

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Applied Doctorate in Business 2019-2020**

Date: 2/26/2020

Time: 11:00 am

Place: Hyland Hall 4303

Invited: Interim Associate Provost, Joan Cook; Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, Matt Vick; Dean John Chenoweth (Business & Econ); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Praveen Parboteeah; faculty and staff in the Applied Doctorate in Business program; Audit & Review Team Chair Carrie Merino; Audit & Review team members S.A. Welch, Elena Levy-Navarro, Tia Schultz, and Matthew Vick, assessment representative Catherine Chan

- 1) Call to order by Dr. Carrie Merino
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments

The program has many strengths identified by the Audit and Review Team. First, as the only Applied Doctorate in Business (DBA) program in the State of Wisconsin, the program is a leader in diversifying the business field in the area. The program's continued growth is exciting. Additionally, the college's AACSB accreditation provides further evidence of the program's quality. Another identified strength is the format of the program, which meets a unique need for students pursuing this doctorate. This encompasses the ability to continue working full-time while pursuing the degree. Much thought and effort continues to be focused on maintaining this unique method of delivery. Additionally, high standards regarding core faculty and extensive coordination with all departments in the College of Business and Economics in support of the program and curriculum is also commendable. Last but not least, the recruitment of diverse students and maintaining high graduation rates of students will continue to set the program apart. The DBA is an innovative program that introduced UW-W to doctoral education.

Program chair Dr. K. Praveen Parboteeah presented a written document not previously read in response to the Audit and Review Committee comments. Due to the nature of the meeting, there was not time to read through that document in its entirety during the meeting. This will be provided electronically to all committee members not present. A discussion of several recommendation points followed.

- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

Overall, the Audit and Review Team commends the DBA program for their innovation and creativity in launching and sustaining a cutting-edge doctoral program at UW-Whitewater. As this is the first time the program has undergone the Audit and Review process on campus, feedback has been streamlined to highlight possible considerations and planning moving into the next Audit and Review Cycle. These highlights build on many program strengths and would contribute to the program's student-centered culture.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:**

Data Collection and Assessment

Create a more comprehensive curriculum map that crosswalks Student Learning Outcomes and other program standards (e.g., accreditation) across courses. This would allow for better organization of student data for each individual objective. This would also allow for a more streamlined discussion of how data is then used to systematically adjust curriculum or program elements, as each standard/objective will be represented across several courses/tasks. Your narrative in your next self-study will also be more clearly tied to assessment methods in courses and final outcomes for students upon graduation. Below is an example of categories that may be included:

SLO/Program Objective	Introduced	Developed	Mastered
Write the objective here	Example course Sequence DBA 810	DBA 820	DBA 850
Assessment Measures	Final Paper	Multiple Choice Exam 3	Final Presentation

Terms can be adjusted to fit with program language. However, the recommendation is to have more than one assessment point for each standard/objective to provide a richer description of student data and how that can contribute to the program as a whole.

To Summarize:

- Create a Crosswalk of program objectives/outcome/standards and how they are assessed across the curriculum at three different points in time
- Use this data to make program decisions
- Specifically discuss how this data was used to make program changes specifically in the next report

Student Retention and Assistance:

The review team recognizes the efforts that the program faculty and staff devote to marketing and admitting diverse students. This is commendable and, given the strengths of the program, likely to continue. As the program considers moving forward in the competitive landscape, the concern of student retention is highlighted by the review team. Retention is a multifaceted concept. During discussion, faculty of the DBA Program stated that retention was not a significant concern, and that students who begin the program complete the program. In response to this, Audit and Review Committee members challenge the program to think about retention in a more comprehensive way. This may be accomplished by considering intersectionality of students within the program and creating a more systematic way of meeting diverse student needs as part of retention efforts. While students may finish, this does not indicate that there are not individual barriers or concerns that the program might consider and provide resources or other assistance. For example, students may be first-generation, come from a minority background in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, etc., or have mental health needs that could impact their ability to complete the program. Being careful to not assume that students are not facing issues in their lives as they complete the program is essential, as is documenting how students are assisted with these challenges. The committee would like to see a more comprehensive way that students with diverse needs are identified and assisted in the program. This may already be happening through the advisory relationship, however creating a way to better track this and speaking to these outcomes in the next report will be needed.

