

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
School Business Management Masters, 2023-2024**

This program received a “continue without qualification” result from the program review committee. Based on this result, the program chose not to meet for the face-to-face meeting and instead will review the results provided within the Department. Below is a summary of the review team results:

- 1) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists three recommended actions (see page 9, point 4) related to assessment and partnerships to increase student diversity.
- 2) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation without qualification*
 - **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
 - **Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:**
 - ☒ **Next SHORT self-study will be due to the Dean on May 1, 2030 and to the Assessment Office on August 1, 2030.**

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

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Graduate Programs, 2023-2024**

Date of Evaluation 12/1/2023 Short Self Study (SS*) _____
 Program: School Business Management MS Masters ☒ Major ☐ Minor ☐

Evaluations submitted by: Katy Casey; Kristen Prock; Matthew Vick; Rhea Vichot; Tia Schultz
Review meeting attended by: Katy Casey; Kristen Prock; Matthew Vick; Rhea Vichot; Tia Schultz

I. General Program Information

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

2. The program's mission statement aligns with the School of Graduate Studies mission.

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

3. Program described changes impacting the program since the last review.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No Evidence	0

General Comments related to section I.

The overall mission and goals of the program are clear. The changes since the last report are described but not much evidence is given other than the descriptions.

3. Report adequately described faculty turnover/changes but did not provide information beyond that.

1) The mission statement of the program is clear, and career focused.

II. Alignment within the University

1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's mission.

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

2. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's Strategic Plan.

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

General comments related to section II.

2. It is unclear how going from three to five adjunct faculty promotes shared governance (Goal 6).

I don't think the involvement of adjuncts in decision making is what was intended by the value of shared governance, but other alignments were made as well.

I think one more goal could be added, especially given that the goal of the program is to create school business administrators (Goal 3 or 5 feels relevant for the aim of the program).

III. Program Goals & Accomplishments

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No Evidence	0

2. Goals currently in place will contribute to the program's advancement. Criteria for determining success were measurable and attainable.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No Evidence	0

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

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

4. Program faculty, staff, and/or students received special recognitions or awards during the review period.

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

General comments related to section III.

The program set realistic goals and was able to make progress on, or accomplish, those recently set. It was not clear if the program meets regularly with instructors, or an advisory-type board, to set goals annually. Marketing seems to be the focus moving forward.

It is unclear in the report what is being done to increase enrollment. There was discussion of a new certificate (two students have earned this) and the possible addition of other courses, but how does that increase enrollment?

There are useful stories of curriculum improvement (not requiring the 2 credit Accounting 701 course as it goes into more depth than necessary for SBMs) but not really examples of larger methods of assessing the effectiveness of the curriculum other than faculty feedback.

One listed goal was to increase enrollments and an implementation of a certificate to drive enrollment, but no mention of what the current enrollment is until Section VI (37), just that it is a small program where "advisee enrollment has remained flat over the past five years with a slight increase with the Fall 2023 semester."

IV. Curriculum

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

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

2. Dual-listed courses are described and explain differences between expectations for undergraduate and graduate students.

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

3. Changes to the curriculum were described, including the basis for the changes.

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

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

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

5. The program provides opportunities for students to engage outside the classroom.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

General comments related to section IV.

4. While there was not a lot of assessment data reported, the author provides sufficient detail on how decisions were made, and those decisions were based on student performance and partners in the field.

2. Program reports no dual listed courses 3. The report indicates that the capstone was previously a letter-grade, and now is competency-based, but it is unclear if that means it is now P/NC?

The internship would seem to be a meaningful capstone, even if the portfolio needed improvement. As noted, before, the curricular revisions do appear meaningful, but a systematic process to evaluate gaps/needs beyond instructor anecdotes is not evident.

Only "dual listed" course is the ACCOUNTT 201 which can be taken if ACCOUNT 701 isn't available, though this is only for students with no previous experience in accounting and the two credits do not count for the degree anyway.

V. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program uploaded an assessment plan that includes student learning outcomes.

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

2. The program aligns their student learning outcomes to the Master's Essential Learning Outcomes.

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

3. Student learning outcomes are "mapped" to the curriculum.

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

4. The program provided a timeline indicating when faculty and staff assess SLOs. The timeline is manageable and sustainable.

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

5. The program described the measures/processes they use to assess SLOs, and the criterion for performance.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

6. The program described the results of the assessment data collected.

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

7. The program described specific actions individuals in the program took, or will take, to make changes to the program based on assessment results.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

General comments related to Section V.

