

**Meeting Minutes for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Operations & Supply Chain Management Majors and Minors, 2017-2018**

Date: 4/18/2018
Time: 3:30-4:30PM
Place: HH4303

Attended: Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean John Chenoweth; Department Chair David Munro; Program Coordinator Manohar Madan; Faculty and staff in the Operations & Supply Chain Management program Anna Land, Rick Pues, Sameer Prasad, David Munro, Anto Verghese; Audit & Review Team Chair Yeongmin Kim; Audit & Review team members Barbara Bren, Ahmad Karim, Joan Littlefield Cook

- 1) Meeting was called to order at 3:30pm
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
Strengths of the program identified by the review team were shared by Kim. These included the program's successful merger with the IT program, a high demand for graduates in the market and the program's success in meeting this demand, success in recruiting diverse faculty, strong faculty research, good internship and other out-of-classroom opportunities for students, and close ties to local industry and communities. The committee congratulates Sameer Prasad, a faculty member in the program, who won the UW-Whitewater Award for Outstanding Research in 2017.

Program coordinator Madan noted that enrollment is strong, but the most significant program strength is the newly hired faculty and academic staff. The new faculty have taken the lead on increased involvement in case competitions. This involvement has a positive impact on the students involved, as well as on the faculty in their classroom teaching (e.g., increased use of "case-based teaching"), to connections with businesses. Department Chair Munro added that the program has done well in spite of big changes in staffing over the review period.

- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) Assessment.

The self-study mentions AOL and provide scores/percentages for assessment, but it was not clear to the review team what those mean. For each SLO, what direct and indirect measures are being used? Is there need to develop more systematic, direct measures to assess students' outcomes other than content knowledge. How are the SLOs mapped into core courses? How are the SLOs systematically measured in each course?

Kim shared the identified issues related to assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs). The faculty provided documents that show how SLOs are measured in the core courses as students progress toward upper levels. Multiple measures are used to assess each SLO. J. Cook suggested that the program review and consider revising the wording of the SLOs so that they better highlight the higher level thinking skills and connections to industry that are taking place and seem to be the program's focus. Faculty also explained how the assessment data are being used to improve the curriculum.

There was discussion of the opportunities offered to students and how these function as high-impact practices (HIPs), in that they offer students the chance to apply information and to better understand the workplace. About 40% of majors participate in an internship; fewer participate in the case competitions, but there is increasing interest in both and the number of students in these opportunities is expected to

increase. There was discussion of how these activities could be expanded in their impact and made available to all students. Finally, the program will host the national case competition in an upcoming year, which will encourage greater student involvement and bring national attention to the program.

b) Enrollment and Resources.

Oversized classes (especially ITSCM 306, which is an important avenue to promote the program to the COBE students) and infrequent offering of core courses (only once a year) can be significant barriers to schedule flexibility, thus to students' success and graduation on time. What would be the short-term and long-term solutions?

Kim shared the identified issues related to enrollment and resources. Faculty shared some of the challenges in meeting the increasing needs of the students in the program, and the need for an additional faculty position was discussed. With regard to challenges, the course in which students are primarily recruited to the major (306) has increased in size from 35 to 65. In addition, due to staffing limitations, only one 400-level course can be offered each semester. The program would like to offer additional sections of 306 to reduce class size and offer additional sections of 400-level courses. These problems are expected to become more significant as enrollment increases. Finally, there was discussion of the potential opportunity afforded to the program by new businesses in the region, including FoxConn and Snap-On Tools. With sufficient resources and support, the program could move to offering online courses to these companies and/or offering their program using an additional locations format within the companies' physical facilities.

c) Recruiting a more diverse student population.

The self-study talks about some plans to recruit more female students, but "pull" concept may not be sufficient for active recruitment strategy. Also, there is not much discussion of the diversity in other aspects (racial, income, etc.)

Kim shared the identified issues related to recruiting a more diverse student population. Faculty shared the program's efforts to recruit more female and racially underrepresented students, noting that it has been an ongoing process. There was discussion of how to reach out to more students outside of the campus. Provost Elrod noted the possibility of working with tech colleges (e.g., Blackhawk, Gateway Technical) to create a pathway from their 2-year tech degrees to a 4-year UW-Whitewater degree, and providing certificate programs. Such programs may better serve the needs of the community and nontraditional students. Finally, the program will review the minor program and discuss any needed revisions.

