Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Management Majors and Minors, 2023-2024

Date: 2/19/2024

Invited: Provost John Chenoweth; Interim Associate Dean Kelly Delaney-Klinger (Business & Economics); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Soroush Aslani; faculty and staff in the program; Audit & Review Team Chair Jonathan Ivry; Audit & Review team members Kelly Delaney-Klinger, Cody Marie Busch; Assessment Representative Katy Casey

1) Call to order

2) Introductions

3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
   Review team chair, Dr. Ivry, provided an overview of the review team findings highlighting the team's reported strengths and areas of improvement.

4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

   a) Describe how the program works collaboratively to address administrative responsibilities (e.g., monitoring student learning through assessment), teaching loads, and service.

   The program chair updated the committee on the progress towards assessment of student learning. The program shared a completed assessment plan with designated responsibilities and individual plans to assess each SLO.
   The assessment plan included a timeline. Since most of the data will be collected in fall, the analysis will take place in the spring. The plan is for the program to meet in fall a couple weeks before the spring advisory board meeting- coordinator plans to compile data, meet with the program the week before the meeting to summarize the findings, and then share out results with external stakeholders.

   Suggestions for managing administrative responsibilities:
   Take time to understand the "why" of work that is expected of programs.
   Meet regularly (monthly) as a program to review goals, project plans, and get work completed.
   Consider spreading out the review data on a cycle. The program plans to collect data every year, but does not need an extensive review of data on every SLO, every year. Consider reviewing data on a cycle to keep the workload manageable.
   Include program outcomes and signature assessment in course syllabi to maintain consistency across instructors.

   b) The program recently completed an extensive curricular redesign, but the review team discussed concerns with the long-term viability of certain emphases given difficulties in staffing.

   Looking for one additional hire in strategy management due to faculty loss in fall 2023. The other area the program would like expertise in is non-profit, and social issues in healthcare. In the short-term, the program coordinator was able to find a healthcare professional to teach the healthcare systems course. The overarching issue is creating a program that is competitive, and meets the interests and needs of students, with current faculty that may not have expertise in those areas.

5) **<u>Recommended Actions</u>**: The evaluation report lists three recommended actions (see page 13, point 4) related to assessment, staffing, and enrollment data.

6) **<u>Recommended Result</u>**: *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, 2028 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2028.**
        ⊠ **A progress report will be due Oct. 15 to Dean, Nov. 1 to Assessment, of 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, 2023-2024

Date of Evaluation _____12/6/2023_____Short Self Study (SS*)_____
Program:___**Management Majors and Minors**_____ ____ _____ Major ☒ Minor ☐

Evaluations submitted by: Jonathan Ivry; Edward Gimbel; Kelly Delaney-Klinger; Katy Casey; Cody Marie Busch
Review meeting attended by: Jonathan Ivry; Edward Gimbel; Kelly Delaney-Klinger; Katy Casey; Cody Marie
  Busch

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	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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.

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

General Comments related to Section I

2: The department makes a solid case for additional faculty to offer course options in developing areas in the field. 3: The department does a very good job of noting its strengths. More could be done to put these strengths in the context of similar programs regionally and nationally.

3. The answer provided was very detailed about the program's strengths, but it did not reference other regional or national programs to discuss what characteristics "set this program apart from others." 4. Impressive attention to last Audit and Review recommendations.

3. The program attributes described are impressive and likely to attract and retain students. However, there was not information provided to give context on this program in relation to others in our region that may also attract students.

The program seems to have taken results of the previous review seriously and has done much to determine what a current quality program in management entails.

The Management program should be commended for continuing to develop programs and implement curricular changes that best align with current employment trends. It should be noted that staffing challenges were noted in the previous audit and review report (2018-19) and are mentioned again in the current report. Despite staffing challenges, the department made a great effort in addressing gender equity by developing a taskforce focused on four distinct sub-groups. Further, student satisfaction scores remained high. It would be helpful to have more information on how the Management program at UWW is unique compared to other programs in the area and nationally. They mention how UW-Madison enrollment has increased and suggest that UW-Madison is taking students from CoBE. It would be helpful to highlight how this program is unique (might help with attracting those students back to CoBE).

