

2019-2020 Program Review

Executive Summary

Overview

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 Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs and the 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 one year in advance of being due each November, (on a staggered schedule so that college programs are reviewed together) when the Office of Academic Affairs offers a workshop for chairs and assessment coordinators, and continues until April 1st when the studies are submitted to the respective Deans. Thereafter the studies are reviewed by the Deans, Graduate School (as appropriate) and the University Program Review committee (consisting of the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs; Assistant Director of the Office of Planning Analysis; 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 December 1st.

Intensive Review of Selected Programs

The programs being reviewed this year are in the Barton School of Business and include:

- Accountancy (52.0301),
- Business Administration (52.0201),
- Economics (52.0601 and 45.0601),
- Entrepreneurship (52.0701),
- Executive MBA (52.0201),
- Finance (52.0801),
- General Business (52.0201),

- Human Resource Management (52.1101),
- Information Technology & Management Information Systems (52.1201),
- International Business (52.1101),
- Management (52.0299),
- and Marketing (52.1401).

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 2018.
- Data from exit surveys and other surveys collected by the University and within departments.
- External specialty accreditation reports (as appropriate).

Overall Outcome of Program Reviews reported to KBOR: While the Barton School programs are the primary focus of the KBOR program review report for 2019-2020, the WSU Program Review process also included programs in the College of Fine Arts. Each program either exceeded, met, partially met or did not meet expectations in each of six areas. One of the four programs reviewed, the School of Music, was found to meet or exceed expectations in all but one area. The Performing Arts School meet or exceeded expectations in three of the six areas. Both programs partially meet expectations in other areas and were provided with coaching and resources to make improvements.

The Arts, Design, and Creative Industries and Media Arts programs were found to partially meet most expectations and areas of improvement were identified. Media Arts is a new program with new faculty leadership. These programs have been required to submit an interim report in two years. All reviewed programs submitted forward facing goals. Goals submitted were related to areas of improvement that were found during the self-study. The Program Evaluation rubrics are available on the university website.

All business programs are recommended to continue.

Triggered Programs Monitored

In addition to the programs that underwent intensive review this year, the remaining low major/degree triggered programs were also reviewed for updates on plans to increase majors and degrees (using AY 2019 data, see below).

School or College	Program	Trigger from Minima Report	Status
Barton School of Business	Management Sciences and Quantitative Methods	Majors (GR)	Continue – NEW.
College of Applied Studies	Athletic Training	Majors (UG) Degrees (UG)	Continue – intensive review in SP 2020

College of Health Professions	Health Care Administration	Majors (GR)	Continue - Intensive review in SP 2020
	Communication Science/Disorders	Degrees (PhD)	Continue - Intensive review in SP 2020
College of Fine Arts	Arts/Studio Arts	Majors (GR) Degrees (GR)	Continue – 2019 Forward Facing goals address trigger.
	Game and Interactive Media Design	Degrees (UG)	Continue - NEW
	Music Teacher Education	Majors (GR)	Continue – 2019 Forward Facing goals address trigger.
College of Engineering	Biomedical Engineering	Majors (GR) Degrees (GR)	Continue - NEW
	Manufacturing Engineering	Majors (UG) Degrees (UG)	Continue – New program emphasis to help with recruitment
Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Chemistry	Majors (GR) Degrees (GR)	Continue - Intensive review in SP 2021 MS only awarded to students who are ABD
	Homeland Security	Majors (UG)	Continue - NEW
	Interdisciplinary (Liberal Studies)	Majors (UG) Degrees (UG) Majors (GR) Degrees (GR)	Discontinue - Recommendation for Elimination in AY 2021
	Physics	Degrees (UG) Majors (GR) Degrees (GR)	Continue – Intensive review in 2021 Academic support program
	Philosophy	Majors (UG) Degrees (UG)	Continue - Intensive review in SP 2021 Academic support program
	Psychology	Majors (GR)	Continue – Intensive review in 2021 MA only awarded to students who are ABD
	Forensic Science	Majors (UG) Degrees (UG)	Continue - Intensive review in SP 2021
	Sociology	Majors (GR) Degrees (GR)	Continue - Intensive review in SP 2021
	Spanish	Majors (GR) Degrees (GR)	Continue - Intensive review in SP 2021
	Women's Studies	Majors (UG) Degrees (GR)	Renaming major to Women, Gender and Diversity Studies
Bill & Dorothy Cohen Honors College	Honors	Majors (UG) Degrees (GR)	Continue - NEW
Institute for Interdisciplinary Innovation	Industrial and Product Design	Majors (GR)	Continue – NEW

Note: There are no new additions to this list for 2019.