5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists three recommended actions (see page 14, point 4) related to assessment, enrollment, and the program's minor.

6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation without qualification*

- Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
- Because the recommended result of this review is to continue without qualification, the program's next full self-study will be a "short" one focused on the recommended actions from the current report. This short self-study is due **October 1, 2022 to the Dean of the College of Business & Economics and November 1, 2022 to the chair of Audit & Review Committee.**

7) Meeting adjourned at 4:35pm.

Submitted by Yeongmin Kim.

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

Date of Evaluation 3/20/2018

Short Self Study (SS*) _____

Program Operations & Supply Chain Management

Major X

Minor X

Evaluations submitted by: Review Team Chair Yeongmin Kim, Barbara Bren, Ahmad Karim, Joan Littlefield Cook

Review meeting attended by: Yeongmin Kim, Barbara Bren, 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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

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

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

Comments

2. The program offers courses in the MBA program, some of the program's faculty participate in the DBA program, and the program offers ITSCM 306 Operations Management, one of the upper division core business courses required of all business majors, including the integrated science/business major.
3. The faculty/instructional staff represent diverse backgrounds (three of the five are of Indian origin) and have used their multicultural backgrounds in the curriculum, e.g., developing a model for health care service delivery in India. The program has plans to improve recruitment of female and minority students.
4. As stated in the self-study, there are responses to comments--29 of them--from the previous review report (2013), but no list of, nor responses to, recommended actions. Were there none?

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

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

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

6. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate.

Sufficient Evidence	0
---------------------	---

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

Comments

- Mission statement is good. I was expecting to see "problem solving skills" specifically mentioned, but this is certainly implied.
- It shows what the program did over the last 5 years, but they should be clarified and linked to the program objectives.
- What kinds of data are collected?
- Program has regular meetings to discuss, set, and monitor progress toward meeting goals.
- I especially like the way this is worded in the vision section: "to facilitate knowledge exchange between academia, industry experts, and our students..." This reflects a good emphasis on contributing to as well as learning from industry, and keeping the student in the process.
- Mission was revised during review period. I appreciate that it includes partnership with industries and the community.
- No data for faculty.
- Good awards for students. Anything for the faculty, or the program as a whole (are any program-level awards, recognition available)?
- No report of recognition/awards for faculty/staff, but two presentations by UWW students at India Development Service (IDS) Midwest Student Conference in 2013 were selected "IDS Scholars" based on the quality of the presentations. There were seven presentations selected. <http://idsusa.org/midwest-student-conferences/2013-midwest-student-conference/>
- More information on the COBE accreditation process is needed (for ITSCM 306 Operations Management).
- No program-specific accreditation, other than CoBE's AACSB accreditation. The program is not geared toward students passing specific certification exams.

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

Comments

1. No explanation of how the curriculum is both efficient and purposeful.
1. The program offers a project management emphasis. The 2018-19 online course catalog lists a Supply Chain Management minor (<http://uww-public.courseleaf.com/undergraduate/business-economics/management/professional-business-supply-chain-management-minor/>), which is not on the web page listing undergraduate majors and minors (<http://www.uww.edu/academics/departments-and-majors>). But it is listed among the College's minors with a LINK TO planning sheet (<http://www.uww.edu/cobe/undergrad/minors>)
2. No dual listed courses.
3. The curricular changes were made on the basis of industry needs and faculty areas of expertise, which is fine. But I didn't see any mention of considering assessment data in making the changes. What are the assessment of student learning data telling you about students' knowledge and skills (e.g., content knowledge, but also skills in problem solving, teamwork, writing, oral communication, critical thinking, analysis, etc.), and how is this information being considered in changes to courses or to assignments and activities WITHIN courses?
4. About how many students participate in UG research, in presentations to industry? The opportunities for students are good, but could be expanded to involve more students (hopefully the capstone will be a good vehicle for this).
4. No discussion of how those activities has impacted the university and the community.
4. In addition to the case competition, elsewhere in the self-study the APICS student organization is mentioned. What percentage of the majors participate in that? The link to it from the CoBE web listing of student organizations fails (<http://www.uww.edu/cobe/aboutthecollege/studentorgs>), although I see it in OrgSync with information about certification and a guest speaker. I'm happy to see 50% of the students do an internship.
5. Online 306 course passed Quality Matters and student feedback is collected and reviewed. There is no information about what types of modifications have been made as a result, only that the course instructor "regularly modify" it.

