

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Integrated Science & Business Majors and Minors, 2020-2021**

Date: 4/13/2021

Time: 9-10am

Place: Webex

Invited: Interim Provost Greg Cook; Interim AVC Kristin Plessel; Dean Frank Goza (L&S); Dean John Chenoweth, Department Chair/Program Coordinator Hephzibah Kumpaty; faculty and staff in the Integrated Science & Business program; Audit & Review Team Chair Lynn Gilbertson; Audit & Review team members Bruce Cohen, James Collins, Jalal Nawash, Coordinator Dennis Kopf, Assessment Representative Katy Casey

Present: Interim Provost Greg Cook; Interim AVC Kristin Plessel; Dean Frank Goza (L&S); Dean John Chenoweth; Program Coordinator Hephzibah Kumpaty; Coordinator Dennis Kopf, Chemistry Department Chair John Ejnik; Audit & Review Team Chair Lynn Gilbertson; Audit & Review team members Bruce Cohen, James Collins, Jalal Nawash, Assessment Representative Katy Casey

- 1) Call to order
The meeting was called to order at 9:02 AM.
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
L. Gilbertson commented on the quality of the self-study and recognized the strong implementation of high impact practices, assessment tools, and responsive interdisciplinary nature of the program.
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) Are there alternative models for staffing considering the change in coordinator support? Are there benefits to identifying a home department? Could articulating the expertise needed for the dedicated courses afford more staffing options?
Coordinators of the program recognize the need for a funding/staffing model that will balance the program needs with workload. The supporting department currently seems to be the home department of the coordinator, with the chemistry department recently providing the most logistical support. The history of coordinator and reassignments was discussed and coordinators stated that a steering committee exists to help guide the program direction. The Provost and Dean expressed a desire to standardize the coordinator support across programs based on number of students. It was suggested that the current contributors of the program create a five-year plan for stable staffing. It was suggested that the coordinator position be split (one in each college) and then the advisor and instructor roles be defined in order to garner support from faculty.
 - b) What strategies are employed by the program to remain connected to the alumni for potential collaborations and assessment of program success?
The program attains contact with alumni through an exit survey and LinkedIn. The ISB council is active and invites alumni presentations. The program collects alumni information from the Career and Leadership office, but admittedly did not devote high energy to utilizing alumni to assessing program success. The program relied heavily on alumni for career placement.

- c) What strategies or resources are utilized to promote diverse student interest and success in the program?
The program has maintained representation. The program does not currently have a coordinated approach to directly recruit and retain diverse students. The program relies on University recruiters and College level events to recruit students. The program does education about the program through informal student interactions and formal open house events.

5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists four recommended actions (see page 10, point 4) related to program mission, planning, staffing, and student engagement.

1. Revise mission to more clearly reflect ISB unique program value and goals. Articulate what it means to have integrated science and business knowledge and skills (such as project management, collaboration, teamwork, communication, and leadership in order to bridge the gap in understanding between the hard sciences and business and industry).

2. Review responsibilities of coordinator to determine impact on program management activities. May need to revise the assessment plan to assess SLOs on a cyclical basis to allow time to collect, analyze, and report out the data. Continue discussion with Dean and campus administration to identify sustainable staffing models given the current resource shortage.

3. Continue to develop a plan to diversify student interest and enrollment in the program. Consider identifying specific strategies for academic success in areas of challenge.

4. Continue engaging students and community partners with high impact practice and leverage networking applications and alumni networks. Consider enhancing partnerships with regional healthcare providers.

6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns*

- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
- Click or tap here to enter text..
- **Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:**
 - Next FULL self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2025 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2025.**
 - Next SHORT self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2025 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2025.**
 - A progress report will be due** Choose an item. **No progress report is needed.**

7) Adjourn at 10:00 AM.

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, 2020-2021
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 3/11/2021 Short Self Study (SS*) _____
 Program: Integrated Science & Business Major Minor

Evaluations submitted by: Lynn Gilbertson, Katy Casey, Bruce Cohen, James Collins, and Jalal Nawash
Review meeting attended by: Lynn Gilbertson, Katy Casey, Bruce Cohen, James Collins, and Jalal Nawash

I. General Program Information

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

1		Sufficient Evidence	0
2		Some/Partial Evidence	5
3		No/Limited Evidence	0

2. The program is aware and reflective of changes affecting improvement since the last review.

1		Sufficient Evidence	5
2		Some/Partial Evidence	0
3		No/Limited Evidence	0

3. Characteristics of the program set it apart from others when compared regionally and nationally. The unique aspects of the program attract students.

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

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

1		Sufficient Evidence	5
2		Some/Partial Evidence	0
3		No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section I

- 1.1. The mission and SLOs align well. It is a little unclear what aspects of business are part of this major, or the specific value of this program in preparing marketable professionals unique to this field. For example, the skills highlighted are essential to any degree- what sets this one apart other than a focus on "science and business."
- 2.3. This is a very unique program and requires a lot of coordination between colleges.

