

*Guidelines for Submission of the Program Review and  
Assessment of Student Learning Reports*

*Revised Fall 2020*

## **Graduate School Program Review Report** **(Submitted concurrently with the Assessment of Student Learning (ASL) Report)**

The Graduate Program Review Report (PRR) is three-pages for each degree program (i.e., MS/MA one report; PhD/EdD one report), **using two pages to answer #1-6 and the third page for #7**. The first two pages is for KBOR. The inclusion of the third page is internal communication for the program, department, college, and institution to guide continual improvement. If a department includes both a MS/MA and PhD/EdD, then one report may be submitted but items 3, 4, and 7 must address each degree level separately. The final iteration of this report must be submitted to the Graduate School and the final version combined with the undergraduate PRR is to be submitted to the Office of Assessment as a unified two-page report.

The PRR focuses on the purpose, need, and future plans for each academic program. In other words, this report describes the academic program and includes the inputs and resources required to provide a strong and viable program to meet the needs of the students, faculty, state, nation, and international community. The report may also include other types of information and/or data that may enhance the respective discipline (e.g., number of grant proposals, continuing education enrollments, GPIDEA, etc.).

The Graduate School Program Review Report includes:<sup>1</sup>

1. *Mission, Centrality, Uniqueness – What do we do and why do we do it*  
Centrality of the degree program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution
  - Brief mission statement.
  - Brief statement of the centrality of the Department and its academic degrees to the College, University, and State.
  - Brief statement of the uniqueness of the Department’s academic degrees to the College, University, Regents System, State, Region, Nation, and Global Community.
2. *Strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the Faculty – Who does it*  
The quality of the degree program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty (faculty profile)
  - Effective teaching (class size, use of appropriate instructional technology)
  - Research/scholarship activities
  - Service and extension/outreach activities
  - Include special awards and recognition
  - Number of approved Graduate Faculty in program
    - Master’s program minimum = 6 (*unless just masters, then 3*)
    - Doctoral minimum = 8 (*unless just doctoral, then 5*)
3. *Quality of Curriculum and Impact on Students- How well do we do it*  
The quality of the degree program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students (student profile, productivity, placement rates, national rankings, awards)
  - Brief description of the quality of the students in the degree program (admissions qualifications).
  - Explain enrollment trends (e.g., increases or decreases).

---

<sup>1</sup> The bullet points provided are suggestions for content within each area. Include relevant material that will support your findings or reporting in each area.

- Master minimum (*5-year average*) = 20
- Doctorate minimum (*5-year average*) = 5
- Describe sub-specialties within a degree program.
- Provide various awards and recognitions by students in the program
- Admissions rates
- Accreditation/external reviews
- Graduation rates – Number of Degrees Granted; explain if program does not meet the minimum
  - Masters (*Five Year Average*) = 5
  - Doctoral (*Five Year Average*) = 2

Overview of the assessment of the Department/Program including methods used to assess the extent to which students learned, description of the results, and how the evidence or information gathered has been used for program improvements.

- Describe the results of the assessment strategies
- Describe the effects on student learning of the actions and/or revisions that occurred during the review cycle
- Describe the process by which program faculty reviewed the results and decided on the actions and/or revisions that were indicated by those result.

#### 4. *External Demand*

Provide demonstrated student need and employer demand for the degree program

- Types of employers
- Types of positions – projected employment needs
- Areas of the country employed
- External indicators – employer survey, societal demands, evaluation of program by alumni

#### 5. *Service the graduate program provides to the Discipline, the University and Beyond – Plans to advance the degree program*

- Provide information on any special information resources and services (e.g., library collections, counseling clinic, animal clinic, etc.).
- Briefly describe the service courses provided that are required by various majors at the university
- Faculty and Staff development
- Service to constituents
- Consulting
- Conferences planned and held

#### 6. *Cost Effectiveness*

The program's cost-effectiveness should be discussed in terms of the size and quality of the graduate degree program relative to its costs. Costs are the faculty time required to offer the necessary courses for majors, the support and equipment required for students, and the necessary infrastructure to produce a high quality degree.

