

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

Date: Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Time: 9AM-10:30AM

Place: Winther Hall 1013

Invited: Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean Seth Meisel; Program Coordinator Dr. Karla Saeger; faculty and staff in the Business Education (Grad) program/s; Audit & Review Team Chair Matt Vick; Audit & Review team members Pavan Rao Chennamaneni, Edward Frederick, Christine Neddenriep, Shannon Stuart, Joan Cook

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) Advisory Board. The program is to be commended for having an active and engaged advisory board.
 - b) COEPS support for faculty recruitment. Are there options to increase the total compensation for faculty in MS-BE through additional courses taught in COBE? Is the new DBA a potential route for HLC qualified faculty applicants?
 - c) Technology. Make sure information on COEPS website is updated in order to lower hurdles for potential students to learn about the program and contact current faculty/coordinators. Instead of dedicated computer lab space, is Bring Your Own Device (supplemented with check out laptops) more feasible? With campus virtualization, specialized software can be run on student laptops. Consider looking at Special Education and the Masters of Business Administration programs for how they are combining face-to-face classes with synchronous online work to allow for a single class to reach a greater number of students in the state.
 - d) Assessment Plan. Work with COEPS assessment committee and campus assessment office to develop a full assessment plan and strategic plan that lead to data that can be used to guide curricular decisions.
 - e) Capstone Experience. Are students able to opt-out of all research by taking additional classes? Should there still be a required capstone?
- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists 2 recommended actions (see page 11, point 3).
- 6) **Recommended Result:** Continuation with minor concerns
 - **Next progress report is due October, 2019**
 - **Next full self-study will be due in October, 2021.**
- 7) Adjourn.

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

Date: Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Time: 9AM-10AM

Place: Winther Hall 1013

In Attendance: Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean Seth Meisel; Program Coordinator Karla Saeger; John Smith; Audit & Review Team Chair Matt Vick; Dean Katy Heyning, Associate Dean Robin Fox, Rowand Robinson, Joan Cook

8) Call to order

9) Introductions

Karla gave a report on the history of the program in her time here (transitions from Lila Waldman and Michelle Gibson-Herman); since spring 2015 the program has only had Karla and John; trouble has been in attracting candidates to fill the second faculty line; reviewed three emphases of the MS-BE program

10) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments

11) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

a) Advisory Board. The program is to be commended for having an active and engaged advisory board.

Dean Fox also pointed out that it is the most endowed program in COEPS in terms of scholarships, both for graduate and undergraduate programs.

b) COEPS support for faculty recruitment. Are there options to increase the total compensation for faculty in MS-BE through additional courses taught in COBE? Is the new DBA a potential route for HLC qualified faculty applicants?

There is an offer out to a candidate currently. Provost mentioned how COBE took Business Law faculty position and turned it into academic staff because it better attracted qualified candidates. Provost asked about a joint-appointment.

- c) Technology. Make sure information on COEPS website is updated in order to lower hurdles for potential students to learn about the program and contact current faculty/coordinators. Instead of dedicated computer lab space, is Bring Your Own Device (supplemented with check out laptops) more feasible? With campus virtualization, specialized software can be run on student laptops. Consider looking at Special Education and the Masters of Business Administration programs for how they are combining face-to-face classes with synchronous online work to allow for a single class to reach a greater number of students in the state.

Trouble with scheduling rooms in Hyland after COBE got first choice of lab times. Program is moving online, so lab space might no longer be a concern. Karla redesigned website for marketing purposes. Pre-admission advising is time intensive for Karla.

The conversation shifted toward marketing and program redesign, which fit a discussion of Recommendation 1:

Develop a strategic plan for where the program is headed in terms of enrollments, market, online presence and faculty membership. Work with the college to obtain guidance and resources needed to develop this plan. The plan should include enrollment goals and strategies, and strategies for marketing the program.

AVC Cook asked about current enrollment (2) and size of classes. Most courses are dual-listed.

