Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
General Business Majors and Minors, 2021-2022

Date: 1/18/2022
Time: 9:30-10:30 AM
Place: Hyland 4303

Invited: Provost John Chenoweth; Interim Dean Paul Ambrose, Chair/Program Coordinator Linda Amann; faculty and staff in the General Business program Yefeng Wang, He Li, John Olson, and Nicholas Lovett; Audit & Review Team Chair Andrea Ednie; Audit & Review team members Lynn Gilbertson, Hephzibah Kumpaty, Ahmad Karim; Assessment Representative Katy Casey

1) Call to order

2) Introductions

3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments:

   Dr. Ednie shared program highlights from the review team including the noted improvement in program management and progress since the previous review, strong student demand (particularly non-traditional students) and success in placing graduates.
   Mrs. Amann shared program context, which included the interdisciplinary nature and related challenges. Most notably the reliance on other departments in terms of courses offered, taught, and assessed. The program expressed feeling a lack of control which makes data collection difficult. She highlighted the program's rank as 4th largest major in college, 6th most popular minor on campus, and 1st fully online program.
   The program has a diverse student body in terms of interests. Mrs. Amann noted a struggle advising students in their sophomore year when they are expected to choose a path- general business or another major in college. The program observes students avoiding this decision, and they are trying to figure out why that is and how to best support these students.

4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

   a) The A&R review team would like to **recognize the tremendous amount of work done** to support this program since their last self-study.
      - Especially on process coordination, leadership, communication, and involvement of all departments.

      This sentiment was recognized and supported by all attendees.

   b) **Closing the assessment loop:** The assessment plan is detailed in all areas, except for discussion about how assessment results are being used to inform the program. How does the program use the SLO assessment data they have collected? How can SLO data be used to inform course/program changes and improvements?

      The program shared an ambitious plan to evaluate program objectives within each of the five groupings (i.e., (Project Management, Legal Issues, Broad Economics, Social Responsibility, and Interpersonal/Supervisory). The assessment plan is well organized, detailed, and has the potential to provide valuable information for program improvement. As a result of the discussion, it became clear that while the program uses data to inform program changes and improvements, the methods used were not sufficiently captured in the report. Additionally, it became clear that measuring outcomes in each of the grouping was logistically very challenging. The review team recommended a simplified plan to assess the five program SLOs. The belief of the committee was that survey data and notes from advisory meetings (which include representation from

each department teaching in the program) is a sufficient start to inform program goals. The program will likely learn from this analysis and may add additional assessment methods.

c) **Intentionality behind the program design**: What knowledge and skills will students have upon program completion? The self-study report appears to focus more on analyzing enrollment trends and course offerings.

Dean Ambrose appreciated the work of the program and clarification on assessment. He noted concern that the assessment recommendations made at this meeting may not be remembered at the next A&R. He would appreciate clarification, perhaps in the recommended actions that the program does not have to abide by specific methods of assessment if they do not meet program needs (e.g., course embedded assessments).

Provost Chenoweth was pleasantly surprised at the progress from the last A&R when the program was trying to write outcomes/achievement for each of the five curricular groupings (Project Management, Legal Issues, Broad Economics, Social Responsibility, and Interpersonal/Supervisory). He noted improvement in program coordination and appreciates the standing committee with representation from each department.

5) **Recommended Actions**: The evaluation report lists 4 recommended action (see page 13, point 4) related to assessment, staffing, contributions to general education, and program goals.

6) **Recommended Result**: *Continuation with minor concerns*
   - **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**

   - **Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:**
       ☒ **Next FULL self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2026 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2026.**

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, 2021-2022
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors

Date of Evaluation _____12/3/2021_____Short Self Study (SS*)_____
Program:___**General Business**_____   Major ☒   Minor ☒

Evaluations submitted by: Andrea Ednie, Hepsi Kumpaty, Katy Casey, Lynn Gilbertson, and Ahmad Karim
Review meeting attended by: Andrea Ednie, Hepsi Kumpaty, Katy Casey, Lynn Gilbertson, and Ahmad Karim

I. General Program Information

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
First self-study for the program	0

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

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
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.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
First self-study for the program	0

5. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate (only select N/A if there is no accreditation available).