Strategic Program Alignment

Two programs were selected for strategic program alignment this year.

- Liberal Studies (B/M) The bachelor option is not needed as most students are now electing the BGS. The master option 'bleeds' other master programs, i.e., sociology, history, social work. More generally, the master is duplicative.
- Women's Studies (B) - As WSU's underserved population (defined as first-generation, underrepresented minority, and low income) has increased, students have requested topics that have a broader appeal to these groups. Plans include (1) realignment of program and its host department, (2) remove religion from the scope of the department

and degree program, (3) move ethnic studies to department from the School of Criminal Justice, (3) rename department Women, Gender, and Diversity Studies, along with the degree program, (4) realign mission to provide expertise in advancing equity, justice and diversity through allyship and interdisciplinary studies (5) major and minor will offer courses in dimensions of diversity such as gender, race, ethnicities, sexualities, disabilities and class privilege.

Potential Costs of Recommendations

None of the recommendations made will require any additional cost to the University.

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

AGGREGATE RUBRIC FOR ENTIRE SCHOOL

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 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 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 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.

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department is expected to address:	Exemplary 4	Meets Expectations 3	Partially Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	2	7	1	
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	1	6	1	2
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students		7	3	
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	2	5	2	1
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond		7	1	2
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	1	3	5	1

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

ACCOUNTING

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.

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BBA Accounting • Master of Accountancy
Triggered Programs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.A. Accounting for number of faculty
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited quantification or qualification of results related to recommendations.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission simply states departmental activity, could better explain how it ties to university mission. • Clarity requested around research activity requirement two referred articles over 5 years. If two is the minimum are there other qualifiers. More information is needed to substantiate claim of “high scholarly” activity. • Improve narrative around the learning outcomes and assessment benchmarks. Need more assessment tools at graduate level. • Concerns about decreasing enrollment noted. • Could enhance narrative around faculty engagement.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interdisciplinary model of the college supports all programs/departments. • Faculty services is solid. • High quality journals were represented in publication record. • Several goals addressing multiple program facets. SMART format used with benchmarks.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report notes enrollment management efforts are underway. Continue focus in this area. • Address accreditors concerns, pg. 16 of self-study.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please use the form as provided. • When using appendices, please include page numbers to highlight needed information. • Where possible, program should refer to Purpose Statement vs. Mission to facilitate vertical alignment with WSU Strategic Plan.

Internal Follow-up Recommendation:

☐ Resubmit FF Goals

☐ 2 year Follow-up

☒ NA

KBOR Recommendation:

☐ Enhanced

☒ Maintained

☐ Monitored for improvement

☐ Discontinued

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

BUSINESS 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.

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BBA in General Business Certificate – Business Fundamentals
Triggered Programs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solid evidence that previous recommendations were responded to in this self-study, with exception of a revision of the student learning outcomes.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mission clearly linked to university. Quality of faculty – no scores because no content. The core faculty reported in the KBOR proposal should be included in this section. Exams, clear expectations, rubric present Mixed results on student satisfaction assessments, recently lower than university. Demand is high. Majors dropped, perhaps due to online program offerings Service reported is limited to SCH. No mention of service to discipline, university or other programs. Evidence of feedback loop is incomplete. Pg. 12 goals from last year have results reported from fall of 2016, and a survey in 2014. No report on efficacy of PHIL 105 implemented in 2016. Only one Forward Facing goal listed on page 13 and that goal is to maintain current enrollment levels. A program with substantial enrollment should have more robust student learning outcomes.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued accreditation. The enrollment in the program is strong. Program goals
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only one Forward Facing Goal presented. That goal is not a SMART goal. Consider assessing new course to see if it's an improvement from original (Phil 125).
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where possible, program should refer to Purpose Statement vs. Mission to facilitate vertical alignment with WSU Strategic Plan. Please use the form as provided. When using appendices, please include page numbers to highlight needed information. Secure faculty signatures on submission

Internal Follow-up Recommendation:

☒ Resubmit FF Goals
 ☒ 2 year Follow-up
 ☐ NA

KBOR Recommendation:

☐ Enhanced
 ☒ Maintained
 ☐ Monitored for improvement
 ☐ Discontinued

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

ECONOMICS

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 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.