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

1. Given the mission and vision statements, I'm surprised that there are no SLOs related to intercultural knowledge and competence or to civic engagement (if that can be defined as community engagement).
1. It would be useful to do a curriculum map to identify where each specific SLO is introduced, developed and assessed within the curriculum. This often helps identify SLOs that are not being explicitly addressed in courses or, conversely, where you are addressing SLOs that aren't specifically listed (e.g., writing, oral communication, analysis, teamwork, synthesis).
- 1-2. SLOs are given, mostly couched in terms of 'identify', 'define', and 'apply' specific topics in the field. This is fine, but I'm not seeing where some of the ELOs listed are being assessed (e.g., problem solving, written communication, oral communication). Please clarify where and how you are assessing these more general skills, particularly direct assessments of student performance.

- 1-2. All the LEAP ELOs are listed as 'assessed by industry via internship program.' Are there any (other) direct performance measures of these skills embedded within course assignments, in the AoL assessments, etc.?
- 2-3. Program learning outcomes are mapped to courses, but these are totally separate from the ELOs the program addresses, which are assessed in the internship (and using senior exit surveys). How do the program SLOs map to the campus baccalaureate ELOs?
3. More information is needed on what data are used for assessment
4. It should be clarified what the numbers mean in the report.
4. The "external ratings from employers" mentioned on page 21--are these from internship supervisors?
4. Please clarify: Are embedded course assignments used to assess any of the SLOs? If so, are scoring rubrics used? And if rubrics are used (e.g., to assess case analyses, problem solutions, etc.), who does the scoring, is there interrater agreement, etc.?
5. Please clarify: on page 27, does "and added 1 quantitate problem" mean that the program discussed the data and made a change to a course by adding an additional quantitative problem? or does it mean that an additional quantitative problem was used as part of the assessment?
5. (Page 30) When the program says they start with AoL (from all sources), does this mean they are combining the college and program-level assessments? Or are they relying on the college-level assessments?
6. Consider sharing a summary of the SLO assessment with students in early courses, and in the capstone.

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

3 & 6. Students are alerted to pay attention to the schedule of required courses, since many of them are offered only one semester.

4. Recruiting additional diverse students is a goal of the program.

5. Data should be presented.

6. More information is needed on what the program actually does.

6-7. There was concern expressed about the possible effect on majors completing their degree in a timely manner because of increasing enrollment in 306, which is required of all business majors. Currently the program is able to accommodate its majors.

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

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

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

Comments

1. Placement is nearly 100%!

2. Excellent use of employment projections resources.

3. Good use of student organization and social media to keep in touch with alumni.

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

Comments

There are 6 other UW campuses that offer SCM as a major, concentration, specialization or emphasis, according to MajorMania (<http://majormania.uwex.edu/>). We do have a newish facility. I like the description of faculty/staff as having expertise from academics and industry and the description of the program as being "highly engaged" with local business and communities, with an advantage of proximity to major business and population centers. This is an advantage for internships and subsequent job placement.

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

Comments

3-4. There have been three new hires during the review period (of 5 positions), which have brought desired expertise to the program. There is some concern about the increasing enrollment in 306, a course required of all business majors, and the effect it may have on providing other courses in the program. Additional concern is the class size for 306. Many required courses are offered only once per year. The program would prefer to add 1-2 sections of 306 and be able to offer an additional required course each semester.

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

Comments

- 1-2. The new tenure-track hires participate in the First Year program. The tenured faculty participate in AACSB curriculum development workshops.
2. No information on program's expectations of teaching and advising.
- Any participation in LEARN Center sessions, campus programs/initiatives (e.g., Growth mindset meetings)?

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

Comments

- 1-2. Faculty and academic staff are meeting expectations set by the AACSB accrediting body.

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

Comments

1. Data are outdated.

- 1-2. The unfunded NSF grants listed were prior to the review period. It is noted in the self-study that most research in this area does not require investment in facilities or technologies, although earlier in the report it was also noted that the program does not have resources to help defray the costs of travel study for students. It also was noted that there has been successful internal funding for student research projects.

