System Overview

The figure below identifies the major components of the UAAS. These include data derived from program and university assessments, a data management system, and review processes (including committee review).
System Components

I. University and Program Assessment Plans

Two structures exist to guide university and program level assessment:

A. University assessment plan structured around evaluating the general education program.¹

B. Program assessment plans structured around evaluating degree programs that address at a minimum:

- Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution
- Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty
- Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students
- Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program
- Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond

II. Student Learning Assessment

The mission of Wichita State University is to be an essential educational, cultural and economic driver for Kansas and the greater public good. The university strives to offer the most complete college experience possible to produce well-rounded, successful graduates. To fulfill this mission, the University has articulated goals for student learning and an assessment plan for achieving these learning goals. Driven by the university Strategic Plan, WSU uses multiple measures and process for developing and assessing goals. Two processes are developed around general education and program review. The general education program fosters and assesses common outcomes for all WSU undergraduate students and program review delineates student learning goals and governs assessment process for students at all levels in each academic unit.

A. General Education Student Learning Outcomes

The general education program (http://wichita.edu/generaleducation) is designed for common goals for all students. The mission of general education is to provide a well-rounded education that enables students to live the fullest most meaningful life possible, regardless of their particular career preparation. Upon graduation the faculty expects students to:

- Have acquired knowledge in the arts, humanities, and natural and social sciences
- Think critically and independently
- Write and speak effectively
- Employ analytical reasoning and problem solving techniques

The General Education Committee monitors and reports on the outcomes of the general education program annually.

B. **Program-level Student Learning Outcomes**
Program review provides the structure used by academic units to develop goals and student learning outcomes, assess those outcomes and report periodically (annually for internal program monitoring and triennially to the University Program Review Committee) on the success of individual academic units. The program review self-study template can be found at the Office of Assessment website: [http://wichita.edu/assessment](http://wichita.edu/assessment) (Program Review link). As described in Criteria 4A, each academic program has an established assessment plan that dictates how and when data are collected. The academic programs review their assessment plan periodically. An updated assessment plan is submitted as a part of program review requirements.

III. **Data Collection Management System**

The following outlines the University data collection systems.

A. **The Office of Planning and Analysis**: The University has three managed data systems from which to obtain information related to data for decision-making, planning and reporting. Depending on the type of information needed, these data systems are:

- Business Intelligence and Predictive Modeling (BIPM).
- University Assessment Data (UAD).
- External Reporting Data (ERD).

BIPM and UAD data are used to provide reports and analysis for internal decision-making and strategic planning. ERD are data used to report to external entities such as the Kansas Board of Regents or IPEDS.

B. **College Data Management Systems**: Colleges use a variety of data reporting and retrieval processes and tools to maintain student assessment data for program review and operations. For example, the Barton School of Business uses STEPS as a data reporting and retrieval process for accreditation and program evaluation. The College of Fine Arts uses Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP) to obtain data on program effectiveness from alumni. For the College of Education, all teacher education licensure programs use a data reporting and retrieval process (STEPS) to assess student learning for accreditation (CAEP and KSDE) and program effectiveness.

C. **Department Data Management Systems**: Individual departments use program specific data reporting and retrieval processes to assess student learning for program review.

D. **College/Department Assessment Coordinators**: There is a designated administrator (associate dean or faculty member) who provides the overall leadership and support for program assessments for each college. Additionally, departments assign assessment responsibilities to either a department chair or a faculty member. Typically college assessment coordinators are responsible for:

- Ensuring that unit and program assessments are in place and operational;
• Providing support in the development, maintenance and redevelopment of program assessment plans;
• Providing assessment related technical support for program, faculty and unit leadership, including conducting studies of assessment instruments;
• Support and facilitate the work of the University Assessment Committee;
• Support and facilitate the work of the Program Review Committee;
• Organize or work with relevant committees or individuals to provide needed professional development related to assessment;
• House official records of assessment plans and assessment related-minutes and reports;
• Serve on the University Assessment Committee as needed.

E. Departmental Program Review Committees: Faculty are responsible, at the departmental level, for examining their program’s effectiveness (at least annually) in accordance with the KBOR Program Review process and in consultation with program-specific advisory committees.

F. University Program Review Committee: This Committee reviews program review documents from departments, who submit their reviews on a triennial basis. The Committee includes a dean, Faculty Senate President, Faculty Senate President-elect, Faculty Senate Past-President, Associate Vice President for Assessment, Curriculum, and Student Success, and the Associate Vice President for the Office of Planning and Analysis.