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.A. Economics • M.A. Economics
Triggered Programs:	NONE
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	Limited, one word response but no specifics on work accomplished over the last three years.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program faculty are concerned about impact of retirements and new Institute for the Study of Economic Growth • 40% of research attributed to one faculty member. Should better note productivity of other faculty members in relation to departmental standards. Noted requirements of presentations but limited outputs noted. • BA in Economics job placement seems low, may need to explain activity for students. • Provided information that supports enrollment trends. • Undersell in the work of faculty in part 6. • No new goals, they are the same.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department mission has been tied to university mission in an exceptional way. • Service to other programs is notable. • Strong case made for discipline as springboard for future activities.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forward facing goals are not SMART and not linked to strategic plans. Goals should reflect concerns found in self-study and cover issues where the department has agency. • Committee shares concerns for faculty replacement.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please use the form as provided. • When using appendices, please include page numbers to highlight needed information. • Where possible, program should refer to Purpose Statement vs. Mission to facilitate vertical alignment with WSU Strategic Plan.

Internal Follow-up Recommendation:

☒ Resubmit FF Goals
 ☐ 2 year Follow-up
 ☐ NA

KBOR Recommendation:

☐ Enhanced
 ☒ Maintained
 ☐ Monitored for improvement
 ☐ Discontinued

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

ENTREPRENEURSHIP

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.

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bachelor of Business – Entrepreneurship
Triggered Prog.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited evidence of response to feedback from previous review. Creation of other ways to connect with alumni should be a Forward Facing goal. This would help with the documenting career outcomes for graduates.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program mission is limited to external impact. No mention student impact. Program mission is well tied to the university mission, although limited mention of effort related to cultural driver. Program reports support of General Education program, but list no mention of outcomes. Relying on college assessments. Student satisfaction fluctuates, but remains above university average, except 2015. Service indicated, including support of local and rural businesses. Could share more about the work of the program. Missed an opportunity to brag on impact. Business plan competition is key assessment measure, concerns about the adequacy of this singular measure. No individual assessment noted, only group work. Additional concerns about 70% of students demonstrating proficiency being adequate benchmark. Especially in light of 3.2/5.0 scale (64%). Concerns about retirements/other changes in the department and maintaining intellectual capital of the department. Information on employer demand is limited. Did not provide BLS growth numbers; applications up but enrollment slightly declining; state they cannot track students after graduation; limited information, could have included data or narrative on companies created by graduates Applicants have increased, as have admitted numbers, but census day counts are flat. Consideration of focus on yield. Singular goal of growth with non-majors with demonstrated progress. Three Forward Facing goals are SMART.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three faculty have been acknowledged for research activity during this reporting period. Five additional faculty acknowledge for teaching effectiveness.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider supplementing Venture Competition with additional assessments that focus on individual demonstration of proficiency. Create an instrument, internal to program, to evaluate alumni outcomes. Additional focus on yield of admitted students.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where possible, program should refer to Purpose Statement vs. Mission to facilitate vertical alignment with WSU Strategic Plan. Please use the form as provided. When using appendices, please include page numbers to highlight needed information. Secure faculty signatures on submission with dates.

Internal Follow-up Recommendation:

☐ Resubmit FF Goals

☒ 2 year Follow-up

☐ NA

KBOR Recommendation:

☐ Enhanced

☒ Maintained

☐ Monitored for improvement

☐ Discontinued

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

FREDS: FINANCE, REAL ESTATE, & DECISION SCIENCES

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.