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

General Comments related to Section I

1. The program have been very responsive to previous recommended actions and have improved their assessment plan, tremendously.
1. Program's mission statement is included which shows 5 SLOs for the program. The program SLOs and COBE AOLs look similar!!
1. The program description is broad and while it includes many important aspects of an UG degree, does not seem specific to general business. What knowledge and skills will students leave with related to this major?
1. The program might consider including more business specific "purpose" and "scope" as the current statement could apply to many other programs on campus.

2. Good description of the qualities and advantages of the program - as well as how the program supports other departments and athletics.
2. It seems like there is a challenge of "turnover" in the coordinator position. Is that an advantage or disadvantage? Are there strategies in place to provide stability? Could the change lead to more diverse perspectives?

4. The program has made great strides in fulfilling assessment needs and the process is ongoing. Given that the program is supported through multiple departments, it could pose unique challenges for successful implementation of assessment plan but the program is doing well and should be commended for working together in meeting the goals.
4. The program's assessment plan hinges heavily on surveys. Is there an advantage of including course-based assessments?

II. Alignment within the University

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

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

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

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

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

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

General Comments related to Section II

1. Good explanation of how the program supports the mission and strategic plan. General Business supports general education and other programs by adding students to courses, right?
1. The program aligns with the UW-Whitewater's core values and mission. The general business major offers broad business curriculum to students with a focus on diversity and cross-cultural skills which are integrated in the SLOs. The program prepares students to meet the demands in the business industry.

1. The program supports inclusive excellence goals and diversity objectives; High impact practices such as collaborative and experiential projects involving community partners are integrated in the course work.

2.The program doesn't directly support the University's GenEd program, however, its minor does as it is available to non-business majors.

2. The General Business description includes an expectation that graduates develop knowledge in a number or areas that align with general education (e.g., critical thinking). However, it is not clear in the report if there is recognition or intentionality behind that alignment.

3. General Business seems to be a good starting point for other majors in COBE. In addition, some communication majors complete the minor.

The program should be commended for the opportunities for international and experiential learning.

We feel you are making a contribution to GenEd but your response required us to infer. Please make sure responses fully address the prompts and explicitly state the contributions the program makes to GenEd.

III. Program Goals & Accomplishments

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

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

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

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

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

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

General Comments related to Section III

1. Criteria for determining success was not sufficiently discussed.

2. The group has made much effort to provide an organizational structure for its committee meetings and advisory board. It would be helpful to have the program explicitly state how this organizational structure will improve the student experience. Many of the goals are task oriented, but it is unclear how the completion of tasks will be assessed. For example, how will the committee determine if the tasks improved the program?

3. Glad to note that the program now has mandatory faculty representation from each CoBE department. This is really good for the program. The committee meets on a regular schedule to review program goals and assessment projects and they have a shared Canvas course specific to the program.

Great work securing representation from every department teaching in the GB program- I can imagine meeting with all representatives regularly is a challenge. Program goals focused on advising, enrollment, and course offerings.

IV. Curriculum

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Students participate in the high impact practices.

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

General Comments related to Section IV

1. Good documentation of HIP involvement.

2. It appears course enrollment data has driven program changes more so than assessment data.
2. The curriculum requires one class from five groups (specific areas) that have four courses in each category and 9 credits from 300 or 400 level business courses. Area of current concern is the availability of online sections.

3. The program analyzes enrollment and modality to select course offerings. Some curricular changes were made due to staffing. There was not mention of decisions being made based on analysis of student learning in the major. It seems there would be tremendous value to a required internship- especially since the program indicated many majors are unsure where they want to land in the professional business community. Has the program explored this as an option? It appears all GB BBA students will take BEINDP 101 semester 1 and Management 489 semester 8- could these be used in part as introductory and capstone courses to the major?

