

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Business Education (Undergraduate) Majors and Minors, 2017-2018**

Date: 4/3/2018
Time: 3:35-4:32
Place: WH1013

Attending: Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean Katy Heyning; Dean John Chenoweth; Program Coordinator Karla Saeger; John Smith, faculty in the Business Education program; Audit & Review Team Chair Corey Davis; Audit & Review team members Yeongmin Kim, Katy Casey, Joan Littlefield Cook

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m.

2) Introductions

3) Overview of program strengths, program comments

John Smith welcomed and thanked both Deans Chenoweth and Heyning for their involvement in the program. Smith also highlighted the program's AACSB accreditation and cooperation with UW-Stout. Karla Saeger highlighted expansion of online and blended course offerings. She also noted as a strength of the program the dual licensure in Business Education and Computer Science that will be available to students beginning in Fall 2018, in addition to the existing minor in computer science education currently available to Business Education students. Saeger also announced that the program will have a new tenure-track faculty member beginning in the fall 2018 term.

4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

a. Enrollment

Dean Heyning said the priority should be to build the program. She suggested one way to do this would be to use relationships with DECA. She also suggested a marketing plan to attract more students. Attendees also suggested using the Google+ community, touting the computer science minor and dual licensure, working with the advisory board, using high school teachers to recruit, promoting at FBLA (and DECA) conventions, and promoting the \$200 scholarship for "I want to be a business teacher" camp. There was also a suggestion to market more to Illinois students in light of the closing of the Eastern Illinois University program in business education. Provost Elrod suggested exploring a way to give business teachers business networking opportunities with COBE's corporate partners.

b. Assessment

The program was receptive to the review committee's assessment recommendation. They noted that turnover and continuity have been obstacles. Saeger, Smith and the new hire will be looking for ways to connect assessment data with curricular decisions.

c. Resources

Regarding the computer lab issues, Saeger reported this is no longer a problem because of the number of classes that have moved to online and hybrid formats. The labs also reportedly have more flexibility now. Regarding staffing, Dean Heyning said there may be LTE help available to assist with short term projects. Katy Casey suggested Saeger work with the department chair to explore how she can get more support for projects.

5) Recommended Actions: The evaluation report lists 3 recommended action (see page 12, point #4) related to enrollment, assessment and resources.

6) Recommended Result: *Continuation with minor concerns.*

- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
- **Next full self-study will be due to the college dean by October 1, 2021 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2021.**

7) Adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m.

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2017-2018
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 3/7/2018
Program Business Education

Short Self Study (SS*) _____
Major X Minor _____

Evaluations submitted by: Corey Davis (review team chair), James Collins, Katy Casey, Youngmin Kim, Joan Littlefield Cook

Review meeting attended by: Corey Davis, James Collins, Katy Casey, Joan Littlefield Cook

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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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	0
Some/Partial Evidence	5
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	0
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	4
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

- 2. Builds on previous proficiencies.
- 3. Students of opportunity are mentioned in the two goals, but there is little evidence that these goals are unique to Inclusive Excellence. Simply having high-impact practices is not in-and-of-itself evidence of Inclusive Excellence advancement.
- 3. There was not a sufficient description of how the program addresses achievement gaps- if they exist

4. Efforts were made and are still in progress to recruit and retain full-time faculty for the program, but staffing is still a problem.
4. There is little discussion of how assessment data (especially direct data on student performance) are used to impact the program.
4. The original Recommended Actions (from the 2011 report) addressed the program's vision, strategies for attracting Ph.Ds as faculty, and lots of aspects of assessment. Several of these issues are still evident in the current self-study

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. The program, faculty/staff, and/or students have earned recognition or awards.

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

Comments

The program should be commended for its regular meetings with an advisory board, which likely provides valuable information for program improvement.

3. Advisory board is important, but there should be more systematic ways to set program goals and make needed changes.
4. What is the program's overall vision, in the sense of where they want to be in five years?
4. If I understand it correctly, it seems that licensure through an approved teacher education program is no longer required in business education. If it has been the main focus of the program, there should be more discussion of how the program will address this significant challenge.
5. Congratulations on the awards and recognitions of this program.
6. Is there disciplinary accreditation available for the program?
6. No explanation why the accreditation is no longer being sought by the college.