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

Comments

- 1-2. Three of the five people on the table have been here 1 year. It might have been helpful, for a five-year program review, to have included other people who were here during the review period. But it's clear that both of the new tenure-track hires are active reviewers for journals (i.e., active in service to profession).

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

Comments

1. Concern was expressed about the increasing enrollment in 306, which is required of all business majors, and the future impact it may have on the program's ability to offer required courses for the major. So far the program offers many of its required courses once per year, and students are alerted to pay attention to the schedule. The program would prefer to offer 1 more major course per semester to improve flexibility for students.

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

Comments

1. Hyland Hall, as a state-of-the-art facility, was mentioned as a comparative advantage for the program.

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

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

Comments

3. Incorporation of certification content into courses seems advantageous. The APICS student organization encourages certification (<https://uwwapics.wordpress.com/certification/>).

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

- The program has gone through a successful transition to merging with IT.
- There seems to be high demand for the graduates in the market and the program has been improving to meet the demand.
- The program was successful in recruiting diverse, qualified faculty.
- Employment outlook and near 100% placement of graduates. Internship opportunities, close ties to local industry and communities, and out-of-classroom opportunities (APICS, case competitions).
Implementation of capstone course. Diverse, active faculty who incorporate their connections into the student experience. Advisory Board sounds like a useful resource for the program
- Strong research. Good teaching. Strong professional and community outreach.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- The assessment data used are not clearly articulated in the self-study. It mentions AOL and provide scores/percentages, but it was not clear to the review time what those mean. It seems that the program primarily relies on multiple-choice exams for assessment data; if that is the case, the program needs to develop more systematic, direct measures to assess students' outcomes other than content knowledge.
- How SLOs are mapped into core courses, and how SLOs are systematically measured in those courses should be clearly articulated.
- Oversized classes (especially ITSCM 306, which is an important avenue to promote the program to the COBE students) and infrequent offering of core courses (only once a year) can be significant barriers to schedule flexibility, thus to students' success and graduation on time. The self-study suggests offering 1-2 additional sections of 306 and 1 additional required course every semester. More specific plans are needed to address this challenge.
- Recruiting a more diverse student population. The self-study talks about some plans to recruit more female students, but "pull" concept may not be sufficient for active recruitment strategy. Also, there is not discussion of the diversity in other aspects (racial, income, etc.)
- - As the self-study points out, incorporating certification content into courses and growing internship opportunities can be beneficial to the program.

3. Other comments/questions

- -Has the move to centralized advising freed up faculty/staff time for other activities?
- -Cost was raised as a barrier to travel study, but offering more online courses was listed as a recommendation for reaching more diverse students. But online courses cost students more too. Do they have some kind of data indicating students want more online courses from them? Does teaching 306 online allow for more students?
- How do the credits for the major add up? I see 22 for CoBE requirements and 27 for the major. With GenEd credits (60), this adds to 109, but 120 are required for graduation. Am I missing something?

4. Recommended Actions

1. Assessment:
 - a. Review program SLOs and revise as needed to reflect the general skills mentioned in the mission and vision statements (written and oral communication skills, teamwork, global/intercultural knowledge).
 - b. Develop a curriculum map to identify where each SLO is introduced, developed, and assessed within the program's curriculum. (A clear map that links mission, SLOs, curriculum, and assessment strategies)
 - c. Provide details about the methods used to assess each SLO (e.g., rubrics applied to student assignments? scores on test items?), or develop such methods if not currently existing. Also consider developing benchmarks for each measure.
2. Examine enrollment trends and work with the college to secure necessary resources to support further program growth. Closely monitor enrollment demand for 306 and other required courses in the major, to determine if the trends justify proposing changes in staffing and/or course scheduling.
3. Review the Supply Chain Management minor.

5. Recommended Result*

Continuation without qualification	X*
Continuation with minor concerns.	
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.	

* Because the recommended result of this review is to continue without qualification, the program's next full self-study will be a "short" one focused on the recommended actions from the current report. This short self-study is due **October 1, 2022 to the Dean of the College of Business & Economics and November 1, 2022 to the chair of Audit & Review Committee.**