

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for  
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Human Resource Management Majors and Minors, 2016-2017**

**Date:** February 24, 2017

**Time:** 10:30-11:30

**Place:** HH 4303

**Attended:** AVC Greg Cook; Dean John Chenoweth, Management Department Chair Jon Werner; Program Coordinator Kelly Delaney-Klinger; faculty and staff in the Human Resource Management program; Audit & Review Team Chair James Collins; Audit & Review team members Dennis Kopf, Andrea Ednie, Ahmad Karim, and Joan Cook.

1) Call to order

2) *Introductions*

All members were introduced and welcomed to the meeting

3) *Overview of review team evaluation, program comments*

Program strengths were discussed, including growing student enrollment, departmental involvement with SHRM and an engaged external advisory board, strong student learning outcomes across most domains, and faculty professionalism and their commitment to research.

Areas for improvement were also noted, which includes the need for the department to continue developing assessment methods to evaluate the program and student learning outcomes, to formulate and implement a plan that addresses the staffing problems noted in the department's report, and to improve the quantitative skills of students in the program.

The department provided a draft document that maps LEAP ELOs with SHRM competencies and discussed their work in developing an ePortfolio system to assess student competencies. Student enrollment was also discussed and the steady increase in numbers was partially attributed to students transferring from an accounting major. The vast majority of students are finding gainful employment following graduation.

4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation

a) *What's the program's plan for the next five years? Where do you want the program to go?*

The department and committee discussed how HR professionals are expected to be more data savvy and that there is a need for greater emphasis on the quantitative aspect of the program. The department would like to provide supports to struggling students as early as possible in the process.

b) *Staffing was mentioned at several points in the self-study, but in the end, the department spoke of enrollment being at optimum levels. Please elaborate on enrollment and staffing levels, both current and anticipated.*

Enrollment is currently at an acceptable level, but it is at the upper range of what the department can manage without adding additional faculty or instructional staff. There were concerns noted that the department doesn't have enough personnel to address a contingency plan if unexpected needs arise (such as if one faculty member decided to resign or retire). There is no cap on student enrollment, which may exacerbate this problem unless additional personnel resources are provided.

c) *Regarding assessment, is the department moving towards a focus on evaluation of skills rather than content knowledge? If so, how does the ePortfolio fit into this shift of focus? Please elaborate on your plans for assessment and any resources needed to implement your plans.*

Discussion included the benefit of using an ePortfolio and having a centralized coaching process for faculty and students on its use; peer mentors and other supports may be helpful as the ePortfolio system gets better developed.

5) **Recommended Actions:** *The evaluation report lists 2 recommended actions (see page 12, point 4) related to program assessment.*

Both actions were discussed and the department and committee agreed that both of these areas are important to address prior to the next self-study.

6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with Minor Concerns*

- Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
- A progress report is required for recommended action #2. This report will be due to the Dean of the College of Business & Economics by March 1, 2019 and to the Audit & Review Committee by March 15, 2019.
- The program's next full self-study is due by October 1, 2021 to the Dean of the College of Business & Economics by October 1, 2021 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2021.

7) Adjourn.

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater**

**Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies**

**Undergraduate Programs, 2016-2017  
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation February 6, 2017 Short Self Study (SS\*) \_\_\_\_\_

Program Human Resource Management Major X Minor X

**Evaluations submitted by:** James Collins, Dennis Kopf, Andrea Ednie, Ahmad Karim, and Joan Cook

**Review meeting attended by:** James Collins, Andrea Ednie, Ahmad Karim, and Joan Cook

**I. Program Purpose & Overview: A. Centrality**

<b>1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's core values, Mission, and Strategic Plan.</b>	
Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
<b>2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W.</b>	
Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	2
<b>3. The program has achieved or is appropriately working toward achievement of at least two goals of Inclusive Excellence.</b>	
Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
<b>4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Report; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant.</b>	
Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

**Comments**

- Please provide a little explanation for why the program does not support GenEd. Does the program build on skills developed in GenEd in any way (e.g., cultural differences)?
- The program provided documented attempts to increase the diversity of faculty. Are any college/university resources available to assist with this?
- Responses seem reasonable considering accreditation (or SHRM recognition). However, I wonder if they could build in some higher level SLOs within the SHRM framework?
- The program has had conversations of "how we could begin to incorporate increased quantitative activities...". Have any steps actually been taken yet, any changes made?
- Does the program share results with students?