3. The curricular map was in the SBM program learning outcome attachment. 4. A timeline of when data is collected was provided, but it was not clear when the data is shared, analyzed, discussed, and used for program improvement. There was a comment that the instructors meet annually in spring and maybe that is when this work is completed. 7. Student data was analyzed, and a summary of the results was provided. It isn't clear if specific actions were taken because of the data but overall, it seems students are meeting expected learning outcomes.

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

1a. The program explains fluctuations in enrollment.

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

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

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

1c. Program has strategies to recruit and retain students.

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

1d. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation.

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

1e. The program described efforts to engage underrepresented communities.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	3

1f. The program described student composition and whether it was reflective of the diversity of the University.

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

General comments related to section VI. A

1b. What is the breakdown of students in the different tracks? MSE, just license, and certificate? 1c. I wonder if direct contact with school districts would help attract students to the certificate- does the program send districts information on the non-licensure opportunity? 1e. The author reported that specific strategies were not attempted in this area.

1e. program reported that no strategic efforts were made.

This program exists to serve school districts who hire one licensed SBM, so the population is fixed in the state. It is sustainable and serves a stable number of students. The diversity profile is limited to whom districts are attracting to these positions; efforts to partner with district to diversify the pool of students appear to be in the works.

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

1. Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment to continue their education.

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

3. Described efforts to retain and track graduates.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

4. Described unique features of the program that set it apart from other system or regional colleges and universities.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

General comments related to section VI. B

1. 100% placement was reported; no supporting documentation provided 3. It was reported that midway through the program, it is "typical" for students to receive a program check, but the effectiveness of this is unknown 4. Is reputation enough?

Tracking of graduates could be improved; it seems that the program will need alumni to eventually serve as adjunct instructors, so maintaining this network seems important. Is this something that could be accomplished through WASBO?

VII. Resource Availability & Development: Faculty and Staff Resources

1. Information on the numbers of full and part-time faculty and staff is provided. Expertise of teaching staff is aligned with the needs and future vision for the program.

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

2. Tenure and promotion standards, including post-tenure requirements, reflect faculty and staff ability to advance in rank.

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

3. Information is provided about changes in the faculty since the last Audit and Review.

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

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

General comments related to section VII.A

2. The program is comprised on adjunct instructors who are not on tenure lines.

2. It is reported that adjunct faculty are reviewed annually; evidence of review not submitted.

This program has a unique adjunct model, but it is logical as this is a professional preparation program and the adjuncts are working school business managers who bring important practitioner knowledge to the courses and the program. Occasional turn-over amongst adjuncts is not concerning.

VII. Resource Availability & Development: Student Resources

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

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

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

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

General comments related to section VII.B

VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Areas of strength are provided.

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

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

General comments related to section VIII

IX. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

This program serves our school districts in an important manner and has kept itself sustainable with a model of using qualified alumni as instructors. Their practical knowledge is a strength in a professional development program like this.

Strengths of the program include: 1. Availability of the program; it was noted that many other programs in the state have closed 2. A fully online option allows for flexibility and attracts adult learners 3. 100% placement 4. Curriculum is well laid out, making the path to completion accessible.

Faculty are engaged and provide focused leadership to grow the program. Recent engagement with regional organization to market and recruit students. Good assessment framework. Enrollment remained stable over the past 5-years.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

The program should describe how the program used data collected for continuous improvement. It would help reviewers if the assessment document were compiled, as opposed to searching through multiple one-page documents.

Areas of improvement include: 1. Increase diversity within the program with targeted efforts 2. Provide clear expectations for adjunct instructors in the program regarding evaluation and continuity of employment 3. Need for intentional collection of assessment data with a clear plan for how it will be utilized

As noted by the report, "closing the loop" of using assessment data to inform curriculum and other improvements would move the program beyond just relying on adjunct instructor anecdotal feedback.

3. Recommended Actions

- 1) Describe the process for meeting with the program team to discuss assessment plans, data collected, and how to use results.
- 2) Finalize a program assessment plan to use assessment data to drive improvement.
- 3) Investigate partnerships to help engage a more diverse student body, for example work with the Graduate School to connect with WASBO.

4. Other Questions

5. Other Comments

In the next report, include a more detailed description of how the program supports adjunct faculty in teaching and evaluation, and engages them in program development discussions.

6. Recommended Result

Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	5
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the Audit & Review Committee.	0
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas. Submit progress report(s) addressing the concerns as directed by the Audit & Review Committee. Progress reports must be submitted to the College Dean, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Audit & Review Committee.	0
Insufficient Information in the self-study to decide; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
Refer to Provost for action. This option is selected if the report is not completed by the date due.	0