II. Alignment within the University

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

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

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

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

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

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

General Comments related to Section II

The management program does not teach specific General Education courses, but it does incorporate many of the goals of general education in its curriculum. Management is closely tied to several programs outside CoBE and has also developed a minor that can be beneficial to students in most career areas.

The Management program is dedicated to the development of functional work-related skills that will be used in a variety of settings. This was noted throughout the report. Further, they offer two of the seven required undergraduate core courses in CoBE. Unsure if addressing current strategic plan (2023-2028). It would be helpful to include specific examples addressing each component in the strategic plan.

II.2: The program works to develop key general education learning outcomes for their majors and some related minors. Most of the courses cited in this capacity are upper-division courses, suggesting that these efforts are less focused on proficiency-level skill development for students outside of the program.

III. Program Goals & Accomplishments

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

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

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

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

General Comments related to Section III

The program does have several systems in place that are used to set and measure goals and objectives; it is not described in this section.

Program goals were identified and provided. One thing to consider is that the EDI work that was completed is important work (completed in the 21-22 academic year). There were recommendations made (all dept members integrate EDI best practices) but it would be great to see how the success of this initiative will be measured. For goal #1 (faculty recruitment), staffing was an issue in the previous audit and review report, and you are looking for a unique specialty area. It would be good to think "outside the box" for how you will find qualified candidates AND identify resources you might need to support this initiative.

Management has made strides in addressing their curricular and diversity goals and is working to address staffing challenges through recruiting. Plans for other goals are clear with measurable criteria for success.

3. Not clear why there was not an answer to question 3. Is there no set process for setting and assessing goals that guide decisions about program changes?

IV. Curriculum

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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. Changes to the program's curriculum were summarized and considered student needs/interests and/or internal and external stakeholders.

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

4. Students participate in high impact practices.

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

General Comments related to Section IV

The program's curricula are well-designed, and recent changes have been purposeful.

1. Curriculum appears to give students a good foundation and broad range of elective choices.   3. Impressive curriculum revisions reflecting various information sources. Priority #4 was "more attention to quantitative skills," but the self-study did not clearly indicate how the curricular revisions reflect this priority.   4. Difficult to evaluate the extent of HIPS given a lack of specific data. The required core courses would satisfy the HIP of "common intellectual experience."

Good work evaluating and redesigning the major. It was clear a lot of time and energy went into this work. What was some of the rationale for these changes? Was any assessment data used to determine curricular changes?

The program has done an outstanding job with the recent changes to curriculum. It incorporated research and findings from a variety of stakeholders and worked through an iterative process to best prepare students.

It is clear that the Management Program was very intentional with its curricular revision and utilized a variety of sources (internal and external) to make those changes/decisions. They have noted use of HIP including internships, experiential learning experiences, community-based learning experiences, etc... but it appears that these are only required for some areas of emphasis and are encouraged in others. It was not clear if all students in this major participate in HIP.

V. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program uploaded an assessment plan that includes student learning outcomes.

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 described the measures/processes they use to assess SLOs, and the criterion for performance.

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

5. The program described the results of the assessment data collected.

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

6. Student learning outcomes are aligned with UWW's Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.

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

7. The program described specific actions individuals in the program took, or will take, to make changes to the program based on assessment results.

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

General Comments related to Section V

Management has developed a robust and ambitious assessment plan and is in the process of implementing that plan. There is a shortage of assessment data necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of this plan, and a significant amount of work remains to be done in developing measurement tools and criteria for the seven SLOs.

The assessment plan (looking forward) is well-thought out and clear, but there was a lot that was listed as "under development." There was very limited data regarding assessment activities since the previous self-study period. This data was referenced in the earlier discussion of curricular changes but was not adequately described in this section. Details regarding timeline and schedule of assessment were also vague. It is unclear whether this assessment plan is feasible.

The program has a good assessment plan that includes direct (course embedded) and external sources of data (ETS test). The data is compiled and reviewed annually. The results suggest students are meeting the SLOs, but there was not much description of using the data for continuous improvement of student learning, course design and/or progression, etc.

The assessment plan is still being crafted to meet the changes in the curriculum. The portion of the plan that has been detailed suggests the program is on the right track. There are a lot of pieces, though, so it will be critical to maintain collaboration with the various faculty involved.

