

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
International Business Majors, 2017-2018**

Date: March 6, 2018

Time: 2:00-3:00pm

Place: HH4303

Attended: Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean John Chenoweth; Department Chair Dave Munro; Program Coordinator Andrew Ciganek; faculty and staff in the International Business program Carol Scovotti; Audit & Review Team Chair Eric Appleton; Audit & Review team members Katy Casey, Ahmad Karim, Joan Littlefield Cook.

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
 - a) Note that for a first self-study, it was substantial, well-done, and that we appreciate the work of the program's coordinator and sole permanent member, Dr. Ciganek. Congratulations.
 - b) The program appears to be on solid footing, and most of the A&R committee's concerns and questions are those brought up by the program itself in the self-study.
 - c) For the program to move forward, it appears that establishment of advisory bodies needs to occur; is there a timetable for the creation of these committees, and does the program need external assistance in accomplishing these goals? Once these committees are in place, it is expected that data collection, discussion, distribution, and action are likely to be more effective.
 - d) Once the advisory bodies are in place, the program notes that curricular review and further assessment activities can/will occur; are there SLO review or other assessment activities that are being considered in the meantime, and how would the program go about implementing them? The A&R committee has minor concerns about how the current data is presented (e.g. disaggregation of data found in some of the tables), and whether additional embedded assessment activities (projects and assignments as opposed to surveys and tests) are possible given the fact that courses are distributed among a variety of departments and other programs.
 - e) Beyond the establishment of advisory bodies and curricular review, are there any other long term goals (5, 10 year) that the program can outline?
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation
 - a) Program appreciates positive response to report; notes that program should not be a "one-person-show;" needs to move to a more sustainable model. Assistance would help on a variety of different tasks such as curriculum review and setting of program goals. Internal committee has role to play on goals, assessment activities. External committee has role in influencing progress. Establishment of both bodies is essential.
 - b) Growth in majors and minors has been consistent despite not having much early engagement with students (sophomores); how can the program do a better job of self-promotion? The program has potential to be a leader in international efforts once it moves beyond one-person model.
 - c) There was discussion of competition and priorities among programs; how can the program be promoted on front end of recruitment efforts?
 - d) Big challenge for program is language and study abroad requirements. Decision to enter program needs to be made by freshman year because of prerequisites. Are there majors that pair well with this program, either in or beyond CoBE?
- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists three (3) recommended actions (see page 14, point 4) related to establishing advisory bodies, curriculum and student learning outcome review, and program strategic planning.
- 6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns.*

- **Progress Report due to dean by March 1, 2020 and to the A&R Committee by March 15, 2020**, focusing on the implementation of the Advisory Board and the Internal Committee. As the current self-study is the program's first self-study, and knowing the size of the program with its reliance upon contributing instructors from an array of departments, this progress report is intended to be a check-in with the program to see how their plans are progressing.
- The program's next full self-study is due to the College Dean by October 1, 2022 and to the A&R Committee by November 1, 2022.

7) Adjourned at 3:00pm.

Submitted by Eric Appleton

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

Date of Evaluation 11/14/2017 Self Study (SS) _____
 Program International Business Major X Minor _____

Evaluations submitted by: Katy Casey, Ahmad Karim, Joan Cook, Eric Appleton

Review meeting attended by: Eric Appleton, Louise Tourigny, Katy Casey, Ahmad Karim, 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	4
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	1
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	1

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

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

Comments

2. The program does not offer courses for students outside the major
2. Do students outside the major take any courses cross-listed with International Business? Does the minor pair with other CoBE majors?
2. as an interdisciplinary degree it would be good to hear more specifics on how the program is connected through courses to the contributing programs and departments
2. How does the Int. Bus. Minor support other majors? Would like information on the minor included in future self-studies and reports.
3. Is 'international content' the same as fostering inclusive excellence? It is stated that COBE outcomes include cultural competencies and global awareness -- it would be good to have a few specifics and examples from this particular program
4. This is the program's first A&R self-study.

4. Despite not having recommended actions from A&R to respond to, the program has done a good job of developing an assessment plan, and of further developing/revising the curricula based on feedback from students.
4. While this is the first self-study for the program, an assessment plan was laid out as a request from the Dean; good to see a plan laid out and actions having already been taken.

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

1. The mission and objections are clear and to the point; earlier, 'cultural competencies and global awareness' were mentioned as IE goals -- I wonder how this is expressed through the objectives?
- 2 & 3. The process to set program goals was clearly described. However, it is not clear if the goals were worked on during the review period. In addition, it appears only the program coordinator is responsible for goal setting

and review; that seems like a big undertaking. Are other faculty involved in program implementation or coordination?

