

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for  
Audit & Review Follow-up Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Arts Management Minor, 2015-2016**

**Date:** Wednesday February 24, 2016

**Time:** 2:30-3:30pm

**Place:** Center for the Arts, Room 2080

**Attended:** Provost John Stone; AVC Greg Cook; Acting Dean Bob Mertens; Department Chair (or Program Coordinator/Faculty/Instructional Staff) Marshall Anderson; Sarah Altermatt, Megan Matthews; Audit & Review Team Chair Anthony Gulig; Audit & Review team members, Joan Cook, Jane Ferencz

- 1) Call to order (2:34 p)
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Program Coordinator Marshall Anderson summarized the clear strengths of the minor program. Of special note were concerns relative to staffing the open position in the minor. There is currently only one applicant, though the date at which applicants are to be reviewed has been extended. Many believed the pool of applications could be deeper. There was discussion on how to attract more internal and external candidates for the position. Connections between successful completion of the minor and successful job searches were apparent.
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
  - a) **Staffing:** Staffing concerns as noted in item #3 above were reiterated and discussed at great length.
  - b) **Program SLOs and Direct Assessment:** Much emphasis was placed on encouraging the program to substantially reduce and focus the number of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Cognizant that this is a minor program, two or three SLOs may sufficiently define what students are expected to achieve through completion of the program. It is recommended that direct assessment in the program be strengthened and connected to SLOs.
- 5) Recommended Actions were discussed and is summarized here.
  - Work with the college to stabilize staffing.
  - Complete development of the assessment plan and implement it.  
Specifically, focus on connecting program's SLOs to the mission statement—the assistance of the college assessment coordinator will be helpful in this.  
Make clearer connections as to where and how SLOs are assessed in each of the program's courses—beyond student grades—(especially directly assessed). In doing so, work with the institutional assessment office early and often in this process.  
Work with college and campus offices to develop a way to track use of data for program improvement. Share out assessment data.
- 6) The Recommended Result was discussed and is summarized here: *Continuation with minor concerns*
  - The program should work with the institutional assessment office early and often in the next review cycle related to SLO honing. No progress report is required.

- **Next full self-study will be due in October 2020.**

7) Adjourn. (3:28p)

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies  
Undergraduate Programs, 2014-2015  
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation January 22, 2016 Short Self Study (SS\*)           
 Program Arts Management Major          Minor X

**Evaluations submitted by:** Tony Gulig (chair), Dale Splinter, Jane Ferencz, Andrea Ednie, Joan Cook  
**Review meeting attended by:** Audit & Review Team Chair Anthony Gulig; Audit & Review team members Dale Splinter, Joan Cook, Andrea Ednie, Jane Ferencz

**I. Program Purpose & Overview: A. Centrality**

**1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater’s core values, Mission, and Strategic Plan.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**3. The program has achieved or is appropriately working toward achievement of at least two goals of Inclusive Excellence.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

- 3. Very strategic and effective use of guest speakers & artists, field trips, the Creative Enterprise Symposium, and internships to help broaden students’ experiences.
- 4. Staffing issues were addressed but, unfortunately, may again be an issue. Hopefully the institutional commitment to the program (including adequate staffing) will continue.
- 4. Progress was clearly made on assessing student learning, but more remains to be done. The committee review of the progress report noted “We expect the program to complete several such cycles of assessment [collecting, reviewing, and using data to improve teaching, learning, and assessment] that

can then be reported in the self-study that they will submit in October of 2015.” It’s not clear how far along the program is in these cycles of collecting, reviewing, and using data.

## **I. Program Purpose & Overview: B. Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments**

### **1. The program’s mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### **2. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve or advance the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### **4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a “vision” for where it wants to be in the future and how to get there.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### **5. The program earned recognition or awards.**

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### **6. 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
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

## **Comments**

1. I would agree that the mission statement reads more like a catalog description of the courses that need to be taken and not a standard mission statement. I suggest updating the mission statement to reflect what the students get from the minor, not what classes they have to take.

1. (wording in second paragraph... is it a degree?)
- 1 & 6. The mission statement says this is an “accredited curriculum” but the response to question 6 says that accreditation is not available. Please clarify.
2. Internship and community outreach work seems impressive!
2. Goals included taking advantage of existing processes to gain more data on student learning (e.g., senior survey, internship supervisor survey)—good!
2. Number and extent of goals set and degree to which they’ve been addressed is quite impressive given the small number of staff devoting time to the program. Particularly impressive is that you have job info on 28 of your 30 grads!
3. Does the Advisory Board offer input into goals (some mention is on page 36, but not included in the current section)? Students?
4. Is the Creative Enterprise degree being considered a major? I assume so, but I’m not sure.
5. Not completely sure how to respond to this question. One award to one person was obtained, but it clearly had an impact on the program as a whole.

