

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for  
Audit and Review Face-to-Face report Meeting  
University of Wisconsin- Whitewater  
Marketing, 2018-2019**

**Date:** December 14, 2018

**Time:** 2:30pm-3:30pm

**Place:** HH 4301

**Present:** Provost Susan Elrod; Dean John Chenoweth; Department Chair Jimmy Peltier; faculty/ staff in the Marketing program Yushan Zhao; Audit & Review Team Chair Eric Appleton; Audit & Review team members Corey Davis, Ahmad Kari, Yeongmin Kim, Joan Cook

1. Call to order at 2:30; Welcome; Introductions
2. Overview of review team evaluation, program comments

The program is well structured and currently able to meet the needs of the students. The faculty are active in teaching improvement activities, professional development, and encouraging high impact practices and student experiences. The student organizations are doing outstanding work, and the program has gained a state and national reputation for excellence.

The program is very active in its assessment activities; assessment is done systematically, and the results are used to make course changes. There was a question from the review committee regarding writing proficiency regarding where and how in the curriculum it was assessed. It was also noted that curricular mapping included the courses where SLOs were addressed, rather than how the SLOs built and developed from class to class; it appeared that course offerings were rather non-sequential (without need for prerequisites).

Enrollment and class size were an issue that arose several times in the review. With the success and steady growth of the program, it appears that increasing class size (whether on campus or on-line) seems to be the main strategy for accommodating growth. The committee had concerns about both sustaining the quality of learning as well issues of instructor overload and burn-out in the face of multiple large enrollment classes.

3. Discussion of Review Team's evaluation
  - a. *Enrollment and class size.* The program asked why the committee response was not unanimously without qualification". Minor concerns from some review team members involved the placement and assessment of writing assignments as well as clarification of class sizes and effect of class size limits on program growth. Department Chair Peltier noted that the majority of classes are capped at 35, larger ones capped at 50, and that 3 new positions were gained since last report. The program does not feel that class size is currently an issue. The Dean feels that program is on a sustainable track for foreseeable future.

There was discussion of what level of program growth is desired. The current CPARC process can be used to identify trends and new student markets. The program has discussed possible graduate programs such as an MS in general Marketing as well as more specific emphases on Health, Not-For-Profit, or Marketing Analytics. These programs would require expansion of curriculum and staff. Provost Elrod encouraged the College to consider health-related programs.

It was noted that much of the intended growth would involve a mix of on-line and on-campus offerings. Dean Chenoweth noted that physical space is an issue across the whole college.

- b. *Assessment.* The program does a very good job with assessment. The review team noted that it was good to see several assessment-related publications from program faculty. Dean Chenoweth noted that Dr. Zhao has played an important role in the program's assessment and is a valuable asset to assessment efforts.

The program is working on a grid to follow up on their writing proficiency assessment, as well as how to foster students' skills in identifying a business problem. In general, oral communication is emphasized more heavily than written communication in the program due to the need for verbal skills in sales. There was discussion about whether writing skills are assessed for individual students or mostly in team projects. The review team encouraged the program to continue to make use of their assessment data, and to consider following up on some of the results with a more in-depth assessment of skills on which the program would like to see higher levels of performance (e.g., analytics). Provost Elrod noted that the Math department is working on a quantitative pathway for students and suggested it might be useful to talk with them.

There was discussion of the extent to which the program gathers information from internship sites regarding desired qualities of interns/employees. Provost Elrod noted that such information might be useful to CoBE as well as to overall University marketing efforts. There was also discussion of curricular mapping of the program's SLOs. Dean Chenoweth noted that it can be difficult to identify where SLOs are initially introduced (i.e., identify prerequisite courses) as most students do not start classes in the major until 2<sup>nd</sup> semester in their junior year. All students do take a capstone.