6. Please see my comments below that address each of the recommended actions from the previous review:
- a. Recommendation #1 Discuss whether you are satisfied with the “define, identify and/or apply” structure of the 13 content learning outcomes listed for the major. Does this definition of outcomes and the subsequent assessment system result in the meaningful assessment and improvement for the program that you seek?

Regarding the first portion of the above question, the department explained why they have opted to continue using this approach, but there was no indication of whether or not they are actually satisfied with it. Continued use of this process suggests a certain degree of satisfaction, but it would be helpful if more explicit information could be provided here that directly addressed the question. Regarding the second portion of the above question, the department did not directly answer this question.

- b. Recommendation #2 Going forward, please remember to document how assessment data are used to inform improvements in teaching, learning, and assessment of the learning outcomes listed for the major. It will be very helpful to provide this information in your next self-study, to demonstrate how you used assessment data to close the loop.

The department shared a collaborative process that they use to guide programmatic changes and other decisions. Changes made since the previous review were provided on page 15 of the documentation and includes: \*Changing the HR Seminar/Capstone class to a requirement for all HR majors. \*Adding additional communication avenues to better inform majors/minors of program requirements \*Beginning the process of identifying techniques for incorporating more class activities that build quantitative skills. \*Strengthening relationships between employers and the students to better promote internships.

It would be helpful to have a better understanding of which assessment data, specifically, that the department used to guide their decisions and why. Use of data is frequently mentioned and it’s clear that decisions were made in a thoughtful manner, but to an outsider who isn’t familiar with this department, some more detail here would be useful.

The department acknowledged the lack of student growth in the area of quantitative literacy (see page 12 of the submitted documents) and the suspected reason; however, no solutions are provided. Additional development in this area appears to be something that should be considered.

Which assessments were used to evaluate student progress? I reviewed the results from assessments on pages 12-13, but more information about the specific tests would be useful. In other words, were they in-house assessments developed by program faculty? Or perhaps they were nationally normed and standardized measures that are commonly used in the field? It’s noted that students completed the CAAP for Office of Academic Assessment, but those cells were blank on the submitted document.

- c. Recommendation #3 Develop and implement a system for sharing assessment results and improvements with internal and external stakeholders.

Procedures have been created and applied, which resulted in the department sharing successes and areas in need of improvement with faculty and an external advisory board. This dissemination process occurs at an annual meeting in the spring of each year.

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

**Comments**

1. Has the program sought/received any feedback on its advising from students?
2. Why was the advising session put on hold? Are there plans to move forward with it?
3. Does the program hold regular program meetings?
4. Sounds like they make good use of the Advisory Board.
5. Are students (e.g., from the student org) included in the planning process? Would this be useful?
6. The program is considering revisions to its mission, but I'm not getting a clear vision of where it wants to be over the next few years. What does the program want to do other than "maintain"? Are there areas of strength that you want to develop even further? Gaps, or areas needing attention?
7. Student chapter has received Superior Merit Award for 4 out of 5 years--congratulations!
8. Program has been continuously recognized by SHRM since 2009 ('recognition' by this group seems very similar to accreditation).