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

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

Comments

3. Changes made in consultation with advisory board and DPI requirements.
3. Are any formal assessments used to inform these decisions? The described sources will provide lots of qualitative and useful information, but I'm curious about other data, such as subject-area Praxis scores, etc.
3. Indirect data are used in making curricular revisions, but I don't see evidence of using direct data from student performance. When results of student performance assessments are mentioned, they are discussed in vague and general terms (e.g., "changes were made to the content of the student teaching seminar...", CPR report, pg. 6; "increased effort will be made to continue the development of teacher candidate dispositions...", CPR report, pg. 4).
3. There is a discussion of how assessment data were used to make changes to the required credits for Business and Marketing licensure, but not for other changes.
4. Student teaching placements would be relevant here also.
4. Opportunities are provided, but it is not clear if students take advantage of them or if they receive the scholarships listed.
4. Were UWW students awarded any of these scholarships?

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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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	1
No/Limited Evidence	1
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	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. It is not clear which set of learning outcomes the program uses. Six were written in the self-study report but the WTS standards seem to be what is used as learner outcomes (Learning Outcomes attachment). Further, the Crosswalk attachment includes 5 program outcomes- are those the same as SLOs? It is appropriate to align outcomes with the standards, but the standards lack specificity and are not measurable. Appendix D does not include data from the edTPA.
1. Program SLOs have been revised and are stated in more measurable terms than before, but could be improved a bit more (e.g., rather than saying students will "develop knowledge"--which can be difficult to objectively assess--could say they will "demonstrate knowledge of...").
1. A next step in mapping SLOs to the curriculum is to identify where each SLO is introduced and developed.
2. Alignment with LEAP ELOs will need to be revised, using the newly revised program SLOs.
- 3-4. The Gateways and Success Plan document is a good description of students' progression through the program. However, this is not a program assessment plan. I would recommend an assessment plan document that includes how the program uses data to inform practices and reflect on student learning outcomes. The data provided on edTPA and clinical/dispositions surveys is described well. There were a number of other data sources listed; what information do you collect from those? What is the plan for using data from these assessments (e.g., speaking well, lesson plan rubric)?
- 3/4. The assessment methods described in #3 are not presented in #4 for its results.
5. Program is responsive to assessment data, recommendations from Advisory Board and DPI changes.
5. Lots of data are collected, both direct (in edTPA artifacts) and indirect.
5. There's a lot of description of the data that are collected but little discussion of how what the program is learning from it, and how the data (especially direct data of student performance) are being used to impact the program.
5. It is unclear how the assessment data were used to guide the curriculum changes.
6. Meets twice annually to share data
6. Should data be shared with relevant departments in COBE (marketing, accounting, etc.)?

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	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
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	3
---------------------	---

Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
4. Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students.	
Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. [MAJORS ONLY] Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

- I don't understand why there has been difficulty getting students to enroll if there's such a "critical shortage" of teachers in this area.
- 1-2. Enrollments are relatively steady, but they are not particularly high. Number of degrees granted seems low (from 7 in 2011-12 to 3 and 4 in 2014-15 and 2015-16).
1. What's the enrollment in the minor?
3. Is there any way to decrease the credits to degree? I know this is an issue for all CoEPS licensure programs but is there anything that can be done to address it? Average credits is 147, but that is because a double major is advised to make students more marketable to school districts. Does that include a dual licensure? Is 4 years the average time to degree?
4. The Gateway and Madison College articulation agreements seem like good plans to increase a more diverse student body. The program could use this as an inclusive excellence goal also.
5. 7-17% is a pretty big swing. Hopefully the articulation agreements at Gateway will help.
7. Again, if there is such a critical shortage of these teachers, why has it been difficult to recruit students into the program? Does the program need to rethink and update its recruitment message and target audience?