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BBA in Finance • BBA in Information Technology & Management Information Systems • MS in Global Supply Chain Management, • Certificates – Business Analytics and Supply Chain Management
Triggered Programs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None (MS Supply Chain Management for Majors – NEW Program)
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited responses. Mention towards integration of UNISCOPE mentioned, but no specifics. Same for SEM adoption and alignment.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased faculty productivity • Papers accepted and not accepted were included. • Limited assessment types (exams only) and some clarity needed about the tool used, scope and depth of exit questions would be helpful. • Providing examples of service (brag) would strengthen this section. • Forward Facing Goals are SMART.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a feedback loop in student learning when assessment goals are not met, changes made. • Growing undergraduate student population • Two Teaching Awards and Two Scholars Awards were listed. • Continuing accreditation. • New program in Supply Chain Management. • Well written Forward Facing Goals.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversify assessment tools for student learning outcomes. • Strengthen reporting on service, including both students/staff and faculty.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where possible, program should refer to Purpose Statement vs. Mission to facilitate vertical alignment with WSU Strategic Plan. • Please use the form as provided. • When using appendices, please include page numbers to highlight needed information.

Internal Follow-up Recommendation:

☐ Resubmit FF Goals
 ☐ 2 year Follow-up
 ☒ NA

KBOR Recommendation:

☐ Enhanced
 ☒ Maintained
 ☐ Monitored for improvement
 ☐ Discontinued

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

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.

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bachelor of Business Administration – Human Resource Management
Triggered Programs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NONE
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several specifics given to demonstrate attention to previous recommendations. The reversal of the downward trend in student satisfaction is notable.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mission ties could be better developed. Curriculum assessed by variety of tools. ACT scores of students is slightly lower than university average. Use BLS and career service survey, employer demand is growing. Data is provide, limited narrative. Broad statement but little discussion. Limited service was except SHRM. Missed opportunity to share the impact of program faculty, staff and students. Evidence of data informed decisions is noted throughout the document but limited in the actual section. Forward facing goals are SMART.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued accreditation AASB and SHRM.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete the form as is including signatures of all faculty. SMART Goals provided. Consider additional goal related to student outcome improvements.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where possible, program should refer to Purpose Statement vs. Mission to facilitate vertical alignment with WSU Strategic Plan. Please use the form as provided. When using appendices, please include page numbers to highlight needed information. Secure faculty signatures on submission

Internal Follow-up Recommendation:

☐ Resubmit FF Goals
 ☐ 2 year Follow-up
 ☒ NA

KBOR Recommendation:

☐ Enhanced
 ☒ Maintained
 ☐ Monitored for improvement
 ☐ Discontinued

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS

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.

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.A. International Business
Triggered Programs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some evidence of response to previous recommendations provide. UNISCOPE and Program objectives completed. Others reportedly in progress or ongoing, but few details provided to support progress made.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear articulation of unit purpose and ties to university mission. • Concerns about maintenance of intellectual capital related to faculty changes. • Continued reliance on singular assessment is a concern of the committee. • Two Forward Facing goals provided, neither written as smart goals. Specifics needed to define “high quality of the program” compared to Barton requirements given difference earlier in the self-study. Revisions needed to second goal to add specifics, including time-boundary. • General satisfaction of students apparent in annual scores, exceeds those of WSU aggregate. • Notes support of the general education program, but no response to evaluation of the outcomes specific to program. • No independent accreditation, but college is accredited. • Applications and Admissions continue to increase, but Census Day enrollment is less robust. • Noted service to the university and connection to World Trade Council of Wichita and student groups.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several university awards for teaching and research. • Growth in under-represented students (URM) is notable.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicants have grown, department should consider focusing on yield to increase actual enrollments. • Two Forward Facing goals provided, but neither written as SMART goals. Specifics needed to define “high quality of the program” compared to Barton requirements given difference earlier in the self-study. Revisions needed to second goal to add specifics, including time-boundary. • Undergraduate URM students is notable, but graduation rates are trending negatively.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where possible, program should refer to Purpose Statement vs. Mission to facilitate vertical alignment with WSU Strategic Plan. • Please use the form as provided. • When using appendices, please include page numbers to highlight needed information. • Secure faculty signatures on submission with dates.

Internal Follow-up Recommendation:

☒ Resubmit FF Goals
 ☒ 2 year Follow-up
 ☐ NA

KBOR Recommendation:

☐ Enhanced
 ☒ Maintained
 ☐ Monitored for improvement
 ☐ Discontinued

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION
MANAGEMENT

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.