Joan Cook asked about what the plan and market are. Karla doesn't seem splitting grad/undergrad markets. Curriculum is being modified away from "traditional graduate student model." New 8-week courses are being developed for working adults. Project management and corporate trainers might be another market for the former post-secondary emphasis. Karla is concerned that advisory board is geared toward K-12 education. Joan recommended a steering committee to go forward. Dean Heyning also liked this idea. Provost Elrod suggested focusing on organizational training, HR training, or development of entrepreneurial/STEM business development in secondary/post-secondary organization. Facilitation qualifications? Coaching? This could start as a certificate. Dean Heyning questioned the need for a graduate initial licensure route, perhaps separate this route from the Master's Degree. Provost Elrod suggested a conversation with COBE about accepting credits from this program toward PIE qualifications for Business and Society in high schools. Dean Meisel pointed out the high needs for technical college instructors to learn pedagogy and for high school instructors qualified to teach computer science. Dean Fox suggested collaborating in terms of how the AmeriCorps grant could be linked to business teacher licensure. Meisel asked if there are ways to re-package current curriculum in smaller pieces (non-credit).

Dean Heyning said that COEPS would provide summer compensation to organize these efforts. Provost Elrod mentioned that this is likely to be a part of the Program Array Review process in 2018-19.

- d) Assessment Plan. Work with COEPS assessment committee and campus assessment office to develop a full assessment plan and strategic plan that lead to data that can be used to guide curricular decisions.

Joan Cook met with Karla for initial conversations. She emphasized making clear connections between industry partners and new SLOs. AVC Cook mentioned that with small numbers, they could just interview grad students and have them reflect on their learning. It could be a 1 page summary of outcomes for those students. The assessment plan needs to come after program revision.

e) Capstone Experience. Are students able to opt-out of all research by taking additional classes? Should there still be a required capstone?

12) **Recommended Actions**: The evaluation report lists 2 recommended actions (see page 11, point 3).

13) **Recommended Result**: Continuation with minor concerns

- **Next progress report is due October, 2019**
- **Next full self-study will be due in October, 2021.**

14) Adjourn.

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies

Date of Evaluation 1/10/2018

Short Self Study (SS*) _____

Program Business Education (Grad)

Evaluations submitted by: Matt Vick, Pavan Rao Chennamaneni, Edward Frederick, Christine Neddenriep, Shannon Stuart, Joan Littlefield Cook

Review meeting attended by: Matt Vick, Pavan Rao Chennamaneni, Edward Frederick, Christine Neddenriep, Shannon Stuart

I. Program Purpose & Overview: Centrality

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

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

2. The program supports other undergraduate and graduate programs offered at UW-W (if relevant).

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

3. The program works to support at least two goals from the institution's Inclusive Excellence Guidelines.

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

4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review report; Progress Reports have been included (if relevant).

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

Comments

- 1. Links to the UWW strategic plan, mission, and vision would help make the case.
 - 3. General statements are made supporting inclusive excellence. The need for a plan is apparent.
 - 3. Need more details of recruitment and retention efforts. This seems to be a problem area.
 - 4. High turnover is given as a reason for stalled progress.
 - 4. Continued concerns regarding hiring and maintaining tenure-track faculty. With only 1.5 full time faculty the program cannot meet their goals and objectives of recruiting and matriculating a diverse cohort of students.
-
4. Little progress has been made in strategic planning in the past 5 years. This should be a priority for the program. Changes in leadership and staffing have been problematic, but the college and program need to find a way to maintain progress despite these. Some recommendations were partially addressed, but there is still much work to be done to meet the recommendations from 5 years ago.

I. Program Purpose & Overview: Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments

1. The program’s mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program and aligns with the mission of the School of Graduate Studies.

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

2. The program established and worked to accomplish goals designed to improve the quality of the program.

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

3. The program has a process for setting and evaluating progress on achieving program-level goals, and making decisions about program changes based on assessment data.

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

4. The program is considering potential revisions to the mission, goals, or objectives (i.e., the program has a “vision” for the next level and how to get there).