## II. Assessment: A. Curriculum

<b>1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable).</b>	
Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
<b>2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students; otherwise NA</b>	
Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	4
<b>3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.</b>	
Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
<b>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.</b>	
Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
<b>5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable)</b>	
Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### Comments

1. Few options within the major/minor, but this appears to be necessary
2. The major has a total of 24 required credits. This seems very low. I thought most majors required 35 or 36.
3. The program does not have dual-listed courses.
4. There are no dual-listed courses in the HR Program, so NA is the most appropriate response.
- 5: Specific assessment data were requested on the survey form, but the department did not provide them. For future reference, this information would be useful for the A&R committee to have for discussion
6. The reasons for the curricular revisions make perfect sense but, except for qualitative data from Advisory Board discussion, these changes weren't based on assessment data. Is there a way to assess the impact of these changes (i.e., what data would address this)?
7. The number of students completing internships for credit has increased. What percentage of the total number of students in the major is this? Is there a way to somehow get more information/data on the anecdotal information offered (i.e., ask students on their SOAS if they have had HR-related work)?
8. Eventually, the program should be able to provide evidence to support the statement that "these experiences have helped the HR students grow into stronger and more confident HR professionals," although this isn't really available at this point.
9. Reviewed by students, peer faculty, and technology staff

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

**5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.**

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

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

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

### Comments

1. The curriculum map is helpful and shows alignment of the program SLOs with courses. A useful next step is to elaborate this map, showing where the content is introduced, knowledge and skills are developed, and where they are assessed.
2. I know the program wants/needs to remain aligned with the SHRM LOs, but I really don't think that "define, identify, and/or apply..." language does justice to what the UWW program does. Is there some way to build in language that redefines "apply" as higher level (e.g., 'apply' includes solving real/realistic problems, evaluating concepts, etc.)? They are working toward this with their emphasis on writing, quantitative literacy, and information literacy. I'm sure the challenge is to integrate these rather than thinking of them as 'added on.'

3. The LEAP alignment starts to get at inclusion of skill rather than just content, and at higher level skills. But I wonder if/how the program is able to 'pull apart' which aspects of their assessments align with particular skills. For example, "All" the program LOs align with the LEAP ELO of Critical thinking, but how does the program assess their students' CT skills such that they are able to say 'here are the CT skills that our students are good at, here's where they need to improve.'" The issue really is trying to overlay a skills approach on a content approach, which will work to some extent but not fully.
4. All 3 assessments are within the seminar course (within 2 assignments). Low quantitative scores attributed to faculty rotation.
5. I would argue that the program probably has a pretty strong emphasis on Integrative Learning (the last LEAP ELO), given their addition of the capstone course and encouragement of internships.
6. Is SHRM giving any indication of a movement toward a skills orientation? Until they do, the program really is stuck in the middle, trying to do the best they can to meet two somewhat competing demands (SHRM vs. campus LEAP).
7. The assignments and rubrics to assess writing, quantitative literacy and information literacy are good ones, and they start to address the assessment of skills.
8. Is there an overarching, longer-term assessment plan? That is, will all three skills and all content objectives be assessed every year? Or is there a plan to get baseline data, then take a closer look at a specific LO? This type of longer-term planning might help allocate assessment time and energy.
9. The assessment plan seems somewhat limited; only a few examples were provided.
10. The program has collected both direct and indirect data.
11. It may be time to take a closer look at quantitative literacy, to see if there are specific areas of concern, rather than just looking at general categories.
12. If there is turnover in instructors for course/s that focus on quantitative skills, the program might consider a common syllabus (or maybe a 'suggested syllabus') that incoming instructors can be encouraged to use, along with example problems/assignments. I know this can be tricky, but if this is an area that's both important and not as strong as the program would like, then maybe a more directive approach might be helpful.
13. Regarding pages 12-13, I'm not sure what the data are that are presented here. Are they the average percent correct for students in each category, and are categories based on percent correct? What are the overall averages? A little more explanation of the data would be helpful.
14. Are more formal assessments given to students? The provided information seems a little slim; although, the outcome data were comprehensive.
15. There's some evidence that data on student learning are considered and changes made based on the data (e.g., increasing activities to address quantitative skills). I encourage the program to look in more detail at their data and make it even more prominent in the decision-making process. Increasingly, programs hold an annual meeting of faculty/staff at which they focus in detail on the assessment data from that year and 'dive deep' into what the data mean. Does something like this happen prior to the annual meeting with the Advisory Board?
16. It might be interesting to share the results of both the direct and indirect assessments with students earlier in the program (in the intro course) as a way to encourage discussion. For example, the SOAS item about governments' impact could serve as a springboard for discussion about the importance of government policies and laws on the field of HR and on day-to-day issues faced and decisions made in HR settings.

