected in providing background for non-philosophy majors.

Placement of Graduates: Some philosophy graduates go on to pursue graduate work. The program review document indicates that graduates who do not pursue graduate education are “employed in a variety of fields...including business, journalism, publishing, law enforcement, public relations, the computer industry and the military.”

Sources of External Support/Faculty Comments: As expected, opportunities for external support are not plentiful in the discipline. However, the faculty is productive in terms of teaching and scholarship. The report indicates the faculty of the Department performs well in teaching, research, and service (as reflected in a number of teaching awards). In addition, their program review document, coupled with the “External Peer Review” from 2004 (that was attached to the review document) both indicate the sense of collegiality and shared governance that prevails in the Department.

Conclusions:

Statements/Commendations:

- The Philosophy Department appears to be doing a commendable job at performing the functions expected of it by the University, mostly as a service department. This designation is essential in order for WSU to offer comprehensive philosophy content to its students.
- The Department’s plans to increase enrollment in the major are adequate.
- The report indicates that tenured and tenure track faculties do an excellent job in both teaching and research.
- It is noted that the Department will utilize and evaluate student and graduate perception data the University now collects on graduates and alums. The University implemented an electronic undergraduate student exit survey in 2011 (by program) and will implement an alumni survey (by program) for this purpose in 2012.

By April 1, 2012 (send to the Office of the Provost):

- Efforts should be made to document that the program review process is a part of a continuous improvement approach involving all departmental faculty.
- The learning outcomes for the program should be further developed and a revised assessment process needs to be implemented to include the following:
 - Learning Outcomes: Statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation. These relate to the skills, knowledge, and behaviors that students acquire through their program (e.g., graduates will demonstrate advanced writing ability).
 - Assessment Methods: Direct measures used to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g.,

writing project evaluated by a rubric). Consideration should be given at requiring the CLA, for example, as a requirement for all seniors.

- Targets: Expectations of students to achieve the desired outcome to demonstrate program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of students will demonstrate at least the benchmark performance on a writing project).
 - Results: Actual achievement on each measurement (e.g., 94% of the students achieved at least the benchmark performance on the writing project).
 - Analysis: An evaluation that 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 outcomes and consider whether the measurement and target remain valid indicators of the learner.
- General education expectations should be further developed (and assessed) for both program majors and non-majors.
 - To measure student learning, assess a representative sample of student assignments (e.g., for writing or critical thinking abilities) using a rubric from selected courses (pre, at the beginning of semester and post, at the end).
 - Utilize processes listed above to evaluate the outcomes.

Department/Program (s): Women's Studies

Degree (s) Offered: B.A. in Women's Studies

Triggers: Low majors and degrees

Brief Description of degree programs: B.A. in Women's Studies – The critical examination of the intersection of gender with race, class, sexuality, nationality and global region, and religion is central to the program. Students gain critical understanding of women's lives through three core areas of internationalism, representation and social issues. Graduates of the program are prepared to work in areas such as social work, education, international relations, media, politics, law, psychology, criminal justice and others that concentrate on media literacy, diplomatic or foreign service, international trade, visual design or social services. Recently the department has created two new courses of interest to students throughout the University: Women and Sports; LGBT studies.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes: Appendix C includes an assessment plan in which two goals are related to learning. The first of these goals includes six program objectives and two objectives are associated with the second goal. The plan also includes assessment tools to be used to measure the level of achievement for each program objective. It is not possible to determine if the individual program objectives are met because the data from the two assessment tools used, Exit Survey and Writing Sample, is presented by goal not by program objective.

The statement on page 6, "Data indicate that the department objectives to teach women and gender in interdisciplinary contexts as well as analytical and critical thinking on gender and its intersection with race, class, religion, sexuality, culture and globalization are met," demonstrates an emphasis in the teaching process instead of student learning.

Placement of Graduates: The information on placement of graduates comes from two sources: Career Services and an Alumni Survey conducted in the spring of 2011. The average graduation year for the Alumni Survey respondents was 1994 with a sample size of 25. Graduates from the WS program are employed in a variety of fields with the majority of these working in the non-profit sector. The average salary reported in the survey was \$69,583 for respondents with 17 years of experience on average.

Sources of External Support/Faculty Comments: The sources of external support include the WSU Plaza of Heroines and YWCA of Wichita which provides on average a total of \$5,500 per year for scholarships. The faculty are productive in terms of their teaching and research and have national and international reputations.

Conclusions:

Statements/Commendations:

- The curriculum emphasizes topics that are relevant in today's world.

- An assessment plan is in place and efforts have been made to gather feedback from program graduates through an Alumni Survey.

By April 1, 2012 (send to the Office of the Provost):

- Efforts should be made to document that the program review process is a part of a continuous improvement approach involving all departmental faculty.
- The learning outcomes for the program, which could be based on the current program objectives, should be developed and a revised assessment process needs to be implemented to include the following:
 - Learning Outcomes: Statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation. These relate to the skills, knowledge, and behaviors that students acquire through their program (e.g., graduates will demonstrate advanced writing ability).
 - Assessment Methods: Direct measures used to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., writing project evaluated by a rubric). Consideration should be given at requiring the CLA, for example, as a requirement for all seniors.
 - Targets: Expectations of students to achieve the desired outcome to demonstrate program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of students will demonstrate at least the benchmark performance on a writing project).
 - Results: Actual achievement on each measurement (e.g., 94% of the students achieved at least the benchmark performance on the writing project).
 - Analysis: An evaluation that 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 outcomes and consider whether the measurement and target remain valid indicators of the learner.
- General education expectations should be further developed (and assessed) for both program majors and non-majors.
 - To measure student learning, assess a representative sample of student assignments (e.g., for writing or critical thinking abilities) using a rubric from selected courses (pre, at the beginning of semester and post, at the end).
 - Utilize processes listed above to evaluate the outcomes.

Prior to the next review in 2014:

- A specific timeline should be established for increasing the number of students in the program as well as the number of degrees awarded.
- Discussions should occur with College/University administrators on how the Women's Studies major can be sustained at WSU in the current environment. Reaching out to other colleges is one suggestion (see bullet below).

- Additional multidisciplinary collaborations outside of the Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences should be explored. For example, course work offered in the Department is very relevant to the colleges of Business, Engineering, and Health Professions. Dual degrees may be possible in Women's Studies and Public Health, for example. Developing an undergraduate liberal studies degree with concentrations in women's studies, ethnic studies, religion, and LGBT issues may be another option to increase the profile of the discipline.
- Data should be collected and evaluated in terms of student perceptions about the program. The University implemented an electronic undergraduate student exit survey in 2011 (by program) for this purpose.
- Data should be collected and evaluated from all program graduates to include salary, employment location, and employment in the field. The University is implementing an alumni survey (by program) for this purpose in 2012.