V. Assessment of Student Learning

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgements about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	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.

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

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

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

7. Overall, the program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.

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

General Comments related to Section V

1. The program appears to be highly dedicated to assessment. The assessment plan is detailed in all areas, except for discussion about how assessment results are being used to inform the program. How does the program use the SLO assessment data they have collected?

1. SLOs are very broad- not clearly reflective of GB curriculum. In addition, these are assessed in only the area of the course content (e.g., SLO 2 is assessed in relation to marketing).

1 &2. The program developed a good assessment plan and they are implementing parts of the plan to assess SLOs. They have adopted a systems-approach to evaluate student outcomes at multiple points in the academic life of student. The plan includes a four-phase data collection strategy which spans from the moment of enrollment, throughout their academic studies and into the post-graduation period.

4. It is clear there are challenges assessing outcomes of a major in which instruction is delivered across departments, and faculty are dispersed. I commend the department for evaluating student perceptions, and enrollment. These broad program goals are important and should be addressed. The data on course enrollment is analyzed by the program, but it is not clear how any of the other data is used. For example, there seems to be low enrollment in internships- what does the program make of that data? More broadly, how does the program use this information?

5. There are three criteria for evaluating SLOs: very good (VE), Good Enough (GE), and Not Good Enough (NGE) and different measures ranging from class assignments to multiple choice tests- Who evaluates and assigns ratings? Data is provided for all students enrolled in the course in which the SLO is assessed and therefore results are not necessarily those of GB majors.

7. Assessment results are reviewed by the program committee and the coordinator. The program has five concrete SLOs which are mapped across the curriculum and the plan is to measure each semester.

7. The assessment template was concise, rich, and informative.

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

A. Trend Data

1. [MAJORS ONLY] Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

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

2. [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

3. [MAJORS ONLY] As a follow up to program enrollment and graduation, describe the strategies used to recruit and retain students.

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

4. Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University.

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

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

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

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

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

General Comments related to Section VI.A

1. Student demand is consistent, and the faculty closely monitor course offerings to make sure students can progress through the degree. Student credits are high, but I think this would be expected for such a major.

1.The enrollments look steady, strong and sustainable. This is an attractive major, particularly GB online major and GB minor and based on market projections the program will continue to stay in high demand.

3. There was not a discussion of any recruitment or retention issues- this could be there are not any issues.

3. The program might consider more recruitment/retention strategies outside of UWW admissions. What can the program do to support awareness of the program? How might the advisory board or program committee help to develop strategies for recruitment and retention, especially for the underrepresented student body?

4. Missing a description of College or Department strategies used to engage underrepresented communities.

6. This was not addressed directly, but it seems the program could grow..?

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.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
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

General Comments for VI.B

The information provided here was sufficient. This is a unique degree in its intentionally broad curriculum.

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.

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

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

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

3. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.

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

General Comments related to section VII.A

1. These questions pertain less given the nature of the program.

1. This program's staffing is provided by all the CoBE departments. As such, staffing is not an issue to this major.

Some of the questions were not answered. While there is recognition that the program is interdisciplinary, there needs to be a discussion of how the program is staffed, and there is some intentionality between instructor knowledge and expertise when assigning course load. I do not think it is appropriate to not address these items. What are the responsibilities of the program coordinator?

This section was difficult to evaluate because of the lack of data. It might be helpful to have some summary of the discussions that happen at the committee meetings related to staffing. Do some departments have more staffing concerns than others? Are there courses that were discontinued because of staffing? Perhaps the assessment office can provide clarity on how this cross departmental program was advised to complete this section.

<h3 style="text-align:center">VII. Resource Availability & Development:</h3>

<h3 style="text-align:center">B. Student Resources</h3>

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

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

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

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

General Comments for VII.B

1. Advising through the COBE Advising Center seems ideal for this major given the variety of coursework students take.

The program indicated there are no needs related to student resources.