### 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	5
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	3
---------------------	---



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

**4. Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students.**

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

**Comments**

1. Since 2013/204 enrollment numbers seem to have remained steady. Big increase between 2012 - 2013. Are you planning on growing the major any more?
2. Enrollment is strong (a 47% increase over the review period).
3. Graduation rate (as % of total enrollment) seems to fluctuate but it's difficult to know if this is normal fluctuation or a downward trend (36%, 26%, 33%, 36%, 22% over the years in the review period).
4. No credit-to-degree data are given for most of the years in the review period. Was there a problem with the data dashboard?
5. Average credits to degree not available/applicable since 2014.
6. Courses are taken by students from across campus.
7. Enrollment is listed as being at an optimum level
7. Where would the program LIKE to be over the next 5 years in terms of enrollment? What would be needed to get there?

**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	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

1. Commitment to an active LinkedIn group with 593 members.
2. The department acknowledges that there has been no systematic method of tracking graduates. However, use of LinkedIn was mentioned and this is a nice start. The department is encouraged to work with the Office of Career & Leadership Development to further improve this area.

**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**

- III.C.1. SHRM involvement - student groups, recognition, curriculum alignment. Also, strong internships and faculty research.

**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. Staffing needs will be a concern, particularly if the program grows.

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

##### Comments

- Two faculty members do not have any teaching/advising enhancement activities listed for any of the years. Over a five year period, I would expect everyone to have at least one activity here, if not one per year, given our institution's mission.

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

##### Comments

- Two of the six listed faculty have no evidence of research/scholarly activity listed (33% of the faculty). Was there really no activity or was it just not possible to get the information?

#### IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding

##### 1-2. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.

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

##### Comments

- I know this isn't expected of faculty/staff, but is there a way to encourage the pursuit of external 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	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

##### Comments

- Two faculty members have nothing listed.

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

##### Comments

1. Consistent staffing was raised as an issue, particularly if the program grows.
2. Small program means that the loss of 1 faculty member impairs the program. Other faculty members seem to have stepped up when required.
3. More faculty appear to be needed in this department.

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

##### 4. Other comments by the program (not rated).

Yes	3
No	1

##### Comments

1. No mention of the need to continue to develop and implement assessment plan, although specific things mentioned in question 3 do involve assessment. No mention of increasing assessment of SLOs.

## VI. Reviewer Conclusions

### 1. Strengths of the Program

- Growing enrollment
  - Continuing recognition from SHRM Good progress on assessing student learning
  - Numbers, recognition, student club, internships
- 
- The program is in a good position to take advantage of the strong demand in the workforce for HR professionals.
  - Learning outcomes are strong with the exception of quantitative skills.
- 
- There is a strong and relevant HR curriculum that aligns with SHRM's Body of Knowledge
  - The program has a complement of faculty and instructional staff who are successful in teaching, research, and service and who are committed to the success of the program and its students
  - Students have access to an active and award-winning chapter of the Society for Human Resource Management
  - There is a supportive and engaged external advisory board

### 2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- Develop an assessment plan
  - Develop a process for discussing program progress, issues, staffing, assessment, etc.
  - Assessment of SLOs and improving faculty retention
  - More efforts on developing students' quantitative skills
- 
- More assessment data, including specifics about each instrument used, would be useful
  - Increase in the number of faculty is needed
  - Method of systematically tracking and engaging graduates is needed

### 3. Other comments/questions

Continue to grow the major. Major does an excellent job of recruiting a diverse student body from the University population.