4. The progress report from fall 2018 was attached. This report outlined how each recommendation was addressed, specifically related to curriculum and assessment. There have been changes in program leadership and management over the past year.

5. COBE accreditation, AACSB

2. A well-developed and assessed program. Impressive in scope and attention to demand.

3. Questions regarding the mission statement: Why three parts (college, program, commitments)? Perhaps consolidating the mission statement would make it easier to develop an assessment plan. Can the program still commit to one-on-one personal advising given the budget cuts and reduction in coordinator support? The program should be commended for the curricular changes and development with a focus on time to degree, the high impact practices engaging with the community, and the implementation of a nationally recognized assessment tool. The accreditation question was partially answered. When is the next accreditation report due and what are the advantages of maintaining accreditation?

4. 3. Program is unique within the UW-System and the curriculum was identified as a strength due to its depth and utilization of HIPs.

4.4. Progress report was submitted; three additional areas were requested to be addressed. Program indicates that they have completed work on all three areas and I assume that evidence is forthcoming in later areas of their self-study.

4.5. The accrediting body was provided, but other details within the question prompt (e.g., when the accreditation report is due, overview of advantages/benefits of accreditation, etc.) were not addressed.

II. Alignment within the University

1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's Mission and Strategic Plan.

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

2. The program supports general education and/or proficiency programs at the University.

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

3. The program is collaborative and supports other academic programs across the College and/or University.

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section II

1. Goal1: Objective 1: How are the open house events advertised to encourage a diverse group of participants? Does the program need any resources for this work? Objective 2: What specific strategies are the coordinators implementing for retention? What does "extra support" entail? What is included in the seminar to support retention of diverse students? What resources does the program need to be successful? How does the program measure

"positive impact"? Goal 3 and Goal 5: These are exceptional areas of strength for the program. Goal 4: Given the budget cuts what can the program do to attain additional resources?

2. 3. The program draws courses from two colleges and connects with multiple departments; does not have a home department and relies on support from science and business faculty.

III. Program Goals & Accomplishments

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

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

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

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

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section III

1. 1. Ambitious goals, a lot of work has been done to capture student perceptions of the program. Progress was made on each goal. 2. The program goal is to continue to evaluate student progress in the curriculum. This is likely to be more difficult with one less coordinator. It is worth discussing the impact on this on the program's ability to meet goals. 3. Goal setting occurs twice a year. ISB board is consulted regularly. A process is in place for sharing information with stakeholders, both internal and external.

2. The efforts to connect students and faculty through the creation of a student council are to be commended. This is an excellent example of the program using assessment data to drive changes.

3. 1. The response was brief and did not address all aspects of the question. 2. What are the criteria for success and, specifically, how will they be measured?

IV. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum.

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

2. The program prepares students in majors, minors, and related emphases tracks in post-graduation and other applicable experiences.

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

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

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

4. Students participate in the high impact practices.

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

General Comments related to Section IV

1. 1. The additional career planning documents seems particularly beneficial in this major. The curriculum is clearly articulated. However, the scope and sequence is not as clear. This is a unique and valuable program, and think that needs to be better articulated in program materials. I think a student would struggle to understand the requirements and value to this program based on the materials provided. 2. The descriptions here are very helpful in understanding this program, and seem focused on the water-business emphasis. Is it possible to incorporate some of this language in the mission and SLOs? Specifically, the intersection of "science, business, and technology" "design" "management" and "leadership on scientific projects." 3. Curricular updates based on assessment data were described in the report. The response written here did not include that information. 4. Considerable attention has been spent providing opportunities for students to engage in HIP.

2. The assessment surveys appear to be reviewed and utilized to determine action steps for program improvement. Once again, a notable strength of this program is the integration of high impact practices.

3. 3. I appreciate that the program identified areas of change and assessments that were used, but more details that fully address all areas of the question would have been helpful.

V. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program has clearly articulated learning outcomes for students.

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

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

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

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

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

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

General Comments related to Section V

1. I think because the program is still evolving, it might need more rigorous assistance especially when it comes to communicating with their alumni. It is good that the program requires internships and tries to follow up with their students who graduated, but I think more is needed especially with slowing demand for these graduates. I also wonder why many students started going to health care management?

2. I really like how the program includes the GENED curriculum as an introduction to the program SLOs. There is clear and intentional alignment between the ELOs and program SLOs. 3. The program specified the period of time data was reviewed and discussed (2017-2019). What are the plans for future analysis? 4. Program data was not only collected, but reviewed and analyzed in order to make changes and improvements. The

summaries provided are helpful and comprehensive. The program relies on indirect methods of assessment, which makes sense considering the program's structure. The direct measures are embedded assignments in courses- the analysis of these is a little unclear. 7. Overall, the program has a robust assessment system, which a number of purposeful assessment tools. The plan to date has been executed and data is used for program improvement. It will be helpful to hear what the program plans for the future.

3. 2. I recommend that the program identifies specific courses (or provide a common mapped example of a complete course sequence that a student could take within the available curriculum) that align with all of the SLOs. Their map appears logical and clearly presented; some areas that include a lot of credits are unmapped though.