- c. *Work with marketing student organization.* The program's marketing student organization is consistently recognized as a national leader. There was discussion of how the work that faculty do with the student organization connects to classroom instruction and of its broader impact on students (i.e., beyond those who directly participate in the student org). The program reported that a high percentage of faculty are involved with the student organization. This work is considered an important part of these faculty members' service contribution and is highly valued in the department.
4. **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists two recommended actions regarding strategic planning and program assessment (see page 12).
  5. **Recommended Result:** Continuation without Qualification.
    - a. Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
    - b. Because the recommended result of this review is to continue without qualification, the program's next self-study will be a "short" one focused on the recommended actions from the current report. This short self-study is due by **October 1, 2023 to the Dean of the College of Business and Economics and November 1, 2023 to the chair of Audit & Review Committee.**
  6. Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 3:32pm.  
Submitted by Eric Appleton

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

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

Date of Evaluation 11/6/2018 Short Self Study (SS\*) \_\_\_\_\_

Program: Marketing Major  Minor

**Evaluations submitted by:** Eric Appleton, Ahmad Karim, Yeongmin Kim, Corey Davis, Joan Littlefield Cook

**Review meeting attended by:** Eric Appleton, Ahmad Karim, Yeongmin Kim, Corey Davis, Joan Littlefield Cook

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments**

1. Just curious –

a) does "Academically Qualified" refer to an accreditation body or to UWW's standards?

1. It would be good to spell out acronyms for those of us unfamiliar with these bodies (AACSB) and programs (SPSS, RFM) (this is done in the response to point b)

1. Several courses, offerings are spoken of in the past tense ("Principles of marketing had a module . . ."). Are they no longer offered?

2. MKTG 311 is a prereq/elective in several other programs. No GenEd contributions.

2. Not sure what "success-holding' means.

### 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Comments

2. It looks like the program keeps very good track of goals and how they are accomplished (and by whom).
5. An impressive list, and consistent in level of accomplishment from year to year. Kudos!
5. Impressive list of awards and achievements.
6. N/A for Marketing Department, but is part of College-level accreditation.
6. The response is "NA to department of marketing." Is the assumption that there is no accrediting body?
6. I assume no accreditation is available at the department level.

6. Accreditation is not applicable to the marketing dept.

## II. Assessment: A. Curriculum

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Comments

- Marketing major provides many electives and flexibility, but it does not seem to demonstrate much opportunity for cumulative learning (how courses build upon one another). It appears there is only one prerequisite prior to the capstone class. Program offers multiple emphases to satisfy various student interests.
- "NA in marketing department;" is the assumption that there are no dual listed courses?
- "Assessment data used for this initiative: Based on the assessment data. . . "Not sure what the data was, even if it was simply looking at a selection of writing assignments. Or did this renewed emphasis come about because of the advisory board discussions? This occurs a few times in this section -- that changes were made because of assessment data, but not what tools were used to collect the data, or what the data was. Glad that the program is responding to their collection results, but it would be good to know more about the information driving the changes. How was it decided that the new emphases, minor, and certificate were needed?
- Ah. I think my answer is in that final paragraph.

3. Please give more detail on the data that underlie the decisions.
4. Many opportunities available for students.
4. Page 23 -- just curious -- what is "B2B"?

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

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

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

### 3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

#### Comments

1. The curricular map chart frames coverage of the SLO, rather than introduction, development, demonstration of mastery. In what courses are students expected demonstrate their highest degree of competency in any particular SLO?
3. Comprehensive plan is in place.
3. Good use of Walvoord's information in developing assessment plan

4. The scale on some measures is unclear (e.g., page 5, Appendix K--are these out of 100%). Most are fine, but I was unclear on a few.
4. Wow. That Appendix K was VERY detailed!
4. Format of the assessment report is good: state the measure and where the data were collected, summarize the data, and make recommendations based on the data.
6. Nice to see assessment-related publications!
5. Thorough discussion of the results, culminating in specific recommended actions.
5. Have the changes resulted in measurable improvements in the skills targeted? This is the next phase--i.e., see if the changes worked.
6. Good. Results shared with advisory board, including students.

### 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

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

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

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

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

#### 5. [MAJORS ONLY] Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University

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

**Comments**

1. Not sure what "Null" on the chart means. It certainly has the highest numbers. . .
3. While I don't believe 127 is substantially above 120, I am curious why it is consistently about two classes above 120.
5. While the chart provides a breakdown of the diversity of the program, I did not find anything to compare these numbers to the university as a whole.
5. No comparison with the university data.
5. Mean non-Caucasian enrollment over the period of review is about 15%--similar to university average.
- 6-7. "The Marketing Department is very successful at managing class sizes to accommodate student demand for particular courses rather than control and limit access to sections." What does this mean? What are the average class sizes?
7. Would the program prefer to reduce enrollment down to the optimal number of 600, or seek funding for more instructors? Is there some other solution besides larger class sizes?