### 4. Recommended Actions

1. The program should continue developing and articulating a clear vision. In other words, where would the program like to be in five years with respect to enrollment, offering/requiring internships, staffing, etc.?
  - a. Part of this process should result in the stabilization of staffing. Please work with your college and develop a plan to address this.
  - b. Please determine specific programmatic goals related to enrollment maintenance and/or growth, as well as the steps that will be taken to ensure attainment of such goals. The aforementioned staffing plan should be sufficient to support these goals.
2. Continue to develop and implement methods to evaluate your program and assess student learning
  - a. Articulate an overall, longer-term assessment plan that ensures that all program learning outcomes are evaluated. Within this plan, consider including ways to collect data longitudinally from students.
  - b. Further develop the curriculum map to identify where content and skills are introduced, developed, and assessed.
  - c. Continue to develop ways to integrate the newly developing skills emphasis in SLOs with the existing SHRM framework with its emphasis on content.
  - d. Develop a more consistent, and possibly more frequent, process for discussing program assessment and making use of the data.

**5. Recommended Result\***

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

**\*A progress report is required for recommended action #2. This report will be due to the Dean of the College of Business & Economics by March 1, 2019 and to the Audit & Review Committee by March 15, 2019.**

**\*The program's next full self-study is due by October 1, 2021 to the Dean of the College of Business & Economics by October 1, 2021 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2021.**

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

Program Name: Human Resource Management

Date of Review Team Meeting: April 11, 2019

Date of Follow-Up Meeting: May 10, 2019 Time: 9:30-10:30AM Location: TBD

**Evaluations submitted by:** Sarah Hessenauer (review team chair), Yeongmin Kim, Ahmad Karim, and Andrea Ednie.

**Review meeting attended by:** Sarah Hessenauer, Yeongmin Kim, Ahmad Karim, and Andrea Ednie.

Recommendations listed below are from the program's most recent Self-Study review (2016-2017).

#### **Recommendation #1**

1. The program should continue developing and articulating a clear vision. In other words, where would the program like to be in five years with respect to enrollment, offering/requiring internships, staffing, etc.?
  - a) Part of this process should result in the stabilization of staffing. Please work with your college and develop a plan to address this.
  - b) Please determine specific programmatic goals related to enrollment maintenance and/or growth, as well as the steps that will be taken to ensure attainment of such goals. The aforementioned staffing plan should be sufficient to support these goals.

#### **Recommendation #1 Overall Evaluation**

Good Progress	1
Making Progress	2
Little/No Progress	1

#### **Comments related to recommendation #1**

- No mention of a vision, goals, plans for internships.
- The progress report outlines discussion from what appears to be two HR meetings, but does not describe what efforts have been made to work with the college to resolve the staffing challenges.
- The progress report mentions that enrollment is increasing and that there exists potential demand for an online program, but does not discuss enrollment goals or steps taken to reach the enrollment goals.
- Staffing appears to still be a concern.
- Making progress in hiring staff to meet the demand. No discussion of the development of program visions, however.
- Making progress, but the department needs to talk more about their goals and visions specifically. The review team would like to see a clear vision and recommendations specific to the vision.

**Recommendation #2**

2. Continue to develop and implement methods to evaluate your program and assess student learning.
  - a) Articulate an overall, longer-term assessment plan that ensures that all program learning outcomes are evaluated. Within this plan, consider including ways to collect data longitudinally from students.
  - b) Further develop the curriculum map to identify where content and skills are introduced, developed, and assessed.
  - c) Continue to develop ways to integrate the newly developing skills emphasis in SLOs with the existing SHRM framework with its emphasis on content.
  - d) Develop a more consistent, and possibly more frequent, process for discussing program assessment and making use of the data.

**Recommendation #2 Overall Evaluation**

Good Progress	0
Making Progress	3
Little/No Progress	1

**Comments related to recommendation #2**

- It appears the program has implemented new direct assessments, but has not yet revised SLOs and developed an assessment plan?
- Data should be tied to the SLOs. We found a program SLO document posted online, but it did not appear in the report, nor did the on-line report appear to have been updated with recent changes. Please map and align the assessment plan with the SLO's.
- SHRM has been aligned with LEAP but SLOs have not and the review team were not able to identify existing (up-to-date) SLOs.
- Curriculum map done by course, but does not indicate where SLOs are introduced, developed and assessed.
- The review team would like to know the plan for the data. Do you plan to collect data on every student? A sampling of students?
- There is a plan to collect longitudinal assessment data (quantitative analyses).
- Long-term assessment plan development has not yet started.
- The program needs to discuss how you will use the data to improve the program. How often will you discuss the data?
- Progress has been made in establishing formal meetings to discuss assessment.