2. Any annual goals addressed?
3. The current process for setting and assessing goals is a bit vague. Need a clearer and more sustainable process.
3. Data collection and assessment of goals lies with the program coordinator; how are decisions implemented throughout the program, especially since the courses are housed in different departments?
4. Maybe it is too soon for the program to have a revised vision (?)
4. Specific goals are being considered.
4. What is the overall vision of where the program wants to go over the next few years, where it wants to be in five years? For example, do you want to increase enrollment, increase emphasis on any specific aspects of the program, add any emphasis areas?
4. Is there a timeline for the establishment of the advisory board? Curious -- why has there been no movement on this since 2014 and the closing of the Global Business Resource Center?
5. Have any faculty members associated with the programs, or student received/earned any recognition or awards?
6. Please state that accreditation is not available for the program.

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	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
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)	4

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

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

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

Comments

1. When do students do their Study Abroad experience? Does the 4-year plan take this requirement into consideration?
 1. I found the advising sheets to be clear and practical.
 2. The program does not offer dual-listed courses.
 3. The program is too new to have revised the curriculum.
 3. No curricular changes were made. Was this because the data did not indicate that any were needed? Because the program is new enough that there hasn't been enough data to make adequately informed decisions about changes? I'm trying to get a sense of if/how data are used.
 4. Student org is in place. Community service is required, study abroad is required, and internships are available.
 4. What data have told you that the international work aspect of the internship is "a difficult threshold for students to meet"? Has the program discussed how to address this difficulty?
 5. The program does not offer online courses, but the online courses that students take as part of the overall degree are adequately assessed.

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

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

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

Comments

1. The first two columns of the map have Is and Ds, but no As -- where in the program are these outcomes assessed? Can they be assessed within the program? Similarly, column 3 has only an A -- where is the intro and development for this happening?
1. Please add the 2 additional SLOs to the assessment plan listing. Consider whether these 2 new SLOs need to be rephrased so they are more clearly measurable.
1. What does "firm content knowledge" mean? Is there a way to rephrase this to clarify the SLO?
1. I encourage the program to review the curriculum map and complete it. For example, the two newer SLOs are not shown as being assessed anywhere, and the first one is not shown as being introduced. The 3rd SLO (...apply firm content knowledge...) is not introduced or developed anywhere. If these SLOs are introduced and developed in courses from other departments, the program needs to consider how they will know if the SLOs are adequately addressed in the curriculum.
- 1 & 2. It is unclear why 2 SLOs are added in the response to Q1 and left off of Q2. Does the program have 3 or 5 SLOs?
2. Only 3 of the 5 outcomes from the map are included in the table. Are there opportunities for more embedded assessment activities?
3. A good, basic assessment plan; looking forward to seeing growth and fine-tuning.
3. Ah -- sort of an answer to 1 and 2 -- language and travel outcomes are 'objectively attained by students that satisfy all requirements for the IBM'. Again, are there more embedded assessment activities possible within the program?
3. Please elaborate on what you mean by the 2 newer SLOs are "objectively attained by students that satisfy all requirements..." My interpretation is that this means that if students pass the program's courses, then by definition they have achieved these SLOs. How do you verify that this is the case?
4. Nice that the program has a pre- and post-test for SLO #5 (apply). What does this analysis tell you about specific skills that students are/are not good at applying?
4. Where are the averages for International Business majors in the table on page 10? Are the percentages in this table for all CoBE students? The data need to be disaggregated.
4. The data provided for SLO 2 (content knowledge) is not clear. What do the percentages represent? In addition, it would have been helpful to review the assessment tools used to collect these data (e.g., pre-post assessment).
4. In Table 1, what percentage (I assume these are percent corrects?) is considered 'acceptable', 'good', etc.?
4. Good use of campus rubrics (writing, speaking) and SOAS data.
4. It seems the two main tools are test/surveys and reflection. There is discussion of revising the multiple choice tool, but were there any curricular/course changes that came about because of the use of this tool? Is 7.19 a good enough average score?
5. It's not clear who discusses the data and when, how data-based decisions are made. Need more information on the process of talking about and using assessment data.
5. At this point, assessment seems geared toward data collection; no adjustments have been recommended. It appears that scoring averages are on the good side; however, it seems that most of the testing/survey are at the ends of the program (capstone, etc.) -- is there any way to do assessment at a midpoint of the program to catch possible concerns earlier?
5. The evaluation of this program seems to be the responsibility of one faculty member
6. I'm not sure what it means that the "data are available" to others. Are the data presented at AOL/assessment committee meetings, to students (e.g., in the student org meetings)? If advisory board is reconstituted, make sure to share data on student learning with that group.