**III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: B. Demand for Graduates**

**1. [MAJORS ONLY] Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.**

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

**2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.**

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

**3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.**

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

**Comments**

3. What is the program learning from its efforts to track graduates?

**III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: C. Comparative Advantage(s)**

**1. The program has unique features that distinguish it from competing programs--giving it a competitive edge**

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

**Comments**



1. National profile. Success of AMA chapter makes UW-W marketing nationally/internationally known.

1. It would be nice to see some of these unique features touched upon in the mission statement.

#### 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

##### 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

##### Comments

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

##### Comments

2. Multiple faculty are involved in advising student orgs.

#### IV. Resource Availability & Development: C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities

##### 1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.

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

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

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

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

##### Comments

2. Just curious: While there are grants noted, what are the expectations of the program? Are faculty expected to seek funding as part of the general operation of the department, or is the generation of external funding more of a valuable 'extra?'

2. Research productivity is very impressive.

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

#### IV. Resource Availability & Development: F. Resources for Students in the Program

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

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

##### Comments

1. Earlier the report noted that the program was oversubscribed, and resorting to larger class sizes. It also noted that a retirement meant it was challenging to fill that particular hole. It's stated that "In Hyland Hall, we able to accommodate more students." Again, are the larger class-sizes preferable and sustainable?
1. Difficult to interpret these numbers without knowing class sizes.

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

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

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

##### Comments

1. Hyland Hall is an embarrassment of riches.

#### 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
<b>3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.</b>	
Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

3. There could be more specific action plans.
3. This is pretty vague. Lots of generalizations; not many specifics here.

**VI. Reviewer Conclusions****1. Strengths of the Program**

- Assessment of student learning is done systematically, and the results are being used to make course changes.
- Many opportunities for students are available.
- The program, faculty/staff, and students have won multiple awards and recognition.
- National/International profile of department and student org success (AMA chapter).
- Flexibility in course offerings; after 311, a variety of courses are offered to fit interests. On the other hand, is a non-sequential approach the best option?
- The program appears well structured and able to meet the current needs of the students. They have identified places for growth and improvement and have plans in place to address them.
- The faculty appears to be active in teaching improvement activities, professional development, and encouraging high impact practices as student experiences.
- From the various reports, tables, and summaries, it looks like the program is very active in its assessment activities and uses them to examine and enrich curriculum and teaching from top of bottom.
- 100% placement.
- Strong faculty.
- Tremendous growth.
- Outstanding student organizations.
- National reputation.
- One of the best programs in the campus.

**2. Areas for Work or Improvement**

- Not much evidence of cumulative learning (sequential course offerings, prerequisites); how does a non-sequential approach to the program impact advising, assessment?
- I have concern regarding the current high enrollment in the program and whether it can be sustained without simply resorting to larger class-sizes (unless those larger classes are indeed amenable to content and methods of teaching in this field). If marketing is indeed a field expected to have continued steady growth, this may be an issue requiring a longer term solution.

**3. Other comments/questions**

- Seems that resources are good at this point but with continued growth, which is the trend, this may become an issue.
- Are class sizes an issue? What are average class sizes for 311 and elective classes?
- The report was thorough, detailed, and informative. Thank you for all the work put into it.

**4. Recommended Actions**

- 1) Continue to engage in strategic planning to manage program growth (goals, timelines, documenting accomplishments), especially regarding sustainability of class sizes. Work with the dean and university to develop a plan to ensure that long-term high enrollment does not have a negative impact on the program.
- 2) Continue the good work the program is currently doing in assessing student learning. In future assessment cycles, determine if the data-based changes are having the desired effects on student learning.

**5. Recommended Result\***

Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	<b>X</b>
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	
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.	
Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	

**\*The program’s next self-study will be due by 10/1/2023 to the Dean of the College of Business and Economics by 10/1/2023 and by 11/1/2023 to the Audit and Review Committee.**

If the final recommended result of this review is to continue without qualification, the program’s next self-study will be a “short” one focused on the recommended actions from the current report.