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

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

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

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

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

Comments

3. Should alumni be surveyed more often than every 5 years? This delay could contribute to tracking challenges after students change jobs, move out of the area, etc.
3. What has the program learned from its alumni surveys?

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

One of only two business ed programs in Wisconsin and is the only standalone major.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty Characteristics

1-2. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.)

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

3-4. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.

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

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

Comments

2. More details related to specific areas of faculty expertise would be helpful in defining what the program needs to build upon in the search for new faculty additions to the department.
4. I'm not sure how good of an idea that hiring and promoting from within is; it could result in a lot of similar thinkers
-
- 1-4. Turnover is a problem. Program is having trouble retaining faculty who identify with a variety of genders and ethnicities.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement**1-2. 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**IV. Resource Availability & Development: C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities****1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.**

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

Comments

Impressive accomplishments for the one person who was listed.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding**1-2. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.**

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

Comments

Consider pursuing internal grants to get more resources for faculty development, assessment, etc. or external grants for recruiting.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service

1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.

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

Comments

Fairly limited service commitments provided.

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

Comments

The department notes that they are understaffed by one full time tenure track faculty member

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

Comments

1. Winther is terrible. Hyland is an embarrassment of riches.

The department indicates that computer lab space is needed. How many courses require computer labs, and how many total students are affected?

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

Comments

3. Does the department need additional resources to support these efforts?

VI. Reviewer Conclusions**1. Strengths of the Program**

Uniquely positioned in Wisconsin. Able to capitalize on strong reputation of both COEPS and COBE.

This is a much needed and highly specialized area that is in demand.

The program should be commended for the quality support it provides its majors considering the small number of faculty and staff coordinating and teaching in this program. The commitment to an external advisory board is impressive. Further, the program has plans to increase its numbers in innovative ways.

The program is one of the two provided Business and Marketing Education program in the state. The program has a long history and well-developed curriculum.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- The program discusses the issue of being understaffed. They are having problems recruiting and retaining tenure-track faculty.
- What marketing efforts are being made to boost enrollment?
- The program identified activities to recruit students and should make these a priority. The program collects sufficient data on students' progress through its program. However, the knowledge and skills specifically for BME majors is not clearly articulated. The program should consider using the processes currently in place to create a sustainable assessment plan. This would not require the program to create something new, just better organize and structure the process for collected data on student progress.
- Assessment is an area to work on. The program is collecting a lot of data, but it's hard to tell the extent to which the program is talking about and using the data to impact the program, especially direct assessment data.
- As discussed in the self study, the business and marketing education field is changing continuously, but the program is understaffed and seems to have some issues caused by the recent move from COBE. The program needs to develop a clear plan to address these challenges.

3. Other comments/questions

- Changes to DPI policy that allow untrained teachers in Wisconsin classrooms present potential challenges to this program. The program will need to continue to position itself as a premier trainer of business educators who have pedagogical skills that distinguish them from experience-educated teachers.
- Would it be helpful to have an internal advisory board composed of faculty from CoEPS and CoBE?

- Are there any concerns with having a faculty member with the rank of assistant professor assigned to coordinating duties?

4. Recommended Actions

1. *Enrollment:* Work to increase enrollment in the major and minor. How can the program leverage the facts that there is a "critical shortage" in this area and that UWW offers one of the only programs in the state in this area to attract more students to the program (and to UWW)? Would a completely online program help? Articulation agreements are a good idea, as is partnering with local districts to provide the necessary training for "experience based teachers." Is there any interest in working on an alternate route licensure option for experience-based teachers, so they would receive sufficient training? Does the program work with advisors in CoBE to recruit students?
2. *Assessment:* (a) Create a sustainable assessment plan; (b) clearly articulate how data on student learning are being used to impact the program, particularly the direct data from student performance measures
3. *Resources:* Work with the college/s to address resource needs including staffing and computer lab availability

5. Recommended Result*

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	
Continuation without qualification	
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	X
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	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	
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.	
Non-continuation of the program.	

Next full self-study is due to the college dean by October 1, 2021 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2021.