The report only spoke about advising and Hyland hall. Are there enough advisers in COBE to support the needs of students? Does the program have student help? What resources are needed to support the online students?

<h3 style="text-align:center">VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program</h3>

1. Areas of strength are discussed.

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

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1

No/Limited Evidence	0

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

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

General Comments for VIII

The only improvement noted was to the minor. I think there are some areas the program could reflect and improve. Some that come to mind include tracking students, offering internships, measuring student learning, and further discussion on how to use the data from the 4-phase plan.

3. It appears that there is a need for clarity in the curriculum for the minor. Will the committee be working on revising the minor curriculum?

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

Program leadership structure, faculty from across the college are committed to the success of this program, opportunities for HIPs within the program.

The faculty have committed a tremendous amount of time and effort to develop a stronger assessment plan. Faculty are committed to monitoring course offerings and enrollment to ensure students can progress through their degrees at an appropriate pace.

The program meets an important area of student demand, and successfully places graduates. The program attracts a range of non-traditional students, and students with a diversity of goals and interests. Accreditation boosts credibility.

1. The GB program is the fourth largest program in the CoBE, the program benefits from the strengths of each individual department in COBE.

2. Employment numbers look impressive with 97-100% placed after graduation.

3. The enrollments look steady, strong and sustainable. This is an attractive major, particularly GB online major and GB minor and based on market projections the program will continue to stay in high demand.

4. The SOAS data looks good!

The program has a clear structure and curriculum. The students can design a plan of study that meets their needs. Program goals are clear and evaluated regularly. Enrollment is strong.

The program has developed an innovative cross departmental experience that draws on the strengths across departments and affords students flexibility and diversity in their course offerings as well as high impact practices.

Assessment plan. Support from other College departments.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

1. Close the assessment loop. Consider how LO data can be used to inform program changes and improvements. Reflect on the meaning/significance of assessment results.

1. Keep up the work on assessment collecting and analyzing the data every semester as identified in the report.

2. Implement strategies to track SLOs. Consider sharing the assessment data with appropriate internal and external constituencies for program growth and improvement.

There does not seem to be much intentionality behind the program design in terms of what knowledge and skills students will leave with upon program completion. The focus has been on analyzing enrollment trends and course offerings. This is evident in the lack of analysis of SLO data, and limited reflection on how course and staff choices

may impact student retention and course offerings (versus just whether students enroll in courses which could be due to scheduling preference and not interest in the content).

The program might continue to strengthen the ties across stake holder departments for staffing and resources and work to close the loop on assessment data.

Implement data from assessment.

3. Other comments/questions

Thank you to the faculty team and coordinator for your commitment to the program and this process of assessment and review.

It is clear a lot of work was done to pull items together for the self-study. This likely fell to the program coordinator, considering the limited number of staff (?) supporting the program. However, it is helpful for all items to be answered and for the report to be reviewed for typos and clarity. At times it seemed there was a reliance on the idea that since the program is interdisciplinary it does not have its own presence or identity. Is this an accurate interpretation?

4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

1. Assessment of student learning should be the focus of the assessment plan, using the five program SLOs as the guide. The A&R is interested in learning how the program defines student learning (SLOs, which have already been identified), students' performance on SLOs (could be from student surveys, department reports during committee meetings, select assignments), what is learned from data collected on SLOs (V.4) and how assessment data are being used to make changes to the curriculum (V.5).
2. Make sure to clarify the staffing specifics relative to the program in your next self-study. For example, provide a discussion of the program coordinator and their responsibilities, describe the staffing within the program. Describe the intentionality behind what courses and instructors are selected for the program (VIIA. 1,2,3).
3. Provide an explanation about how the program supports general education and/or proficiency programs at the University (II.2).
4. Clarify how the program goals currently in place will contribute to the program's advancement (III.2).

No progress report necessary. Linda and this group have done a tremendous amount of work. Amazing progress on progress coordination, leadership, communication, and involvement of all departments, etc. We recognize the work that went into preparing the SS.

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.	1
3	Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	4
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 |