The Management Program has three overarching SLOs and then four individual SLOs (one for each unique area of emphasis). It appears that the details for how to assess and track attainment of the unique SLOs is still being developed. It appears that the "key assignments" used to collect data are paper/pencil tasks (exam questions, case study questions, multiple choice questions, etc..) and I wonder if this would be a good place to use some of the HIP mentioned as an assessment measure of SLOs.

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

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

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

2. The program described the College and/or University recruitment activities the program engages in to help maintain enrollment.

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

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

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

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

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

5. The program described retention issues, if any, impacting enrollment.

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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section VI.A

1. Information did not address viability and sustainability directly, though it seems obvious that the numbers are strong, despite recent declines. 6. Self-study claims program is oversubscribed, but earlier the report claimed that the recent reported numbers of students (showing a decline) in majors, was inaccurate. Student-teacher ratios seemed to be based on number of majors rather than number of students enrolled in classes. The conclusions seem valid, but the data seemed shaky.

The program reviewed enrollment data and understood one issue for lower enrollment was incorrect data at the institution level. The institutional data was updated in fall 2022 (10th day). The program should work with IR to understand the data being reported. There did not seem to be much reflection of how the program could/should address enrollment declines. The program reported it being "oversubscribed" due to class size. However, the average class size in COBE has remained relatively stable over the past 5-years at roughly 30-31, when enrollment in the program was higher.

There have been ongoing problems with IRP data for this program. (Verified by this reviewer.) It is hoped that when the new program has been through a full student cycle, things will be more accurate. Individual courses are used by several other programs, which may make it more difficult to manage enrollment, especially as the online program grows. Staffing levels and deployment may continue to be an issue.

First, as explained in the report, the Management Major is not sure if current enrollment numbers are accurate. The Management Major was intentional with reviewing how to address EDI initiatives and created a list of recommendations for instructors. However, student responses were also noted (suggestions for instructors) and I didn't see how those responses were incorporated into EDI initiatives and addressed throughout the program. The Management Program has open faculty lines (able to fill with lecturers this year). Have there been discussions on how to be more strategic and creative in consideration of this issue? Most courses are offered in the Fall and Spring semesters. Can some of those courses be shifted to just one semester? Further, it was noted that Sports Management and the Nonprofit emphases has had low enrollment (at one point in the report there was discussion on discontinuing programs). Again, it seems like an opportunity for discussion on how to best support these programs as the university has really emphasized the importance of unique/specialized programs for enrollment.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
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

The program has had success in placing graduates. Does the department have a process in place to track placement rates more generally?

What is the most recent placement number, as collected for the college? The program has long been thought of as preparation for a second job after graduation. That seems to fit nicely with the usefulness of the minor.

VII. Resource Availability & Development: Faculty and Staff Resources

1. Information on the numbers of full and part-time faculty and staff is provided.

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

2. The program has identified staffing changes since the last review.

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

3. Expertise of teaching staff are aligned with the needs and future vision for the program.

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

4. The program has identified anticipated staffing changes or areas of need, and how these may impact the program.

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

5. The program described factors that may be impacting their ability to recruit faculty and staff.

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

General Comments related to section VII.A

The program has done a good job of making the case that additional faculty hires are appropriate to address faculty: student ratios and to develop curricula in emerging fields of inquiry in the discipline.

1. The self-study lists 15 faculty, 13 "lecturers who teach on a regular basis," and 1 "occasional lecturer" which is a total of for a total of 28-29 faculty/staff. Earlier in the self-study, a chart listed a range of only 12-15 faculty/staff per year over the last 5 years, and from that number presented a high faculty-student ratio. I am confused as to the discrepancy between the number of faculty/ staff listed in this section compared to the earlier numbers indicated. 3. The answer to this question identified gaps in staffing but did not address the expertise of current faculty/staff as it aligns with program needs. 4. The Provost approved a replacement line, but the report does not indicate how that replacement line will address program needs. 5. Factors impacting ability to recruit faculty and staff were not addressed.

The program has been very thoughtful in its assessment of the needs for additional faculty and which areas of expertise should be supported. Be sure to use this information to support faculty position requests to the Dean and Provost.