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

1. Good growth in enrollment.
3. I assume that the graduation rate reflects the enrollment rate, and that the 10 graduates noted for 2015-16 reflect the program's lower enrollment from a few years ago.
4. Program doesn't seem to make recruitment efforts on its own. To what extent does it leverage the efforts of the college (e.g., talk to students in the Summer Business Institute; participate in Business Mentor program)?
5. I don't understand the data on pages 13 and 14. In one place, the program is listed as having 65% white (so a very high percentage of non-white students), but in another place the program is listed as having 84% white. Am I misunderstanding something? How are we to read 'signification variations' in Table 1?
7. Not sure the question was answered.
7. There are no claims of over/under subscription; since the program utilizes courses from COBE to fulfill requirements, 'few constraints exist on program growth.'

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

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

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

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

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

Comments

3. Tracking is done through Career and Leadership office; with the nature of the program it wouldn't appear the program itself has the resources to track graduates.

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

Comments

1. Eau Claire, La Crosse, and Madison campuses have comparable programs. First, what might attract a student to Whitewater over those campuses, and second, how does the program differ from any offered by private universities or colleges? Is this the sort of program that students, regardless of institution, only really become aware of as an option in second or third years?

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

Comments

3-4. It is worth noting that the program may benefit from collaboration among a small group of faculty who teach in this program. To have program goals, evaluation, analysis, and tracking lie solely in one faculty member does not seem appropriate.

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

Comments

1-2. Three faculty members have no activities listed. Can I assume they simply did not report activities to the report preparer?

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

Comments

The faculty should be commended for their commitment to scholarship.

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

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

Comments

None

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	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3

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

Comments

- 1-2. no listings to two faculty members -- was the info not reported for inclusion in the report?
 1-2. There was not an explanation of program/department or college expectations in this area.

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

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

Comments

None

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program**1. Program strengths are discussed.**

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

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	4
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	0
No	3

Comments

1. Which components of the 2017-12 Strategic Plan? Are these the same as those just referred to in section 1.A.?
2. Is there a timeline for the creation of the internal committee and the advisory board?
3. Is there a timeline for the comprehensive curriculum review mentioned?

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

The program is interdisciplinary, which allows students choice and freedom when completing the major. The program goals are clear and the program has a structure in place to analyze student data.

Excellent instructors. Strong research background. Good potential.

Growing enrollment.

It looks like this program draws upon the strengths of its participating departments to build a compelling curriculum. Being the first self-study generated by the program, it appears that things are generally in order -- an assessment plan is in place, curricular mapping has begun, advising has been revamped, requirements for the major outlined clearly, foreign language requirement, etc.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

As the author indicated, the program would benefit from an internal committee to help review the program and SLO data. In addition, an external advisory board would be beneficial.

The data provided on SLOs was not clearly described; would like more explanation on data used. The reporting is appreciated, but would like more insight on the data and tools used to collect it (such as disaggregating the page 10 table)

Assessment plan needs to be furthered developed and fully implemented.

The program needs to develop a sustainable process for program planning, as well as for gathering, discussing, and making use of assessment data.

As noted in the report, the program has three major tasks ahead of it:

- 1) creation of the advisory board,
- 2) creation of an internal committee to
- 3) complete a full curriculum review.

Beyond those items,

- 4) It was also noted that there were concerns about elective flexibility/availability and
- 5) There were challenges in placing students in international internships (the threshold for half of internship hours being 'international work.'). It would be good to know if a timeline has been/can be established for these tasks.

Look for places to embed some assessment tools (rather than surveys or tests). This would require collaboration with the programs and departments which house the various courses. As further data is gathered, it will be interesting to see what conclusions are drawn and how changes (if deemed necessary) are implemented.

3. Other comments/questions

Since the program notes that the internal committee 'must' be established to facilitate curricular review, I am recommending continuation with minor concerns, primarily so that the Audit and Review committee can be updated on the progress of this process before the next scheduled full self-study.

The A&R review committee would like to note that for a program with a single faculty member not only running the program but preparing the self-study, the self-study reflected much good work – both from a program organizational aspect as well as the general clarity of the report. As the program’s first self-study, it appears that a solid structure is in place. The committee is optimistic about the program’s future.

4. Recommended Actions

1. Establish advisory bodies:
 - a. Consult with dean on creation of external advisory board; establish timetable for implementation
 - b. Establish Internal Committee for program activities; establish timetable for implementation
 - c. Implement a sustainable process for sharing data with relevant stakeholders
2. Once Internal Committee is established, begin curriculum and SLO review, which should include SLO clarification. Adjust assessment plans as evidence is reviewed.
3. Create a Vision/Strategic Plan to address specific program goals in the next 5 to 10 years

5. Recommended Result*

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.	
Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	

***Progress Report due to the Dean of the College of Business & Economics by March 1, 2020 and to the A&R Committee by March 15, 2020**, focusing on the implementation of the Advisory Board and the Internal Committee. As the current self-study is the program’s first self-study, and knowing the size of the program with its reliance upon contributing instructors from an array of departments, this progress report is intended to be a check-in with the program to see how their plans are progressing.