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bachelor of Business Administration - Management
Triggered Programs:	NONE
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table indicates recommendations have been completed or ongoing. No specifics provided. Could continue to improve Watson-Glaser response.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change of goals and improved departmental tie to mission. Could add more discussion related to support of cultural driver. No GTA in the department. Curriculum has tests, quizzes and grades to support learning outcomes. Could expand conversation about national comparisons with Watson-Glaser. Applied learning is noted. Notes relating the student performance were incomplete since there was no goal noted. Could better define employer demand. Applications increased and number of majors improved, student demand is growing. More differentiation between online and face-to-face information would help explain growth. Narrative needed. Service was defined and broad statements were included and specifics would be helpful. Opportunities to brag about world-impact were missed. Data used to analyze online program and program enhancements/created is evidence of use of a feedback loop. High student satisfaction.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued accreditation. Evidence of a feedback loop from last year was apparent. Clearly linked program to the university mission statement, economic driver.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forward Facing goal number 3 is not a SMART goal and should be re-written. Consider a goal surrounding parity of academic performance between online and face to face students.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where possible, program should refer to Purpose Statement vs. Mission to facilitate vertical alignment with WSU Strategic Plan. Please use the form as provided. When using appendices, please include page numbers to highlight needed information. Secure faculty signatures on submission

Internal Follow-Up Recommendation:

☒ Resubmit FF Goals
 ☐ 2 year Follow-Up
 ☐ NA

KBOR Recommendation:

☐ Enhanced
 ☒ Maintained
 ☐ Monitored for improvement
 ☐ Discontinued

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

MARKETING

Department is expected to address: Marketing	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.

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BA Marketing
Triggered Programs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NONE
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress has been made on most recommendations. Continued work is needed on assessment.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mission is appropriately mentioned. Quality of faculty. – Five faculty members with limited productivity, perhaps due to transitioning faculty (retirements pending) Department lost three faculty to retirement, hired new JR faculty who should improve departmental activities. Quality of program – Limited assessment tools (Pre/Post Test) with a smaller post-test sample size. Only one measure for the entirety of the two year program. Should include the student learning outcomes from accreditation. Student satisfaction level is high. Employer demand is missing. Slow growth rate based on BLS. Applications are solid, thus student demand.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued accreditation. Leadership is excited about infusion of new faculty to help with revitalization of the program.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forward Facing goals reflect good ideas and they should be written in SMART' format with actual measures to determine efficacy of activities noted.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where possible, program should refer to Purpose Statement vs. Mission to facilitate vertical alignment with WSU Strategic Plan. Please use the form as provided. When using appendices, please include page numbers to highlight needed information.

Internal Follow-up Recommendation:

☒ Resubmit FF Goals
 ☐ 2 year Follow-up
 ☐ NA

KBOR Recommendation:

☐ Enhanced
 ☒ Maintained
 ☐ Monitored for improvement
 ☐ Discontinued

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

EXECUTIVE MBA

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.

BARTON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Degrees Offered:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master – Business Administration • Executive Master – Business Administration
Triggered Programs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Evidence of Response to Previous PR Recs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table says recommendation was addressed but no specifics given. No narrative included.
Committee Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission alignment can be tighter via narrative. • Verbs related to learning outcomes (pg. 3) seem more suited for undergraduate. (Demonstrate vs. Analyze and Synthesize) • Quality of faculty – no scores because no content. The core faculty reported in the KBOR proposal should be included in this section. • And 80% for a graduate program is a low. • Narrative in part five did not reference the data in the table. • Student names and id's should not be included in the tables – FERPA Violation • Good use of SCH in the service area, but no discussion of service to university or constituents. • No signature or faculty associated with the program documentation. Fourteen faculty listed on the websites. • Reference accreditation initially, but no other discussion of the importance of the designation. • Forward Facing goals are not informed by self-study. Goal 3 is not a SMART goal (Specific). • Some assessments and learning outcomes lack sufficient academic rigor.
Commendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • .Continued accreditation. • Acknowledgment of programmatic problems and changes identified.
Recommendations Going Forward:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals should encourage continuous improvement. If the program baselines are exceeded, goals should improve. • Not clear if there is any coordination of this program or the administration.
General Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please use the form as provided. • When using appendices, please include page numbers to highlight needed information. • Where possible, program should refer to Purpose Statement vs. Mission to facilitate vertical alignment with WSU Strategic Plan. • Secure faculty signatures on submission

Internal Follow-up Recommendation:



Resubmit FF Goals



2 year Follow-up



NA

KBOR Recommendation:



Enhanced



Maintained



Monitored for improvement



Discontinued