## **Program Vision**

### 7. *Program Vision (1-2 Pages)*<sup>2</sup>

- i. *The primary purpose of this section is to reflect on the mission of the program and its current impact grounded in evaluation of the outcomes and findings of the previous academic cycle. This portion is to be designed as useful for future planning.*
  1. Articulate a plan for the next 5 years to address strengths and weaknesses within the program.
  2. *Major Achievements or Accomplishments and Major Challenges or Issues (s)*
    - This section should contain a discussion of the following:
      - Internal review – brief description of the process to include a review the program
      - Summarize any major achievements or accomplishments from the last review.
      - Discuss any major challenges and your plans to address, including but not limited to, curriculum, assessment, operations, faculty resources, or recruitment and retention
      - Adjustments or refinement based on program assessment<sup>3</sup>
        - Student learning outcomes
        - Program Goals
        - University Goals
        - Future Goals Based on Recent Assessment
      - Provide recommendations and justifications for retaining or discontinuing the program(s).

---

<sup>2</sup> Inter-Departmental Degrees will submit individual Program Vision Statements (Area 8) for their respective departments.

<sup>3</sup> These should be grounded in information collected from students, faculty, and stakeholders. All perspectives should be reflected in this section.

**SECTION A: Graduate Assessment of Student Learning (ASL) Report**  
**(Approximately three pages)**  
**Submitted concurrently with the Program Review Report**

---

**A. Program Information**

College(s):

Department(s):

Program:

Contact Name:

Contact Email:

Program assessment website *(includes all outcomes and a summary of your current report)*:

**B. Outcome Reporting**

Enter the following information for each outcome:

**Student Learning Outcomes**

List the program student learning outcome.

**Assessment Method(s)** *(must include at least one direct measure)*

Describe the assessment tools, measures, instruments, and/or forms of evidence utilized to demonstrate students' achievement of the learning outcomes. Provide information on who is assessed and expected levels of student performance (minimum expected level, proficient level, etc.).

**Results**

Identify how many students were assessed and the number of students who achieved at each level of the program's expected achievement levels over the past 4 (mid-cycle) or 8 (full-cycle KBoR) years. Include a statement reflecting on what the longitudinal results may mean in terms of student achievement and programmatic expectations.

**Supplemental Documents**

Upload relevant supplemental documents (excel tables of results, plans, etc.) when you upload the report.

**C. Program Self Review**

**Faculty Review of Assessment Data and Process**

Describe how program faculty reviewed the assessment results and process to decide on actions/revisions.

**Program Improvements**

Briefly describe any program improvements resulting from the assessment process. These can be direct instructional or curricular changes as a result of data, new insights or ways of thinking about assessment, and/or changes in the program's assessment process.

**Future Plans**

Briefly describe plans to improve the assessment process and/or student learning. Plans can be immediate or longer-term.

**Summary Paragraph of this Report**

A one paragraph summary that details student achievement of your program's learning outcomes and programmatic efforts to improve.

## SECTION B: Timeline for Graduate Programs for ASL & PRR

<b>Jan 2020</b>	<p>The Graduate School communicates with programs informing the Graduate Program Directors, Department Heads and College Deans of the upcoming review. Notification will include the timeline, format for the Program Review Report (PRR) and Assessment of Student Learning (ASL) report. Office of Assessment provides data to programs undergoing review through the dashboards at</p> <p>The Department prepares the PRR and ASL to be approved by the Department Head prior to submission to the Graduate School.</p> <p>Suggested timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>June 1 – Submit PRR and ASL to the Department Head for review and suggestions for revision.</li><li>June 15 – Submit to Graduate School</li></ul>
<b>June 15, 2020</b>	Departments submit the PRR and ASL reports in .docx format to the Graduate School with Department Head's signature <sup>4</sup> to <a href="mailto:gradinfo@ksu.edu">gradinfo@ksu.edu</a> .
<b>Aug – Nov, 2020</b>	Graduate Council Assessment Review Committee reviews the PRRs.
<b>November 15, 2020</b>	The Graduate Council Assessment and Review Committee provides feedback with list of changes, comments, or additional documentation needed for the PRR. Programs are expected to respond to suggestions by revising their PRR accordingly in the report via track changes or comments.
<b>December 15, 2020</b>	Programs submit final PRR in .docx format to the Graduate School, with cc: to College Dean. The PRR combined with the program's undergraduate information must be submitted to the Office of Assessment.
<b>Jan – Feb, 2021</b>	The Graduate Council Assessment and Review Committee reviews all ASLs and Future Plans (Section 7 of PRR) providing specific feedback to programs regarding their plans and current assessment findings.
<b>February 2021</b>	Office of Assessment submits program review reports to Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR).
	The Graduate Council Assessment and Review Committee provides feedback with list of changes, comments, or additional documentation needed for the ASLs and Future Plans in PRR. Programs are expected to respond to suggestions by revising their ASLs and PRR Future Plans accordingly in the report via track changes or comments. <sup>5</sup>
<b>April, 2021</b>	Final revised ASL and PRR Future Plans should be sent to the Graduate School and Office of Assessment by April 9 at 5p.m.