The program’s next full self-study is due to the Dean of the College of Business & Economics by October 1, 2022 and to the A&R Committee by November 1, 2022.

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

Due to circumstances surrounding COVID-19, this program did not have a Follow-Up meeting for their 2019-2020 review. The document below is considered the program's follow-up report for the 2019-20 audit and review cycle. Please refer to a document on our website titled "Audit and Review and COVID" for further information.

Program Name: International Business

Date of Review Team Meeting: April 14, 2020

Date of Follow-Up Meeting: TBD Time: TBD Location: Webex

Evaluations submitted by: Yamin Ahmad, Katy Casey, Ahmad Karim, Tom Klubertanz

Review meeting attended by: Yamin Ahmad, Katy Casey, Ahmad Karim, Tom Klubertanz, S.A. Welch (Chair)

Recommendation #1

1. Establish advisory bodies:
 - a. Consult with dean on creation of external advisory board; establish timetable for implementation
 - b. Establish Internal Committee for program activities; establish timetable for implementation
 - c. Implement a sustainable process for sharing data with relevant stakeholders

Recommendation #1 Overall Evaluation

Good Progress	5
Making Progress	
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #1

- Advisory board scheduled to convene in April 2020
- The external advisory group has been created, but has yet to meet. Were there difficulties in creating this group?
 - Explanations of how that group will function, how it will be coordinated, and how their inputs will be considered were not provided in the progress report. However, the review team noted that more clarity in the recommendation would have helped the program address these issues.
- The original recommendation specified only that the external group be investigated by the program and Dean and with regards to that recommendation, the program was successful. It sounds like the internal committee has a sustainable structure and that group's efforts will help steer the program.
- The program has made good progress towards addressing the first recommended action. They have established both the external and internal committees, including a timeline for activities for the internal committee. They are using a combination of Canvas and Google Drive to share data with stakeholders.

Recommendation #2

Once Internal Committee is established, begin curriculum and SLO review, which should include SLO clarification. Adjust assessment plans as evidence is reviewed.

Recommendation #2 Overall Evaluation

Good Progress	1
Making Progress	4
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #2

- This recommendation from the last full self-study review is unclear to me. In reading the self-study report, it seems there was confusion on the number of SLOs. I would like to see a complete list, if there are more than the three written. In addition, there seemed to be some desire for the program to report out what it was learning from the data. However, the program includes robust and authentic embedded assessments.
- The program deserves credit for implementing a new assessment tool that was something other than a test or a survey. The A&R team appreciates that the program implemented this new assessment tool that stemmed from the previous self-study. Though the progress report did not provide as much detail as I would like, the idea of evaluating student presentations to area businesses is welcomed.
- The progress report does not clarify how all of the SLOs are connected to assessment. The example of the curricular change BEINDP 200 needed a complete explanation, rooted in assessment. The next self-study will need both clarity and detail in helping the program establish sound assessment of its students' performance.
- SLO review appears to be ongoing. It is a little unclear whether the SLO's themselves are being reviewed (or if this has happened already), or whether the assessment plans/instruments themselves are being changed. Some additional clarification here would be helpful.

Recommendation #3

Create a Vision/Strategic Plan to address specific program goals in the next 5 to 10 years

Recommendation #3 Overall Evaluation

Good Progress	5
Making Progress	0
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #3

- This is a unique program model. I think the collaborative nature of the program provides more diverse and worthwhile experiences for students. It does seem work has been done to communicate regularly with those involved in teaching courses in this program. Specific ways to increase enrollment in the program were also described.

- A list of desired curricular changes was provided, though some of the items listed look like they were initiated prior to writing of the progress report. The list is acceptable on its own as ideas to increase percentage enrollment, but it does not demonstrate that it was created strategically.
- How does each of these connect to strategic goals for the program established by the internal committee?

- The program has a clear vision for where it wants to be in the next few years.

Recommendations for next review. Additional progress reports required?

Yes, Please List Due Dates (e.g. in 1 year, 2 years)?	0
No	5

Additional comments:

The next self-study report should include the following:

- Clearly explain the construction, role, and outcomes of the newly created external advisory group.
- Demonstrate growth in the ability to use assessment data and strategic planning to steer the program.

- The program is to be congratulated for the progress it has made and for its efforts towards assessment.
- For the next self-study, it would be nice to see some additional information on which specific SLOs were revised (if any) and how assessment data was used to inform curricular change.

- While the A&R team requested some specific information, the team would like to compliment the program for its efforts.

***Next FULL Self-Study is due to the College Deans on October 1, 2022 and by November 1, 2022 to the Assessment Office.**