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

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

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

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

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

3. [MAJORS ONLY] Program has strategies to recruit and retain students.

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

General Comments related to Section VI.A

1. 1. Enrollment remains steady. The report noted a decline, and that seemed to be in the water emphasis. Any reason why this emphasis would be impacted so drastically? 2 & 5. The number of credits to degree is not reported- probably because of the various options students have to complete the program. It does not appear students can complete this degree in 4-years. Average credits to degree reported in Dashboard: COBE 142.5 and L&S 146.4 6. Program reports numbers at optimal level. Due to the limited number of dedicated faculty, the program does not believe it can sustain an increase in enrollment. The program reports higher enrollment (40-45) than what is reported in the Dashboard (37).

2. Are the opportunities for growth hinged on determining a home department and dedicated faculty line? Could the newly formed student council be integrated into recruitment and retention efforts? What strategies/resources are used for student retention and what are still needed?

3. 6. L&S coordinator position was eliminated in SP20 due to budgetary constraints. Program indicates that enrollment has been at an optimum level (40-45 students).

VI. 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.

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

VII. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty and Staff Resources

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

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

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

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to section VII.A

1. What is the expertise needed for the dedicated courses? In light of the recent budget reductions and declines in student enrollment, have individuals other than the coordinators been considered for the instructional role in the program? Would identifying a home department supply an ADA that might assist with the administrative work of the coordinator?

2. 1. The program does not have dedicated full or part-time faculty; no information was provided about affiliated faculty and it is unclear how their expertise aligns with program needs. 3. Concerns were noted about use of the current one coordinator model.

3. Is it possible for the program director to map out the ideal staffing and then identify the barriers to achieving the ideal model for conversations with administration?

VII. Resource Availability & Development: B. Student Resources

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

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

General Comments for VII.B

1. The program will find it hard to have those facilities if they do not have a physical space.

2. 1. It seems prudent to consider the reinstatement of the L&S coordinator position.

VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Areas of strength are discussed.

1	Sufficient Evidence	5
2	Some/Partial Evidence	0
3	No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments for VIII

1. The program has a strong list of opportunities for improvement and a clear message of program advocacy.

2. 2. In addition to using a two-coordinator model, the program noted the need for summer financial supports/stipends for coordinators, which would assist with advising and administrative duties.

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

1. Interdisciplinary accommodates students' current needs

2. Unique and impressive interdisciplinary program. The program appears to attract students and provides and professional link between the science and business fields. Enrollment in the program remains stable.

3. High impact practices are embedded across the program. An inter-sectional and collaborative program. Responsive to market need (indications of continuing growth).

4. The program utilizes a wide variety of assessment tools, engages students in high impact practices, and takes action for program improvement.

5. Cross-disciplinary nature of the program Degree is a unique offering in the region. Impressive enrollment numbers Passionate leader(s) supporting it.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

1. Seek opportunities to expand topics in healthcare clinics in the region. Consider attaining CBL designation for courses.

2. Overall, this is a well-planned and structured program. However, the mission statement and SLOs are broad and do not truly capture the value and goals of this program. Considering the now limited resources in program management, it might help for program materials to better market the program to prospective students. Assessment: The plan is detailed and collects both indirect and direct assessment data. Continue the good work in collecting data on SLOs. It appears most data analysis and discussion occurred during a 2-year period. What will the cycle be moving forward? The program may need to revisit the assessment plan with one coordinator leading the assessment efforts. Resources: I agree with the author that a co-coordinator from L&S is important moving forward. Interdisciplinary programs can be more difficult to manage, due to the cross-college collaborations

required. Without dedicated faculty to help support, it is reasonable to assume some of the activities reported in this report will not continue.

3. Concerns about adequacy of staffing/support. Questions about curricular density and ease of completion.

4. The program may consider strategies to encourage diverse student enrollment.

3. Other comments/questions

1. Has the program considered what would be required to grow the program?

4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

1. Revise mission to more clearly reflect ISB unique program value and goals. Articulate what is means to have integrated science and business knowledge and skills (such as project management, collaboration, teamwork, communication, and leadership in order to bridge the gap in understanding between the hard sciences and business and industry).

2. Review responsibilities of coordinator to determine impact on program management activities. May need to revise the assessment plan to assess SLOs on a cyclical basis to allow time to collect, analyze, and report out the data. Continue discussion with Dean and campus administration to identify sustainable staffing models given the current resource shortage.

3. Continue to develop a plan to diversify student interest and enrollment in the program. Consider identifying specific strategies for academic success in areas of challenge.

4. Continue engaging students and community partners with high impact practice and leverage networking applications and alumni networks. Consider enhancing partnerships with regional healthcare providers.

5. Recommended Result

1	Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
2	Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	0
3	Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	5
4	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	0
5	Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	0
6	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.	0
7	Non-continuation of the program.	0
8	Report not submitted; refer to Provost for action.	0