---

<sup>4</sup> If the Department Head and Graduate Program Coordinator are the same person or if the program is interdisciplinary, the Department Head signature will be fulfilled by the appropriate Associate Dean.

<sup>5</sup> See section D



**SECTION C**  
**Graduate School**  
**Program Review Report and Assessment of Student Learning FAQs**

***Who is my first point of contact?***

Dr. Sunanda Dissanayake, Associate Dean  
[sunanda@ksu.edu](mailto:sunanda@ksu.edu)

***What should I do first?***

*Find your previous review... locate, and begin with it as a template. If you have a difficulty locating your former PRR, contact the Office of Assessment.*

***What is the function of the PRR and ASL Process?***

*One of the primary purposes is to identify areas of success and improvement in all programs. The process of submitting review materials to the Graduate School for the Program Review Report (PRR) and the Assessment of Student Learning (ASL) is intended to provide meaningful feedback through an intensive review process from peers regarding the program and assessment processes. The responses provided are intended to help add an extra set of eyes in setting goals for your program moving forward as you begin the next academic cycle. Your program will combine Sections 1-6 with the undergraduate report resulting in a unified two-page report forwarded to the Office of Assessment by the end of December. This unified PRR will be submitted to the Kansas Board of Regents Report in its entirety.*

***Is there a strict page limit for the PRR?***

*Yes. There is a 2-page limit on sections 1-6 of the PRR. Since the full report will be provided as an appendix in the KBOR report, we must adhere to this limit. If your report (sections 1-6) SLIGHTLY exceeds 2 pages, the Assessment and Review committee will provide feedback of possible edits and revisions. The A&R committee's task is to help your program get to the 2-page limit without losing critical data that you would like shared with KBOR.*

***Some guiding questions to consider as you examine your current data:***

***What do you want to know about your graduates that you do not already know?***

*As you examine your assessment data, consider what the data are telling you and where you would like to know more. Are there specific areas that students continue to struggle? Are there consistent patterns of performance that need addressing... in the final section of the PRR is where you can identify these areas and share with the committee the strengths of the program as well as where you would like to see growth. In both areas you will use the assessment data to support your ideas.*

***How will you find this out?***

*What are some strategies or areas for consideration when addressing these areas of concern or strength? How will your adjustments to program or assessment allow you to gather the required information? How will you use the mid-cycle ASL review as a measuring stick or guiding force in determining the effectiveness? The committee will also be able to provide some insight in these areas as well.*

***What is the purpose of the assessment?***

*Assessment is solely for your benefit. As a program, think about what best defines learning in your field, and what graduates of your program should be able to do when leaving the university. Then describe how they will do this and to what extent. The committee then can provide insight on clarity and add helpful suggestions in collection and analyzing. Program assessment is for the program's benefit and allows the program self-examine the areas of success as well as areas in need of enhancement.*

**What should be submitted?**

When submitting a PRR and ASL, please refer to the documents provided on the Graduate School Website. Essentially there are two parts: a three-page Program Review Report and an Assessment of Student Learning report. The three-page PRR report has specific sections (1-7) to address with section 1-6 on the first two pages and section 7 on the third page. <https://www.k-state.edu/grad/faculty/program-review/> The ASL has a specific format that can be found here: <http://www.k-state.edu/assessment/reporting/Graduate%20ASL%20Report%20Template.docx>.

**What feedback should we expect?**

The committee will provide feedback on clarity and quality for sections 1-6. These will then be communicated directly to the Graduate Program Coordinator who will then submit the revised copy to the Graduate School Dean's office by December 15. Section 8 and the ASL will also be reviewed by the Assessment and Review Committee. Here you will receive a narrative feedback on both the vision for the program and the ASL. For both documents, constructive feedback will be provided to help with continual development of the program and quality control for the university.

**I also work on the undergraduate reviews. What are the differences between the two reviews?**

The primary difference is the focus on Graduate Faculty Status. Most other items are similar in scope and depth.

**What are considerations when refining and revising outcomes?**

Learning within any academic program may occur within cognitive (concepts, principles), psychomotor (physical procedures), and affective (attitudes, dispositions) domains. Outcomes must be stated as clearly and specifically as possible in order to allow for easier and more meaningful measurement. There are certain conventions established by instructional designers for the formulation of student learning objectives (SLOs) that may be helpful.

