

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
General Management Majors and Minors, 2018-2019**

Date: 5/1/2019

Time: 3:30-4:30pm

Place: Hyland 4303

Attended: Representing Provost's Office & Dean John Chenoweth (Business & Econ); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Jon Werner; Louise Tourigny, Kaviraj Parboteeah, Ruth Hansen, Jim Schnaedter, Rimi Zakaria, Aditya Simha, Soroush Aslani ; Audit & Review Team Chair Bill Miller; Audit & Review team members Ahmad Karim, Catherine Chan

- 1) Call to order
Review Team Chair Bill Miller called the meeting to order at 3:35PM.
- 2) Introductions
Review Team Chair Bill Miller asked members in attendance to introduce themselves and their affiliation.
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
Professor Miller summarized the review team's notes and comments in regards to the program's strengths. It was clear that the program is doing good work towards assessment and is beginning to put that information to use. The review team noted that the program addresses the scope and mission of the university. It has a strong engagement with the local and regional communities and is doing well to meet the demands of the students and the industry. This is reflected in stable enrollments. The program is working to address diversity and inclusion at the level of faculty as well as enrolled students.

After the brief opening comments, Miller invited the department chair and others in attendance to make comments and present any new information or accomplishments. Following brief comments from Chair Jon Werner, the discussion that followed included areas of growth within the program. In particular, there have been increased enrollments and development in areas like Non-Profit Management, Healthcare and Sports Management. This has been reflected in the addition of the new Non-Profit Management minor, among other notable developments. The discussion also included indications of how the program is developing with the recruitment of new faculty and staff members and the plan for introducing them to the assessment plan.

- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) In regards to the assessment plan for the major, the review team had a few questions. Some of the SLOs were worded in a way that would make them challenging to measure (example: "students must understand..."). Could these be revised to maintain the intent while also clarifying and making them more measurable? There also appears to be opportunities to add more direct assessment of SLOs that could continue the good work the program is doing putting indirect assessment to use. Are there plans for more direct assessment? Finally, the program has some recently hired faculty and is planning to replace some faculty that will be retiring. Are there any plans to help new faculty members work their way into the program's assessment plan?

Werner and other faculty shared their strategy for bringing new faculty members on board for the program's assessment plan. This included sharing syllabi from other faculty and directly working with the department chair. It was indicated that during the Fall college retreat that assessment would be addressed and that this would be followed up at the department level. There will be first year faculty mentorship in which assessment will be discussed with an emphasis on how the program incorporates assessment. An example of how the program incorporates assessment information would be through sharing information related to SLOs and how they address LEAP initiatives, including rubrics and potential for common texts.

- b) What is the long-term vision for General Management? How might the vision for the program incorporate things like potential areas of growth or resources and future needs?

Werner and other faculty shared information about the recently approved Non-Profit Management Minor. This area has seen increasing enrollments and there will be new course offerings coming online soon. The minor is working towards accreditation. Other identified areas of growth included Healthcare Management and the new General Management BBA that will be offered online.

- c) It is clear from the report that the program is putting assessment data to use. Are there plans to address the student responses in exit surveys related to “not feeling challenged” or their performance in mathematics?

The faculty present thought that perhaps the courses that are most challenging in the program are those that are part of the college core requirement. It was also indicated that perhaps the survey question could be revised to help provide more meaningful information. In regards to mathematics performance, the faculty discussed the general need for increased performance in mathematics across the college and not only within the General Management Program. The campus math initiative is under way and will evaluate the needs of COBE programs. A strategy was also suggested where research could be integrated more as a way to apply what students are learning in a way that would make math skills more integral.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists three recommended actions (see page 13, point 4) related to assessment, gender equity efforts, and curriculum development.
- 6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns*
- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
 - **Next full self-study will be due to the Dean of the College of Business and Economics by 10/1/2023 and by 11/1/2023 to the Audit and Review Committee.**
- 7) Adjourn.

Review team report is attached below, including Recommended Actions and instructions for Progress Reports (if required).

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2018-2019
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 3/4/2019 Short Self Study (SS*) _____
 Program: General Management Major Minor

Evaluations submitted by: Bill Miller, Yeongmin Kim, Jiazhen Zhou, Ahmad Karim, Joan Littlefield Cook
Review meeting attended by: Bill Miller, Yeongmin Kim, Jiazhen Zhou, 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	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

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

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

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

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

Comments

- The program has contributed significantly to new program development including the DBA program and the not-for-profit emphasis. It would have been better if the timeline and growth of the not-for-profit emphasis was detailed.
- The organization for the evidence could be better. (1) "The General Management Major supports other programs at UW-W through course offering and the creation of emphases". Seems like most later items should have been

- sub-items of this one instead of being parallel. (2) Collaboration with other colleges/departments in offering different management emphasis should be a separate big item?
2. "program is not designed for general education", program is targeted for CoBE
 2. Although the program does not offer GenEd courses, it makes important contributions to other programs in CoBE as well as other colleges.
 3. through recent hires and adjustments to curriculum (new emphases)
 3. (1) It seems like only one goal of inclusive excellence (attracting more women students) is addressed. (2) It is good that website exposure and advertisement were mentioned for attracting women students. But I feel that the plan was a little bit conservative. Some outreach activities (like organizing camps) might achieve more. The program can raise the related resource requirements to the college in the A&R face to face meeting. (3) Edit improvements needed. An example: "We need to recruit more women to enroll in the program Faculty designed two emphases targeting more women and minorities Healthcare is a growing sector of the economy Not-for-profit is vital to the development of communities".
 3. It is unclear which two goals of IE they are working to meet.
 4. I did not see where the previous report's recommended actions 1a, 1c, and 2 were addressed.
 4. List of actions are listed but it is unclear how they address the two recommended actions in the previous review.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