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

5. The program achieved and/or earned special recognition or awards during the review period.

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

6. The program earned (or retained) specialized accreditation (if applicable) during the review period.

1		Sufficient Evidence	2
2		Some/Partial Evidence	2

4	Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	1
3	No/Limited Evidence	1

Comments

1. Is there an actual Mission Statement for the program?
2. Goals are laid out. Increasing enrollment is not yet happening.

3. The use of an advisory committee with such a large and diverse representation is impressive. I am not sure what is meant by the statement, "The recommendations of this Committee and survey results are considered when setting program goals, but have not been effective in the decision-making process of the MS-BE graduate program."
3. The program needs to develop systematic processes for setting and monitoring program goals. Changes in staffing make this difficult but the college and program must find a way to accomplish this. Otherwise, the program can only be reactive, rather than being planfully proactive in its activities. The college needs to provide support and resources to help support the program's strategic development.
3. Advisory committee is in existence and should continue to be used. Assessment data shared is not clear
- 3-4. Program Overview 3 & 4 Inclusive excellence and revisions to mission. Is the program still short one tenure-track faculty member? What are specific recruiting efforts you are making to gain and maintain a faculty member with a diverse background?
4. Vision for change to new licensure rules is succinct and well laid out.

6. NCATE is no longer sought by COEPS as of 2017 (decision made in 2013) due to negative impacts on diverse student recruitment and a changing landscape of teacher licensure in other states that made NCATE accreditation less attractive; is accredited by DPI.
6. Are any accreditations available specifically for this type of program?

II. Assessment: Curriculum & the Assessment of Students' Learning

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, complete with a capstone experience.

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

2. Expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students in dual-listed courses.

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

3. Changes to the curriculum were based on assessment data.

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

4. The program offers additional opportunities for students, and students make use of these in ways that impact the University, community, and/or region.

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	1
4	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).

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

Comments

1. How does CIBME 762 support the capstone? How are students' field placement capstones as graduate students different from the undergraduate fieldwork capstones? What is the number of students who choose a thesis capstone?

1. This should be laid out in the A&R report as requested.

2. Would students take these courses at the undergraduate level and the graduate level if they complete their undergrad and graduate degrees at UWW? If so, are they essentially taking these courses twice with additional requirements at the graduate level?

2. For the five dual-listed courses you provided helpful specific examples of how graduate expectations differed from undergraduate expectations. Thank you.

3. Curricular changes described were due to external changes, not assessment data. One reference to student exit surveys was given.

3. Several changes were made to the curriculum but I only see mention of data as a basis for one of these.

4. Data is not provided showing participation rates among these activities.

5. Are the courses certified through Quality Matters? Do you intend to pursue the certification of these courses?

5. How often are your online courses approved through Quality Matters?

5. Descriptions of online courses suffice. One distance ed course requires live WebEx presence. Others use standard UWW hybrid expectations for participation.

II. Assessment: Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program has clearly articulated learning performance outcomes for students, which are "mapped" to the curriculum.

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

2. The program has an Assessment Plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the learning outcomes.

1	Sufficient Evidence	2
2	Some/Partial Evidence	4

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

3. Research/scholarly activity, as defined by the program, is incorporated in the achievement of student learning outcomes.

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

4. The program collected a variety of assessment data, allowing judgments to be made about the extent to which students are achieving learning performance outcomes.

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

5. The program has developed a process for using assessment data in making changes to students' learning outcomes.

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

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	4
2	Some/Partial Evidence	2

