

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Human Resource Management Majors and Minors, 2022-2023**

Date: 2/13/2023

Time: 10:00-11:00

Place: HY 4301

Invited: AVC Kristin Plessel; Dean Paul Ambrose (Business & Econ); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Kelly Delaney-Klinger; faculty and staff in the Human Resource Management program Joshua Knapp, Jon Werner, Uma Kedharnath; Audit & Review Team Chair Corey Davis; Assessment Representative Katy Casey

- 1) Call to order at 10 am
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
 - a) Review team chair highlighted strengths of the program including 100% placement rate for program graduates. The course array is broad and covers a number of opportunities for High Impact Practices. Faculty are committed and working hard with a small number of staff members dedicated to the program. Concerns were noted in the report including staffing, and the review team questioned some aspects of program management and implementation of the assessment plan.
 - b) The HRM program commented that the review process was helpful and collaborative- faculty and staff in the program felt it helped move them forward. In regards to the sustainability of the assessment plan- the program feels very confident in the process and ensures the entire program is engaged and the plan is documented in a way they can sustain.
 - i) The program shared discussions they had regarding the implementation of the assessment plan.
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) The review team discussed the program's decision to increase the GPA for admission to upper division HRM courses. Please explain the decision-making process and impact on program enrollment.
 - i) Program shared the rationale for this decision. They found students were struggling on signature assessments and they were able to identify the issue being related to foundational knowledge, and a belief that students below a certain GPA were not "capable" of performing well. The program feels that the changes were worth some of the adverse impacts on enrollment.
 - ii) The advice from the advisory group was to improve rigor so graduates are better prepared. Further, the market demands a certain amount of knowledge and expertise of professionals in this field and increasing the GPA helps produce more qualified professionals. The goal is for the program to be seen as rigorous.
 - b) Staffing in the program was noted as a concern, and is impacting the program's ability to attract students by not being able to offer an online option. Hiring goals are well-articulated but also reflect challenges of the marketplace. What else could be done to make sure the program is able to hire good faculty? Have you considered approaching more adjuncts who work in the field and who may be interested in teaching part-time?
 - i) The program is currently down 1.5 (academic staff and program chair), and is trying to fill the academic staff line. Some clarification was provided in that the program feels they can work within the current staffing structure but may need to prioritize creating the online program.
 - ii) The program noted difficulty in attracting adjuncts due to pay and instructional skills (sometimes not a good fit for program). Additionally, the College may not have the resources to hire adjuncts.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists three recommended action (see page 13, point 4) related to assessment, diversity, and enrollment. ***The recommended actions were discussed in detail with the program.*
- 6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns*
- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
 - **Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:**
 - Next FULL self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2026 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2026.**
- 7) Adjourn.

Review team report is attached below, including Recommended Actions and instructions for Progress Reports (if required).

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2022-2023**

Date of Evaluation 12/12/2022 Short Self Study (SS*) _____
 Program: Human Resource Management Major Minor

Evaluations submitted by: Corey Davis, Katy Casey, Janine Tobeck, Jonathan Ivry, and Ahmad Karim
Review meeting attended by: Corey Davis, Katy Casey, Janine Tobeck, Jonathan Ivry, and Ahmad Karim

I. General Program Information

1. The program's mission statement reflects the nature and scope

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. The program is aware and reflective of changes affecting improvement since the last review.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
First self-study for the program	0

3. Characteristics of the program set it apart from others when compared regionally and nationally. The unique aspects of the program attract students.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Reports; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
First self-study for the program	0

5. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate (only select N/A if there is no accreditation available).

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
N/A	5

General Comments related to Section I

2. Program needs at least one additional faculty member to pursue strategic priorities like fully online degrees and micro-credentials. 3. Prolific research faculty. Courses are uniquely designed around HR functions. Students have opportunities to network with local/regional professional organizations. Recent Roseman winner. 5. Accredited within the AACSB COBE accreditation.

The program shared challenges but also noted a clear plan to move forward, both with and without the resources they hope to secure. Congrats to the faculty and staff for a productive teaching and research load. SHRM advises alignment but does not offer program accreditation. AACSB is College accreditation and not specified by program.

The program has focused efforts on prior recommended actions, though it is hampered by availability of staff to manage forward movement.

2. Staffing issues need to be addressed by administration. 3. Impressive faculty commitment to research and service. Well-established connections with local HR professionals. 4. Drop in enrollment numbers is surprising.

Under College AACSB accreditation

II. Alignment within the University

1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's Mission and Strategic Plan.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. The program supports general education and/or proficiency programs at the University.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	5

3. The program is collaborative and supports other academic programs across the College and/or University.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section II

The items in Goal 2 seem more focused on retention and success (Goal 1) than inclusivity. Evidence of solid groundwork laid for Goal 6. The program states it does not support General Education or proficiency programs. Is HR's direct treatment of inclusivity something that could help strengthen these ties?