- 2. Some good goals like supervising undergraduate research and mentoring minorities are identified, but seems that they were not really that well undertaken
- 3. There seems to be a process but it may not be systematic.
- 3. Program appears to use various assessment data and information to identify, set goals, and then work towards those goals
- 4. Goals appear to be related to: recruitment/retention, branding/marketing, hiring/staffing, mentoring, and curriculum development
- 6. Program identified there is no accrediting body for their program, but that faculty meet requirements of college wide accreditation

II. Assessment: A. Curriculum

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments

- 3. Good use of survey data to review and revise courses.
- 3. I encourage the program to work toward including more direct data on student learning in their assessments. There is some of this.
- 5. Program provided information related to training, support, and guidelines for online teaching

II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning

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

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

2. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.

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

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

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

Comments

1. Table F seems to be outdated. Also no course-embedded measures? I would like to see the specific list of SLOs.
1. Particular attention was paid to aligning learning objectives in courses and the program towards LEAP
1. Were the SLOs clarified from the previous report? I encourage the program to look at these again. A couple, as currently phrased, are very difficult to assess (e.g., "students must understand...", "Students must be able to...", "Students have to..." 1. I assume I'm reading the SLOs correctly (they're included in the "Methods employed" column of Appendix E, correct?
- 1-2. Appendix F is a good crosswalk of AoL skills, LEAP ELOs, and the program's SLOs.
3. Good specification of where data will be gathered for each SLO (e.g., exam, case study, group projects, etc.)
3. It says "each course employs different assignments, learning methods.... to enhance student learning." But more information on those assignments is needed.
- 3-4. The program is collecting data from a variety of sources. I encourage them to build in a bit more direct data on SLOs (vs. mostly reports of satisfaction data).
- 3 & 4. Types of assessment identified in the report include mostly indirect measures; benchmarking with other universities' programs, updates to exit survey and use of exit exam, student success in core courses, advisory board
5. In 4, the exit survey indicates that students do not get sufficiently challenged. Also mathematics were rated low. What is program's plan to address these issues?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0

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

Comments

1. It would be ideal if you also show the nationwide data for female student percentage for the management program.
3. Credits to degree is above average
4. Provided data shows increases in enrollment related to diversity, but other than creating new targeted emphases related to diversity and inclusion the identified strategy is through branding/marketing, are there other strategies?
4. The program is aware of the needs, but detailed strategy or action is not that clear.
- 4-5. No specific action was taken in the review period to recruit diverse groups of students?
5. Numbers indicate increases at the department level but I don't see comparison to university wide numbers
6. Course rotation, winterim and summer, online provide flexibility in student scheduling
7. Could benefit from some courses with smaller enrollment sizes

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

Comments

1. placement and continuing education numbers are very high
3. It needs to discuss plans to develop the systematic way of tracking graduates.
3. The program could do a little bit more to track their 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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Benchmarking study helped to identify strengths and weaknesses of the program, the flexibility within the program related to student scheduling and course offerings helps to establish unique features in the program

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

Comments

- 1 & 2. Faculty research and service records appear strong
- 3 & 4. Based on current assignments and upcoming retirements, the program is in need of more senior faculty

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

Comments

1 & 2. Limited amount of information provided related to how faculty are enhancing teaching and advising

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

Comments

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

Comments

1 & 2. Limited amount of information provided related to how faculty are pursuing funding

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

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

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

Comments

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

Comments

- Based on information within the report, the program is currently meeting needs in regards to staffing but with additional resources and staffing there may be potential for growth
- The program needs more staffing and resources to maintain the high demand.

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

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

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

Comments

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Program strengths are discussed.

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

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

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

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

Comments

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

- Program addresses scope and mission of the university
- Is working to address diversity and inclusion
- Use of assessment data appears to be helping the program develop and move forward
- Enrollments appear stable
- Strong engagement with local/regional communities
- The program seems to be doing well meeting the demand of the students and the industry. But the self-report does not provide the details in an organized way
- Strong research and teaching. Good service.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- Many parts of the self-report should be clarified. Develop a clear plan to address the staff and resource shortages. Also develop a plan to address the issues identified in the exit surveys.
- Related to diversity and inclusion, continue working on recruitment/retention and mentoring
- Continue exploring branding and marketing of the program

3. Other comments/questions

- Explore potential for undergraduate research

4. Recommended Actions

1. Assessment:
 - 1a. Review and revise some of the SLOs so they are direct indications of student performance, and are more easily assessable.
 - 1b. Continue to work toward including more direct assessments of student learning outcomes to augment the indirect survey information.
2. Continue your good work on addressing gender equity in the program.
3. Continue updating curriculum and incorporating assessment data in decision making process.

5. Recommended Result

Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.

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.

X

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.

Next full self-study is due to the college dean by October 1, 2023 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2023.