**II. Assessment: A. Curriculum**

**1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable).**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students; otherwise NA**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**4. The program provides opportunities for students to learn in ways that extend beyond the classroom, and discussed the extent to which students are involved in these activities and opportunities.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable)**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2

No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

1. The curriculum appears to be efficient and the department has a clear vision for future developments, pending a faculty hire.
1. The program clearly has student needs in mind when they consider how best to schedule courses (e.g., to allow them to complete the courses in a sequence and within a timeframe that allows greater interaction with instructors, while also recognizing that students must “work these courses into their Major schedules”).
1. Good collaboration between two colleges (A&C, CoBE) in terms of utilizing courses from both.
3. It appears a significant amount of work has been accomplished with assessment including curriculum changes and goals.
3. My concern here is that curricular revisions are primarily a product of indirect assessment and not student learning measures.
3. Data from senior surveys were used, but no mention of using/considering data on student achievement of SLOs.
4. This appears to be a true strength with internships, practica, and field experiences.
5. What’s the nature of the online course evals? Are they the same as or significantly different from evals of F2F courses?

**II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning**

**1. The program has a clearly articulated learning outcomes for students, courses are "mapped" to these learning outcomes, and some outcomes received specific attention during the review period.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**2. 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
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	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
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**6. Results of assessment efforts have been shared with appropriate internal and external constituencies.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

- The SLOs are problematic and need to be further clarified (pg. 17). For example, how is “summarize the breadth of opportunities...” considered to be critical thinking? Several are vague (e.g., “demonstrate ability and knowledge of...”—I’m not sure what “ability” means here or what indicators one would look for in an assessment). #6 (Demonstrate the ability to communicate critically and effectively, whether orally or in writing) is more clearly stated, although it combines written and oral communication into one SLO when it might be more informative to have two separate SLOs for these skills. Finally, most combine a number of skills into one SLO, which makes it difficult to assess and then to interpret what assessment data mean (e.g., if a student has high scores on an SLO that has 4 different skills included, does this mean she/he is strong in all 4, moderate in 2 but strong in 2, etc.?).
- Which SLOs were the main focus of attention during this review period?
- Table demonstrates that learning outcomes are aligned with LEAP.
- There is an initial attempt to align the SLOs with LEAP. In several cases, however, the same program SLO aligns with several different LEAP ELOs (i.e., the same program SLOs are used to address critical thinking, knowledge, teamwork, etc.). This makes it very difficult to figure out how these students are doing with respect to specific LEAP ELOs.
- No longitudinal measure of assessment is described. I recognize this can be difficult with a small number of minors and the fact that often students attempt to take courses out of sequence. This combined with attempting to complete the minor in 3 semesters makes longitudinal assessment is difficult.
- A variety of direct and indirect measures representing the learning outcomes.
- Both direct and indirect assessments are included in the assessment plan.
- The assessment plan needs further elaboration. For example, are all SLOs assessed, analyzed, and focused on every year? This seems overly burdensome. Which assessments will take place in which courses?
- How are the assessments listed on pages 22-23 to be scored? Do the scoring processes/rubrics align with the program (and LEAP) SLOs? The main issue here is how do *these* assessments tell you the degree to which students are achieving each of the individual SLOs? I encourage the program to simplify their plan, include only a few well-chosen assessments that are specifically designed to provide information about specific SLOs. These can (probably should) build on/be revisions of existing assignments.
- Data has been collected across the measures, and early evidence of trends were discussed. The report

- contains examples of how data were interpreted to evaluate the curriculum.
4. The direct assessment plan needs to be strengthened. Direct assessment of graded assignments in class is not the best measure of student learning. In fact, comparing one semester to the next is difficult because students rotate in and out of classes. To evaluate written and oral communication I suggest using the UW-W rubrics.
  4. I rated this as No/Limited evidence because, although a variety of data are being collected, I don't see how the data being gathered (with the exception perhaps of the internship supervisor ratings) can "allow judgments about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes."
  4. Grading is not the same as program assessment. For example, the Season Programming Project is intended to assess SLO#2 (Demonstrate the ability in and knowledge of the fundamentals of Arts Management topic, such as organizational structures, mission/strategic planning....). What does a grade of A- tell me about students' achievement of this SLO?
  4. How are scores on the team projects interpreted? That is, are they intended as an assessment of teamwork, or also of other SLOs (e.g., ability and knowledge of...)?
  4. Good inclusion of internship supervisor ratings.
  4. (pg 29). "Based upon this assessment data, we feel that our student interns ...show the ability to think critically and work effectively in real world environments ..." I see where the conclusion about 'work effectively in real world environments' comes from, but I don't see where interns or their supervisors were asked about thinking critically. Please clarify.
  5. Specific examples of assessment-advised curriculum changes were discussed.
  5. Most of the information considered is not data on student learning.
  6. Assessment information is shared with faculty and advisory board, which is good. It sounds like, although there are productive meetings with students, assessment data about students' achievement of SLOs at the program level are not presented or discussed.