2. The program does not support General Education or proficiency programs

2. The HRM Major does not support General Education or proficiency programs. 3. Provides some classes as electives to other majors and certificates in COBE.

1. Statement about serving the mission did not indicate how the program aligns with second paragraph of university mission statement, regarding inclusivity and diversity. 1. The response regarding Goal 2 Objective 2 does not really speak to the intention of that goal. The response given is more aligned with Goal 1 Objective 2. 2. A program can support the stated General Education Goals of UWW without providing support to the Gen Ed Core or general education electives. It would be worth discussing how your program supports those goals.

III. Program Goals & Accomplishments

1. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve/advance the program.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. Goals currently in place will contribute to the program's advancement. Criteria for determining success were measurable and attainable.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals and making decision about changes to the program.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section III

1. Pursuing objectives related to intentional inclusivity (Goal 2) and shared governance (Goal 6). 2. Goals are aligned with assessment plan. 3. They have assigned a coordinator for their goals.

1. I find there to be some confusion about what inclusive excellence means in the response. You do a good job of addressing the issue as a topic in your curriculum but have not indicated how these issues are being addressed in terms of student enrollment and faculty recruitment (if at all). On the faculty recruitment side, this oversight may be related to the response to Goal 2, regarding the challenges of staffing. 2. What about some goals related to increasing the number of majors/minors? Hiring goals are well-articulated but also reflect challenges of the marketplace. What else could be done to make sure the program is able to hire good faculty? Have you considered approaching more adjuncts who work in the field and who may be interested in teaching part-time?

IV. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. The program prepares students in majors, minors, and related emphases tracks in post-graduation and other applicable experiences.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	1

4. Students participate in the high impact practices.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section IV

1. "In comparison to other majors in the University, there are more required courses and fewer elective options, in order to ensure that graduates have had an in-depth HR education. This often results in students taking slightly more than 128 credits prior to obtaining their degree." How many more credits? 4. 9 different HIP opportunities.

3. I would like to better understand the decision the program made to increase the minor GPA to 2.25. Were there any other data sources (except GPA) used to determine success of students. Cumulative GPA is not a great indicator of competence in one subject area.

The common intellectual experiences and collaborative assignments are apt to the program's mission and commitment to making students feel they are valued members of a community.

3. It seems surprising to me that the one solution arrived at for a decline in student performance among minors was to raise the minimum GPA required for admission into the program. What solutions could you devise to support student learning other than excluding students from the program based on their overall GPA? The new minimum required (2.25) doesn't seem like it would make much difference in the stated problem of student comprehension of difficult content. To justify the rise in GPA by referencing the university mission reflects poorly on your program. The mission statement does not justify the exclusion of a subset of students from a program of their choice.

1. The program has clearly articulated learning outcomes for students.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. Student learning outcomes are "mapped" to the curriculum.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. The program provided a timeline indicating when faculty and staff assess SLOs. The timeline is manageable and sustainable.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

4. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgements about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

6. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

7. Overall, the program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section V

3. The plan seems to be to assess every objective every year. Is that feasible/sustainable? 4. The program has multiple signature assignments and associated signature assessment tools.

The assessment plan not only addresses all the required components, but is clearly written and easy to follow. 1-2. Well written and clearly aligned SLOs. 4. The program selected embedded assessments to align with SLOs and provide students developmental support to meet the outcomes throughout their course of study. While there was data provided on outcomes- it is not clear what criteria are used to evaluate the SLOs (were class grades on assignments used?). 7. I commend the program for their work in this area. I think this plan lends itself to a greater focus on what is being learned about students' knowledge and skills. When analyzing the findings, what do you all find meaningful about how students are performing- what do they know and what can they do related to the SLOs?

While implementation of the assessment plan is relatively new, the structure seems well built to support loop-closing through all-faculty discussion at an annual meeting.

VI. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: A. Trend Data

1. [MAJORS ONLY] Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. [MAJORS ONLY] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years, or reasonably efficiently.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. [MAJORS ONLY] As a follow up to program enrollment and graduation, describe the strategies used to recruit and retain students.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0

4. Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University.

Sufficient Evidence	2
---------------------	---

Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

5. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

6. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level is justified or supported by examples or data.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section VI.A

1. There is a downward trend. The minor decreased from 43 to 18 students in four years. Was it best to raise the minimum GPA for minors in light of these numbers? 2. 130 credits rather than 128. Still lowest in COBE. Average completion time is still 3.9 years. 4. Lower than university proportion. Higher than college average.

1. The trend of decreasing enrollment is concerning, as is noted by the program. However, the current numbers appear to be more sustainable than when peak enrollment was hit years earlier. I think the program should discuss strategies to maintain and possible level toward their ideal enrollment number. There has been a decrease in enrollment in the minor in part due to increasing the GPA requirement. If enrollment is a concern, it is worth reviewing this decision and consider if GPA is the best indicator of success.

