

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESSTOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM - OVERALL EVALUATION

| On Target | MeetsExpectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
|-----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 3 | 2 | 1 |



DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESSTOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM - OVERALL EVALUATION

| Departments/ programs reviewed: | On Target | Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
|---|-----------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| $Total = 13^*$ | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Year: <mark>2017</mark> | | | |
| Department is expected to address: | | | |
| Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | >12 | ->1 | |
| Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty | >9 | ->1 | ->1 |
| Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | >6 | >5 | >2 |
| Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | >9 | >4 | |
| Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | >7 | >4 | |
| Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | >5 | >7 | ->1 |

*College of Fine Arts – Art, Design, and Creative Industries; Music; Performing Arts

*College of Business – Accounting; Economics; FREDS; General Business; Management (Entrepreneurship, HR management, International Business) Marketing; MBA (General business and MBA are interdisciplinary programs, therefore, faculty and their service are not evaluated in these programs)

Notes:

- 1. The Program Review Committee provided feedback to each unit in terms of their overall assessment of how the unit completed their assessment report.
- 2. Compared to the 2014 review, improvement continues to occur in the overall process.
- 3. 85% of programs were on "target" or "meeting expectations" in the area of assessment and 92% in other areas.