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

Comments

- 1-6. A wide variety of SLOs are described and mapped, but actual data is not shown. Is it actually tracked and used for program improvement? What assessment data is actually shared with the external advisory board?
1. More work is needed to complete development of program SLOs that are assessable and, for licensure programs, align with WI Teaching Standards. The WI TS are not stated as assessable SLOs, but the college is available to help programs restate them as SLOs.
 2. The program would benefit from clearly articulating an overall assessment plan--i.e., which SLOs will be assessed in which years, which will receive in-depth attention in a given year, which courses will be used for assessment. Some of this has been developed, but there needs to be a comprehensive 'roadmap' for program assessment.
 3. Students seem to be able to "opt out" of research by taking additional classes. Whether students really get research training depends on the scope of the research projects required within classes--are there clear expectations and guidelines for these in-class research projects?
 4. Are there any results to report from the in-class embedded assignments yet?
 4. How many students are the data for? Do they come mostly from those in the licensure program? If so, this is fine, but the program needs to expand its assessment program and include students in their other emphases.
 5. Who uses the data and makes decisions? Please describe the process for discussing data and closing the loop.
 5. It appears that there is limited evidence of use of assessment data to drive improvement because of the numerous external mandates and changes that have occupied the faculty/staff time.

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

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

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

3. Composition of students reflects the diversity of the University, and the program has developed methods of recruiting and retaining students and to enhance diversity among students in the program.

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

4. Graduation rates indicate that students complete the program in a timely manner.

1		Sufficient Evidence	6
2		Some/Partial Evidence	0
3		No/Limited Evidence	0
4		Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. Program level has provided evidence to support its claim of being oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level.

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

Comments

- 1. Description of the environment are given. What about school districts that are still giving pay increases due to a master’s degree? It seems overly broad to claim that no districts want graduate education for teachers.
- 1. Enrollments seem low. Is this something the program is concerned about? 3. The program has well developed strategies to attract more diverse students.
- 1-2. the attached table covers only 3 years.
- 5. what is meant by “The optimal number of students in the Post-Secondary and General emphases is infinite”? Can it actually be infinite?
- 5. How specifically will you work with districts to gain more graduate students (e.g., secondary business teachers adding master's degrees)? You indicated that the program is unsubscribed and the optimal number is infinite. More specifics on need and program limitations would help.

5. The report doesn't address whether they feel they are currently undersubscribed. While a challenge exists, it should be acknowledged.

Act 10 and the changes to licensure requirements as stipulated by DPI has certainly hurt the program. At the same time, given the number of faculty, increased enrollment would be difficult to support.

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

1. Graduates of the program find employment or continue their education.

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

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

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

3. Program is cognizant of differences in student populations (e.g., full-time/part-time students, working adults, recent undergraduate degree recipients, etc.).

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0
4	Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program effectively tracks graduates of the program.

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

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

Comments

General Comment: There are a lot of webpages with old information. Need to remove these. The homepage for the program is good. <https://www.uww.edu/gradstudies/bused>
<https://www.uww.edu/Documents/gradstudies/catalog/2010-2012/Business%20And%20Marketing%20Education%20Degree%20Program.pdf>

Given the small number of graduates, the program should be able to track and report for 100% of its graduates with regard to employment without reliance on the university's alumni survey results.

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

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

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

Comments

1. Specifics about competitive advantage would be beneficial for the program to identify in order to use them to develop marketing plans. Quality faculty/staff is important. How is that different than other programs in UW system and private colleges?

More evidence is needed here.

Faculty retention is a minus

Are there other similar programs in the state? I thought you said in another section there were not many. If this is true, that's a competitive advantage.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: Graduate Faculty Characteristics

1. Characteristics of the faculty (e.g., gender, ethnicity, rank, percentage of time devoted to the program and course responsibilities) are clearly indicated.

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
4	Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

2. Expectations, preparation, and work experience of the graduate faculty are conducive to the effective delivery of the program.

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

3. The program has identified how changes in the composition of the graduate faculty have affected the program (if relevant).

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
4	Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

4. The program has identified staffing needs and pending changes that may affect the delivery of the program.

1	Sufficient Evidence	4
2	Some/Partial Evidence	2

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

Comments 4. "Growing our own" may be a viable solution to addressing faculty shortage.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: Teaching & Learning Enhancement

1-2. Graduate faculty engage in activities to enhance teaching, advising, involvement in course or curricular revision, new course development, etc.