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

**1-2. Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	4

**4-5. [MAJORS ONLY] Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students. Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	4

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1



No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

- 1-2. Current faculty resources would not be able to accommodate many more students.
- 1-2. (page 41) Is Accounting 244 *necessary* for the minor? If it's impacting enrollment, is there another course that might accomplish the same learning goals but be less intimidating?
- 6. Course offerings cause the minor to take 4 semesters to complete. The department is flexible with prerequisites in order to support students' needs.
- 7: The program has maintained a fairly steady enrollment. Were the program to grow, more instructional time would be required. Currently the budget does not support growing the program too much more.

**III. 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	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	4

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

- 2. I do not recall seeing a future job outlook section, but it appears that this minor helps students in the job market. Many of the students that have completed this minor have a job in their field of study.
- 2. Graduates have been tracked and 93% are employed/in grad school, and 72% employed within the field.
- 3. Good job tracking grads. This is not easy to do.

**III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: C. Comparative Advantage(s)**

**1. The program has unique features that distinguish it from competing programs--giving it a competitive edge**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

1. Attractive internship opportunities, exciting community partners, connected to other campus and organizations...
1. Is there any potential to grow this to a major? Is there a job market for this?

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty Characteristics****1. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.)**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**2-3. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

- 2-3. The Audit and Review Committee understands a search for the program director is in progress.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement****1. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

1. It is hoped that the strength of the program will continue with the new program director hire.
1. Ensure broad support for the program from participating faculty and advisory board.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities****1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.**

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments****IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding****1. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

1. UW System Tech grant was awarded. The limited faculty resources for the minor would make this difficult. The minor appears to succeed without much funding.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service****1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments****IV. Resource Availability & Development: F. Resources for Students in the Program****1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.**

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

1. Seems understaffed. Reading the indirect assessment some students feel that 1 instructor is enough and others believe one individual overseeing the minor is problematic. I am not sure....just a comment.

1: Funding and staffing are always an issue, but the Chancellor and Dean have committed resources sufficient to maintain the program.

1. Students appear to receive excellent advisory access and to experience a lot of interaction with faculty and professionals.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings****1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, and technological resources to effectively serve its students.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
---------------------	---

Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### Comments

1. Appear to have adequate resources and to benefit from our location (access to large communities with arts programs)

## V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

### 1. Program strengths are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### 2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### 3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### 4. Other comments by the program (not rated).

Yes	2
No	2

### Comments

1. Very impressive!
2. Provided a detailed list composed from assessment results, industry feedback, and staffing needs.

## VI. Reviewer Conclusions

### 1. Strengths of the Program

It provides a much need minor for many of the majors in Arts and Communications.  
 The internship is very beneficial to students as a High Impact Practice and has led to employment for some students.  
 Mock interviews are very beneficial to students. I appreciate the assessment piece associated with the mock interviews.  
 Indirect assessment is well done and beneficial  
 Committed faculty and staff. Looking to keep current in the field by exploring a Creative Enterprise/Entrepreneurship focus, a new "hot topic" in arts management and arts programs A minor that is a practical add-on for a number of degree programs inside and outside of the College  
 Practical experience, internships, opportunities for students to engage with professionals, connections

with other university and professional programs, carefully-designed curriculum, assessment plan.

**2. Areas for Work or Improvement**

A much needed upgrade in direct assessment measures is needed. Must move away from course assignments and grades as measures of assessment.

More clarification is needed on the program’s SLOs.

Broaden faculty and academic staff involvement in the program.

Faculty leadership through the transition and effect of having the same person teach every course.

**3. Other comments/questions**

This is a program that has garnered good jobs for a number of its graduates over the years. While small, it is an active, arts-oriented program that provides "real world" experience and job opportunities for students.

**4. Recommended Actions**

1. Work with the college to stabilize staffing.

2. Complete development of the assessment plan and implement it.

- Specifically, focus on connecting program’s SLOs to the mission statement—the assistance of the college assessment coordinator will be helpful in this.
- Make clearer connections as to where and how SLOs are assessed in each of the program’s courses—beyond student grades—(especially directly assessed). In doing so, work with the institutional assessment office early and often in this process.
- Work with college and campus offices to develop a way to track use of data for program improvement. Share out assessment data.

**5. Recommended Result**

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
Continuation without qualification	2
Continuation with minor concerns	3
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