One such convention is the ABCD structure – (intended target) Audience, (desired observable) Behavior, Conditions (under which said behavior will be performed), and Degree (of accuracy of performance). SLO statements including all of these four parts are called behavioral SLOs, because they measure learning as expressed in observable behavior.

Within higher education contexts – where complex concepts, principles, procedures, and attitudes/dispositions are to be learned – it may also help to structure SLO statements into terminal (TO) and enabling (EO) objectives. TOs relate to the achievement of complex, multi-faceted, superordinate learning goals. EOs relate to the subordinate/component learning goals that must be met in order to enable the achievement of the TO.

Following such conventions while structuring SLO statements makes it much easier to subsequently formulate meaningful and appropriate rubrics to measure performance of the given SLOs.

**Other considerations:**

- What are the qualities beyond the passing level?
- All graduate students are expected to pass once at the thesis or dissertation step in the process. The most valuable information emerges from qualifying the levels of achievement among those who pass. Who are passing at the expected level? Who are passing at a level that exceeds most, if not all, expectations? Who completes a project that is a true exemplar that demonstrates the highest level in a given field?
- How does (or how well) does our program develop the special qualities beyond the passing level?
- Is it a specific program of study?
- Is it localized in specific areas?

***What should our overall focus be?***

A program can continue to review and strengthen or develop levels of rigor and expectations throughout all 8 years of their review cycle. Use the mid-cycle ASL review as a chance to determine growth or trajectory to the current point. Then consider revising to ensure enough usable data and reporting for the full cycle review. The focus of the Assessment and Review Committee is to provide meaningful and constructive feedback through a peer review process to allow for self-governance of quality control for all programs across the Graduate School.

**SECTION D: Expectations for the PRR**

**For Sections 1-6**

	<b><u>Unsatisfactory</u></b>	<b><u>Approaching</u></b>	<b><u>Meeting</u></b>
<b>Content:</b>	Content provided is superficial and not useful for any type of meaningful program review. Discussion is not evident due to lack of pertinent information.	Content provided attempts to address areas 1-6 for program review. Discussion is presented, but depth of analysis is not apparent.	Content provided addresses areas 1-6 for program review. Discussion accurately reflects the current program from a variety of perspectives.
<b>Clarity:</b>	Program implementation or analysis is unclear. More detail in multiple sections is needed.	Additional clarification is needed regarding program implementation or analysis. See changes requested for more details.	Implementation is clear and understandable for a wide audience and clearly establishes the value of the program through prose.
<b>Succinctness:</b>	Full program report (excluding section 7) exceeds the 2-page limit or is not long enough to deliver the requirements of content and clarity.		Full program report (excluding section 7) is provided within the 2-page maximum.

**Changes Requested:**

*Mandatory:*

*Recommended:*

*General Comments:*

## For Section 7

	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>Approaching</u>	<u>Meeting</u>
<b>5-Year Plan:</b>	Plan is cursory and only superficially addresses the necessary reflective points. No real reflection is observed in the reading of the plan.	Plan described contains a stated vision for the program moving forward. There is a lack of clarity in intended adjustments to the program based on current assessment data.	Plan described contains a clear vision for the program moving forward and provides logical and measurable adjustments to the program based on data gathered from a variety of sources.
<b>Review Process:</b>	There is a lack of clarity in how the decisions are made and implemented.	Clear and logical. The description provides limited information on how program evaluation occurs.	Clear, logical, and measurable. The description provides an optimal framework for decision making at the program level.
<b>Challenges:</b>	Strengths and challenges are missing and/or no action plan to enhance the program is articulated.	Strength and challenges are shared, but action plan is unclear or not well articulated.	Strengths and challenges are clearly articulated and assessed in a succinct manner. A plan to address challenges is grounded in multiple data sources and approaches.
<b>Adjustments based on assessment:</b>	Adjustments to the program are not provided or are not clearly articulated.	Adjustments to the program are provided but no connection to the data is clear.	Adjustments to the program are grounded in meaningful and relevant data.
<b>Reflection:</b>	Reflection is limited and represents superficial data analysis.	Reflection provided, but connection with the assessment process and program evaluation is not completely clear. Necessary information is present but more connection with the data is warranted.	Reflection is meaningful and serves as the foundation of the current PRR. All responses are thoughtful and will serve the program well through the next academic cycle.
<b>Recommendation to Retain or Discontinue</b>	Recommendation is unsupported.		Recommendation is supported.

**Changes Requested:**

*Mandatory:*

*Recommended:*

*General Comments:*