G. University Assessment Committee: The primary entity designated to review various assessment initiatives for the University, including the review of the Student Learning Assessment System. The Committee has representation from each college.

IV. Review Mechanisms

Figure 1 illustrates how components for program level and university level assessment interrelate. Aggregated and disaggregated data are examined regularly by the Program Review Committee and University Assessment Committee to review and make relevant recommendations, where appropriate.

Student Learning Assessments

The institution gathers data from a variety of sources based on the university assessment plan as well as individual program assessment plans. Academic programs and service units analyze data collected from multiple initiatives and evaluate the results in relation to university and program outcomes for students. University outcomes primarily relate to general education and program outcomes relate to each major at the departmental level. Program outcomes reflect the learning outcomes for specific academic programs as aligned with program conceptual frameworks, the strategic plan applied learning goals, and professional accreditation standards (as applicable).
The Office of Assessment (OA) serves as a point of centralization and assistance for colleges, departments and programs as they develop and implement their ongoing assessment plans. The primary vehicle that drives ongoing assessment is the program review process. Implementation of the process is overseen by the OA and reported at this link:

http://wichita.edu/assessment

Assessments follow Kansas Board of Regents Program Review guidelines found at this link:

http://webs.wichita.edu/?u=shockerassessment&p=/ProcessforProgramReview/

A. **Assessment for General Education Outcomes**: Wichita State University currently uses a mix of direct and indirect measures of student learning. The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) is a primary tool used to assess outcomes gained through the students' educational experience. Each fall and spring semesters, a representative sample of entering and graduating students participate. This assessment is used, in conjunction with Program Review, to verify the University's impact on the outcomes as well as contribute to continuous improvement of the University's programs.

B. **Results**: WSU undergraduate student learning outcomes are reported on a dashboard, as prepared by the General Education Committee. The results can be found at this link:

http://webs.wichita.edu/?u=GENERALEDUCATION&p=/Originals0808/Tracking/

C. **Assessment of Program Review Outcomes**: Program review is organized around the 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 and Senior Vice President) is expected to strengthen the academic programs, identify program needs and campus priorities, and identify areas for reorganization.

D. **Results**: Departments post their completed reviews on the University assessment website:

http://wichita.edu/assessment

Annual results as prepared by the University Program Review committee are posted at the following link:


V. **Feedback Loop for Improvement**

A. **Systematic Reporting**: For the general education program and program review the process asks for systematic reporting of student learning outcomes related to any recent program changes and to determine the effectiveness of those changes on student learning. The Program Review Committee and the General Education Committee provide an annual report each year. Additionally, the Program Review Committee provides an
analysis of reviewed program’s progress toward overall assessment. The Program Review process further instructs programs to create a feedback loop that spans three years of student outcome data. Dashboards and reports have been developed to centralize selected data in a convenient format for frequent review by various constituents. Constituents include individual academic units (such as program committees and advisory boards) as well as university level committees such as the University Assessment Committee, the University Program Review Committee, the HLC work group, General Education Committee, University Retention Council and so forth.

As various committees review data, recommendations for improvement of student learning are channeled through relevant units using university policies and procedures such as curriculum change policies, etc. At the practice level, faculty and staff are encouraged to consult various student learning data sets to become better informed about student needs and to make individual adjustments for individuals and groups of students.

B. **Feedback:** The results of yearly assessment activities provide feedback to the program’s faculty to help them improve its quality and effectiveness. The assessment evaluation by the Program Review Committee provides an evaluation at the program level and whether programs are either “meeting,” “not meeting” assessment expectations. On the basis of the assessment feedback, many program units have adopted or proposed changes to improve student performance and enhance student success in meeting program goals. These changes include changes in course content and scheduling, creation of new courses, changes in assessment procedures, and changes in degree requirements.

C. **Program Revision:** The results of program review establish the program unit’s general effectiveness and ability to achieve its academic mission. The aim of program review is to present a comprehensive picture of the program over time, collaborate collegially in assessing the program’s needs and challenges, and make meaningful recommendations to the unit, dean, and academic vice president to institute change if warranted. These intensive reviews have resulted in program discontinuance or major changes in programmatic offerings. Suggestions for program improvement coming from any of the levels of review are addressed by the dean and program unit.