The Management program describes the need for one or two full-time faculty members and appears to have filled those needs with adjunct instructors. One issue that needs to be addressed is that they are looking for a specialized area of expertise. Meaning, not only are they going to try to hire a faculty member (and that is often a challenge all by itself) BUT they are looking for a specific specialty. I didn't see how they plan to find candidates who meet that specific area of expertise.

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

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

General Comments for VII.B

1. As indicated earlier, I am somewhat confused by the numbers (both of students and faculty/staff) that are being used to arrive at student/teacher ratios (see notes above). 2. Somewhat vague.

1) how has the program worked to help finance the costs of student activities? For example, has the program advocated for student travel dollars from the college, looked at sponsors from the foundation, considered fundraising events?

You raise a great point about supporting student activities. There may be a way to embed that in GMO and receive funding from SUFAC. Otherwise, it is reasonable to make a case to the Dean.

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

You make a good case for the professional development of existing faculty, as well as focusing on new positions in particular areas. The program has much to offer its students, including flexibility, while still providing enough structure to help students successfully complete the major/emphasis.

The Management program should be commended for continuing to deliver a high-quality program despite staffing concerns (faculty retired/left and it appears more faculty are planning to retire). It also appears that there are ongoing discussions about who will take ownership for assessment, curriculum, etc. discussions and changes as these are key roles within a department.

IX. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

The program has robust and well-designed curricula. Student demand remains high. The program has an ambitious plan for assessment of student learning.

The program has conducted a revision of its curriculum that seems to be an improvement. It offers students four distinct tracks. It has the framework for a good assessment plan. Good student job placement.

-Created curriculum after extensive benchmarking, review of student comments, and involvement by external advisory board. -The curriculum provides the skills/abilities needed in today's business. -Students have flexibility to choose a path/emphasis that will aid them in pursuing future employment.

1. Intentional with design of major and emphasis areas. 2. Continuity of programs despite staffing challenges. 3. Deliberate work with EDI across programs. 4. Focused efforts on incorporating feedback from various sources (internal and external) for improving work readiness skills.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

While ambitious, the assessment plan is still a work in progress. The plan does not yet seem to have produced actionable data that the department can use to improve student learning. The department has identified a need for additional staffing to address faculty to student ratios and to meet demands in evolving areas in the discipline.

Staffing issues threaten the viability of some of the tracks and possibly may affect the quality of the existing program, especially if current faculty and staff are overworked the assessment plan going forward is a good framework, albeit incomplete; more concerning, the current self-study did not share enough data about assessment efforts since the last self-study.

-The assessment plan is in the initial stages. As the program works through each assessment period, it will want to adjust to ensure that the process is "doable" and ensure that the full cycle is completed. -Strengthen ties between students and extra-curriculars. This may be an opportunity to grow/focus GMO.

1. Focus on recruitment and retention efforts for faculty/staff within program (this is especially challenging as they are looking for a unique skillset/specialty area). 2. Development of assessment tools for SLOs 3. Integrate more HIP. Consider requiring some of these innovative teaching approaches as opposed to encouraging participation (including internships, experiential learning, etc..).

3. Other comments/questions

The curricular changes described in the self-study were prompted by a "benchmark study" of the program, student exit surveys, and consultation with advisory board, but details from these sources were missing from the self-study.

-This is a large program and requires the input/assistance of multiple faculty members. Department and college leadership needs to address lack of participation in the program by adding or deploying staff.

4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

1) Complete the assessment plan, paying particular attention to how the plan will be coordinated and monitored by individuals in the program. The program may want to review the current plan to ensure it is a sustainable plan overtime. Additionally, collect data over the next review period and include an analysis of how that data contributes to continuous review and program changes/improvements. Include specific examples of intentional use of data to make decisions.
2) Identify a plan on how you will recruit a qualified pool of applicants for the specialty area(s) needed. Develop a long-term plan for covering not only academic courses but the service work that needs to be done within a department to maintain continuity.
3) The program should meet with Institutional Research to better understand program enrollment numbers, or inform them of changes impacting the accuracy of the data. Based on accurate enrollment numbers, the program should develop a more strategic response to this change, as it may be helpful in informing hiring decisions.

5. Recommended Result

Insufficient Information in the self-study to decide; 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.	0
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	5
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
Refer to Provost for action. This option is selected if the report is not completed by the date due.	0