Though there is evidence of recruitment and retention strategies, it is clear that staffing issues will affect their feasibility. Will micro-credentialing require new courses for those seeking professional development credit? If so, is this feasible in addition to getting online with the current curriculum? There seems to be some concern about maintaining current optimum level but countering possible additional decline with online major accessibility, which may or may not drastically affect numbers. Are there any projections of how much it might?

1. Decline in enrollment began before COVID, so explanations relying exclusively on COVID-related factors are insufficient. 2-6. Limited data made evaluating the claims made in the self-study difficult.

**VI. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation:
B. Demand for Graduates**

1. [MAJORS ONLY] Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments for VI.B

1. 98.79% placement rate for college; 100% for HR majors.

VII. Resource Availability & Development:

A. Faculty and Staff Resources

- 1. Information on numbers of full and part-time faculty and staff are provided. Expertise of teaching staff are aligned with the needs and future vision for the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

- 2. Information is provided about changes in the faculty since the last Audit and Review.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

- 3. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to section VII.A

The program clearly outlined staffing issues that are preventing execution of some initiatives.

The program has well-defined goals for hiring.

1. No indication about expertise of faculty as related to curricular needs.

VII. Resource Availability & Development:

B. Student Resources

1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Total	5

2. The program has adequate facilities equipment, technological, and library resources to effectively serve its students.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Total	5

General Comments for VII.B

1.2: Not very much detail in the self-study responses related to student resource needs.

VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program**1. Areas of strength are discussed.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments for VIII

Thank you for a well-written report!

Since this program is part of a larger department, it seems that the staffing needs of the program should be a priority for the management department. Is this not the case? Why? Is there a larger strategic plan for this department or for COBE that would address this problem?

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

1. 100% placement rate. 2. Accredited within COBE. 3. Major has classes tailored to different functions of HR. 4. Multiple HIP opportunities for students.

committed faculty and staff taking on extra responsibilities to support the University clear and well articulated curriculum that measures student growth in knowledge and skills

Good sense of curriculum as a marker of uniqueness, clear development of assessment and meeting planning to guide ongoing changes. Good student placement success and faculty productivity.

1. Engaged faculty 2. Strong demand for employment post-graduation 3. Solid curriculum 4. Assessment plan good research, strong placement and good demand

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

1. Downward enrollment trend in major and minor. 2. Staffing prohibits expansion into online instruction.

use of data for meaningful program improvement how faculty allocate time (this was noted in the self study) and additional staff

The clear need is to address staffing issues for sustainability and growth.

1. Staffing issues needs to be addressed. There should be a staffing plan created for the next five years, so the program is not caught short-staffed or is forced to always be reactive. How could adjuncts be used better? 2. Increasing student enrollment, retention. The decline in majors/minors is not being adequately studied or addressed. 3. The program needs to think more intentionally about how to support student success as the content becomes increasingly difficult and specialized. 4. Attention to incorporating diversity as a goal within the program, not just as a topic in the curriculum. 5. Is there a clear vision for the future of this program? Any areas of innovation that should be addressed? The self-study was a little vague on the future development of the program.

3. Other comments/questions

If possible, once staffing issues are addressed, consider ways to connect IE focus to the larger university community, which may help with diverse recruitment.

1. The self-study talks about offering a wholly on-line major/minor and also "micro-credentialing." Is the on-line major/minor a specific goal of the program and COBE? If so, what action steps can be taken to move toward this goal? What is "micro-credentialing" and is that also a specific objective moving forward? 2. I am concerned about creating seemingly arbitrary minimum GPA averages to exclude students. This would seem to adversely impact efforts at increasing diversity in the major or in COBE more generally. It also puts pressure on other majors in the College and throughout the university, who then have to absorb those students into their majors. The rationale behind creating this GPA minimum was very thin in terms of actual evidence. I think this is a larger issue that should be taken up by the college as I know there are other COBE major programs that require minimum GPAs. I have had students approach me asking for a higher course grade so that they can reach the minimum GPA and be accepted into a COBE major, so this policy has an impact beyond the major itself.

4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

No progress report is required for this program.

- 1) Assessment plan:
 - a. Consider a rotation that allows for assessment of each SLO in a 5-year cycle, but doesn't require the assessment of every SLO every year.
 - b. When evaluating and reporting out students' performance on SLOs focus on knowledge and skills and not just data points.
 - c. Consider the use of rubrics to get an understanding of the elements of the SLOs in which students are exceeding or struggling.
- 2) Describe the plan and strategies moving forward to attract and support a diverse student body.
- 3) Report out on current enrollment in both the major and minor. In addition, evaluate the impact of actions related to recruiting and retaining students (e.g., GPA requirement, online learning and micro-credentialing).

5. Recommended Result

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	1
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	4
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns	0
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	0
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion.	0
Non-continuation of the program.	0
Report not submitted; refer to Provost for action.	0