**Recommendations for next review. Additional progress reports required?**

Yes, Please List Due Dates (e.g. in 1 year, 2 years)?	1
No	3

**Next self-study report should specifically address the following:**

Same recommendations as this progress report. Develop a clearer vision for the program, and continue to work on assessment. Clearly articulate program SLOs, demonstrate how they are being assessed, and provide examples of how program is starting to "close the loop" with assessment data that have been collected.

**Additional comments:**

Good progress has been made.  
The program could consider participating in the Summer Assessment Institute.

**\*\* No further progress reports required. Next full Self-Study is due to the Dean of the College of Business and Economics by October 1, 2021 and to the A&R Committee by November 1, 2021.**



**Audit and Review**  
**Discussion of the Progress Report Submitted March 15, 2019 by**  
**Human Resource Management**

May 10, 2019  
9:30-10:30am  
Hyland Hall 4306

**Attendance:** Ahmad Karim (Associate Dean), John Werner (Department Chair), Kelly Delaney-Klinger (Program Coordinator), Jim Schnaedter, Sarah Hessenauer (Review Team Chair), Review team members Yeongmin Kim, Andrea Ednie.

We discussed the review team's comments related to the progress report submitted March 15, 2019 by the Human Resource Management program. The program is making good progress on assessment and is in a growth trend, where there appears to be increased demand for online learning in particular.

With respect to staffing, we discussed how the program is currently able to cover instructional needs with existing staff, where Jim S has transitioned to teaching more HRM courses and additional staff have been gained. The program faculty clearly described that they cannot support continued enrollment growth unless additional faculty/instructional resources are attained. The program indicated they are at the right spot now for the numbers/need in the program. As it stands, the major has been approved to go online, but instructional resources are not in place to do so, particularly considering the anticipated enrollment increase a fully online version of the program would bring.

We discussed the review team's recommendations about developing short-term and long-term goals. Kelly, who is currently program coordinator, will transition to Department Chair for fall 2019. A decision will be made about who will take over Kelly's position as coordinator. We discussed the importance of working as a team and not relying on one person to make decisions and to be accountable for the program. The program faculty and staff appear to be working together and sharing responsibilities effectively. The plan is to continue weekly program meetings and to keep everyone involved in ongoing programmatic discussions.

With respect to assessment of student learning, we were able to clarify during our discussion that the SHRM goals also serve as the program's SLOs. The program has also aligned the SHRM competencies with LEAP ELO's. The review team recommended that the program further develop their assessment matrix by indicating where SLOs are introduced, developed and assessed. Communication and quantitative literacy have been selected as the first two SLOs to assess, and the program has also begun assessing a integrated learning (a third SLO). We discussed how some assessment measures are working better than others; and tweaks are being made to improve measures as needed. A major assessment for the program are students reflections on the competencies, collected in the capstone course via e-portfolios. The program will be working with LTC in order to move the e-portfolios away from D2L.

We discussed the program's internship program and the opportunities to collect assessment data from the student internship courses. Internships are not required, however, numbers are increasing in the internship course and assessment measures are in place that align the internship with SHRM competencies. Currently, the capstone course is the main place for assessment data collection, and these measures are working well. In addition, assessment measures have also been initiated in the Introduction class, and data are also being collected from annual advisory board meetings.

We discussed the process of 'closing the loop' and documenting how assessment data are used to make course improvements and program decisions. The program team were encouraged to provide specific examples of how data is used to inform the program in their next self-study.

***No further progress reports are required. The program's next self-study is due October 1, 2021 to the Dean of the College of Business and Economics, and November 1, 2021 to the Audit & Review Committee.***