

Evaluation Report for Program Review Face to Face Meeting

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater: General Business (BBA)

Majors and Minors, 2021-2022

Date: 1/18/2022

Invited: Provost John Chenoweth; Interim Dean Paul Ambrose, Chair/Program Coordinator Linda Amann; faculty and staff in the General Business program Yefeng Wang, He Li, John Olson, and Nicholas Lovett; Audit & Review Team Chair Andrea Ednie; Audit & Review team members Lynn Gilbertson, Hephzibah Kumpaty, Ahmad Karim; Assessment Representative Katy Casey

Overview of review team evaluation, program comments:

Dr. Ednie shared program highlights from the review team including the noted improvement in program management and progress since the previous review, strong student demand (particularly non-traditional students) and success in placing graduates.

Mrs. Amann shared program context, which included the interdisciplinary nature and related challenges. Most notably the reliance on other departments in terms of courses offered, taught, and assessed. The program expressed feeling a lack of control which makes data collection difficult. She highlighted the program's rank as

4th largest major in college, 6th most popular minor on campus, and 1st fully online program.

The program has a diverse student body in terms of interests. Mrs. Amann noted a struggle advising students in their sophomore year when they are expected to choose a path- general business or another major in college. The program observes students avoiding this decision, and they are trying to figure out why that is and how to best support these students.

Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

1 – The A&R review team would like to recognize the tremendous amount of work done to support this program since their last self-study.

-Especially on process coordination, leadership, communication, and involvement of all departments.

This sentiment was recognized and supported by all attendees.

2 – Closing the assessment loop: The assessment plan is detailed in all areas, except for discussion about how assessment results are being used to inform the program. How does the program use the SLO assessment data they have collected? How can SLO data be used to inform course/program changes and improvements?

The program shared an ambitious plan to evaluate program objectives within each of the five groupings (i.e., (Project Management, Legal Issues, Broad Economics, Social Responsibility, and Interpersonal/Supervisory). The assessment plan is well organized, detailed, and has the potential to provide valuable information for program improvement. As a result of the discussion, it became clear that while the program uses data to inform program changes and improvements, the methods used were not sufficiently captured in the report. Additionally, it became clear that measuring outcomes in each of the grouping was logistically very challenging. The review team recommended a simplified plan to assess the five program SLOs. The belief of the committee was that survey data and notes from advisory meetings (which include representation from each department teaching in the program) is a sufficient start to inform program goals. The program will likely learn from this analysis and may add additional assessment methods.

3 – Intentionality behind the program design: What knowledge and skills will students have upon program completion? The self-study report appears to focus more on analyzing enrollment trends and course offerings.

Dean Ambrose appreciated the work of the program and clarification on assessment. He noted concern that the assessment recommendations made at this meeting may not be remembered at the next A&R. He would appreciate clarification, perhaps in the recommended actions that the program does not have to abide by specific methods of assessment if they do not meet program needs (e.g., course embedded assessments).

Provost Chenoweth was pleasantly surprised at the progress from the last A&R when the program was trying to write outcomes/achievement for each of the five curricular groupings (Project Management, Legal Issues, Broad Economics, Social Responsibility, and Interpersonal/Supervisory). He noted improvement in program coordination and appreciates the standing committee with representation from each department.

Recommended Actions:

Recommended Action #1

Assessment of student learning should be the focus of the assessment plan, using the five program SLOs as the guide. The A&R is interested in learning how the program defines student learning (SLOs, which have already been identified), students' performance on SLOs (could be from student surveys, department reports during committee meetings, select assignments), what is learned from data collected on SLOs (V.4) and how assessment data are being used to make changes to the curriculum (V.5).

Recommended Action #2

Make sure to clarify the staffing specifics relative to the program in your next self-study. For example, provide a discussion of the program coordinator and their responsibilities, describe the staffing within the program. Describe the intentionality behind what courses and instructors are selected for the program (VIA. 1,2,3).

Recommended Action #3

Provide an explanation about how the program supports general education and/or proficiency programs at the University (II.2).

Recommended Action #4

Clarify how the program goals currently in place will contribute to the program's advancement (III.2).

Recommended Result:

Continuation with minor concerns

Next Self-study and/or Progress Report Due Dates:

1 - Next FULL self-study will be due to the Dean on May 1, 2028 and to the Assessment Office on August 1, 2028

For a copy of the full evaluation report and detailed comments, please reach out to the assessment office: assessment@uww.edu.