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

Comments

1-2. LEARN center is praised and noted in narrative but is not in any of the activities of the faculty/staff in the table.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities

1-2. Graduate faculty engage in scholarly/creative activity in ways that support or advance the graduate program.

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0
4	Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

Scholarship and presentation activity is especially commendable given teaching load.

With high teaching load/advising responsibilities, the presentations by the one faculty member and the publication are good.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: External Funding

1-2. Graduate faculty pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts in ways that support or advance the graduate program.

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

Comments

What is the program’s expectation regarding external funding?

None pursued. Other program priorities in review period.

No reported grant activity nor would be expected given faculty teaching load and expectations of the department and College.

No external funding was sought, so no documentation provided.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: Professional & Public Service

1-2. Graduate faculty engage in professional and public service in ways that benefit internal and external constituencies.

1	Sufficient Evidence	6
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
4	Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments Commendable service!

IV. Resource Availability & Development: Resources for Students in the Program

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

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

Comments Need additional faculty member.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings

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

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

Comments

Consider alternatives to a computer lab such as Bring Your Own Device or occasional lab use in McGraw. Virtualization is now a campus service that provides access to many software packages on BYOD.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Program strengths are discussed.

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

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

1		Sufficient Evidence	6
2		Some/Partial Evidence	0
4		Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
3		No/Limited Evidence	0

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

1		Sufficient Evidence	6
2		Some/Partial Evidence	0
3		No/Limited Evidence	0
4		Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

The program's close connection to schools and the state's dept. of education give it an excellent perspective on the goals and objectives it must pursue and ties the curriculum closely to practice.

Small, dedicated faculty; rich history of program; need for the program in the state (only one of two programs); contributions of faculty to the profession and the community.

Strengths are the program understanding the nature of the areas specific needs for graduate students (i.e., need for first licensed graduate students, need for currently licensed business educators to earn a master's and become leaders in their districts).

The program has a number of scholarships. The program has identified its need to aggressively recruit more students. An advisory board is in existence and is being utilized.

Curriculum appears to be thoughtfully designed and updated.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

Increase enrollment, increase marketing of program, increase faculty, align learning outcomes across areas.

3. Recommended Actions

1. Develop a strategic plan for where the program is headed in terms of enrollments, market, online presence and faculty membership. Work with the college to obtain guidance and resources needed to develop this plan. The plan should include enrollment goals and strategies, and strategies for marketing the program.

2. Assessment: Focus assessment on a few specific SLOs with data that can be easily reported in a report.

- Work with the college to further develop and refine program SLOs that align with WI Teaching Standards but that are assessable.
- Work with the college to develop a comprehensive assessment plan to guide program assessment.
- Implement the embedded assignments.
- Clearly articulate a process for discussing and making use of assessment data.

4. Other Questions

Could undergraduates in Business Education incorporate 9 graduate credits (at undergraduate tuition) as a part of their BSE so as to “hook” them into the Master’s program? Special Education is working toward such a pathway.

Should the program move away from a path to licensure toward a focus on career enhancement, diversifying of one’s background and resume, and leading to other career options (e.g. teaching business as faculty at a technical college or as a lecturer at a university)?

Could this degree also be useful to a corporate trainer?

5. Other Comments

Identify school districts that still reward teachers for graduate degrees and market to them. Explore a cohort model with anchor school districts.

6. Recommended Result

1	Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
2	Continuation without qualification	0
3	Continuation with minor concerns	5

4	Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress reports to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress in addressing the major concerns	1
5	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
6	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
7	Non-continuation of the program	0

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Graduate Program Audit and Review Committee
Minutes for MS Business Education
Progress Report Follow-up Meeting**

**1-2 PM, February 27, 2020
Hyland Hall 2303**

Meeting attended by: Karla Saeger (Program Coordinator), Denise Roseland, Andy Yu (Review Team Chair) Matt Vick (Interim Associate Dean, Graduate Studies), Catherine Chan (Assessment representative)

1. Regarding Recommendation #1 Strategic Plan
 - Program Coordinator Dr. Karla Saeger and Faculty Dr. Denise Roseland provided solid information on how to recruit students and updated the competitiveness of this program in the nation. The online courses may help attract more students. The first cohort of students as planned will be starting in the summer of 2020.
 - The program is making great progress as the timeline showed in the progress report submitted (Oct. 2019).
 - The committee also provided feedback on how to improve the self-study report for 2021, such as organizing/analyzing survey data to identify improvement opportunities. More information collection is in progress.

2. Regarding Recommendation #2 SLOs
 - The program has developed a great, detailed plan on how to measure students' learning outcomes (SLOs). The committee highly commended the great effort of the program coordinator and faculty. The SLOs data will be collected beginning in the summer of 2020 (from the 1st Cohort students) and presented in the self-study report in 2021.
 - The program also specifically maps SLOs with specific courses as the committee suggested.

3. The program and committee agreed with the evaluation comments and results (self-study report due in 2021) below.

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Yu (Committee Chair and Recorder)

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Progress Report
Graduate Program, 2019-2020
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Program Name: Business Education

Date of Review Team Meeting: December 12, 2019

Date of Follow-Up Meeting: February 27, 2020 Time: 1-2pm Location: Hyland Hall 2303

Evaluations submitted by: Andy Yu, David Wachanga, Matthew Vick, Christine Neddenriep, Elena Levy-Navarro, Catherine Chan

Review meeting attended by: Andy Yu, Matthew Vick, Christine Neddenriep, and Catherine Chan

Recommendation #1

Develop a strategic plan for where the program is headed in terms of enrollments, market, online presence and faculty membership. Work with the college to obtain guidance and resources needed to develop this plan. The plan should include enrollment goals and strategies, and strategies for marketing the program.

Recommendation #1 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

Good Progress	5
Making Progress	1
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #1

- The submitted document speaks in the future about activities that are presumably completed. It would be good to mention that the program is on the path to achieve its strategic plan. Also, the survey results could be attached.
- The program's redevelopment is in the CourseLeaf approval stream.
- Congratulations to the program for developing the strategic plan and having a clear timeline for implementation.
- Great progress for sure. I can see how you are going to promote this program. Please make the great points explicit in your marketing strategies.

Recommendation #2

Assessment: Focus assessment on a few specific SLOs with data that can be easily reported in a report. Work with the college to further develop and refine program SLOs that align with WI Teaching Standards but that are assessable. Work with the college to develop a comprehensive assessment plan to guide program assessment. Implement the embedded assignments. Clearly articulate a process for discussing and making use of assessment data.

Recommendation #2 Overall Evaluation (please select your choice).

Making Progress	5
Good Progress	1
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #2

- Given that courses are already being developed and that there is a plan to develop new courses, it would be ideal if there was a sense of which SLOs would be examined through which classes.
- The new program objectives appear to be relevant, integrated, and measurable.
- I commend the program for developing a set of SLOs. Some of the stated SLOs may be more difficult to assess. I look forward to seeing the more developed/mature assessment plan and the initial assessment data.
- SLOs were already developed so the program is making some progress. However, the report stated the program's assessment work is still in progress. Accordingly, the implementation and using assessment data are still pending.

Recommendations for next review. Additional progress reports required?

Yes, Please List Due Dates (e.g. in 1 year, 2 years)?	2
No	4

Additional comments:

- The next self-study is due in 2021.
- Please do emphasize your response to our further comments in your next A&R report. Keep up the great work!
- Please talk about the plan to relaunch the program.
- Please elaborate on the target market (of your students).
- This program should continue steps toward revision and reactivation (accepting students).
- More discussion of the student demand and enrolled students.
- More development of the assessment plan with a specific strategy on which SLO will be assessed in which classes.
- Please provide an update on the development of the program's assessment plan, including the embedded signature assignments mentioned in this progress report.
- Please elaborate on the processes for reviewing assessment data and decision-making.

****Next FULL Self-Study is due to the College Deans on October 1, 2021 and by November 1, 2020 to the Assessment Office.**