One point noted in the report was the mention of remedial performance and reaching out to the student the next semester. The Committee would like the program to include specific procedures that can be tracked on who does this, what the response was, and how the student is then assisted. This would speak to a more specific retention plan for students who may need this assistance. This may be represented through a chart or table, but help to clarify the specifics of the process of helping retain students once they are in the program if needed.

In summary, please include the following in the next report:

- Documentation of how diverse needs are identified and considered in the program. This may include more demographic data, more formal advisory meetings, etc. Consider a broad range of intersections of identity as part of this discussion.
- Documentation of the process for students with remedial performance and what plan there is in place for that student beyond simply being contacted the next semester by someone.

Consultative Feedback

- Continue to streamline the dissertation process to better serve students.
- Report on how the DBA competitive landscape changes between this report and the next self-study; focus on how UW-W's program is distinct and attractive.
- Collaboration with the Campus Graduate Community: One area that the review team also noted builds upon the strength of the DBA program integrating diverse CoBE faculty to assist doctoral students with dissertations. The review team would like the program to also consider collaboration with other programs, particularly graduate programs on campus. How could the program potentially market or collaborate with other graduate programs on campus? How might other graduate faculty provide support as requested for dissertation that may touch on some of their field in addition to a business focus? (human services, counseling, special education, psychology, etc). UWW has many outstanding graduate level faculty who would value a partnership with students completing dissertations within their areas of specialty, and could provide additional diversity to the training experience as well as the overall program. Again, considering this moving forward would be of benefit to the program and the students served when applicable.

6) Recommended Actions:

The evaluation report lists five recommended actions (see page 19, point 3) regarding data collection and utilization as well as student retention and collaboration with the campus graduate community. Consultative Feedback is also provided.

7) Final Result: *Continuation without qualification*

Faculty of the DBA program feel that they have met all requirements and asked for the committee to reconsider their recommendation for a full self-study to be due in 2024. This discussion happened with other committee members. The following result was agreed upon by the committee:

- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
- **Next SHORT self-study will be due to the College Deans on October 1, 2024 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2024**

Adjourn by Dr. Carrie Merino.

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**

Date of Evaluation 12/10/2019 Short Self Study (SS*) _____
 Program: Doctorate in Business Administration Major Minor

Evaluations submitted by: Carrie Merino, Tia Schultz, S.A. Welch, Catherine Chan, Matthew Vick, Elena Levy-Navarro

Review meeting attended by: Carrie Merino, Tia Schultz, Catherine Chan, Matthew Vick

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	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.A.1

I appreciate how each strategic goal and objective is provided and explained, and at least one had a more concrete example of work done by a student.

Detailed connections to the UWW core values, mission, and plan were included.

One cannot argue with the fact that there is sufficient evidence here; however, I might work on being a bit more succinct. Especially helpful is the use of specific examples as used in the section on regional partnerships.

2. The program supports other undergraduate and graduate programs offered at UW-W (if relevant).

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

Comments for I.A.2

I wonder how this degree could also be attractive to those beyond the MBA program- perhaps this would be something to think about.

Their response did not really answer the question. However, they were clear in that the program goes beyond the MBA

I think the response is adequate, but I guess I don't find this applicable overall. You make a compelling argument that this is a different group of students (even if you have alumnae/i in the group). It might help in our reputation, which is one of the arguments made throughout.

3. The program works to support at least two goals from the institution's Inclusive Excellence Guidelines.

Sufficient Evidence	4
---------------------	---

Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	1

Comments for I.A.3

The specific steps taken in striving for inclusive excellence with students is not detailed. Further, the appendix was unclear as to how it supports this process.

The program's access to working professionals does hold promise for helping to diversify the business professoriate. The variety of locations for face-to-face recruitment sessions provides a good service to reach out to different populations.

4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review report; Progress Reports have been included (if relevant).

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

Comments for I.A.4

NA- this is the first A&R for the DBA program

Since this is the first time the DBA has participated in the A&R process, there are no previous A&R reports to address.

This is the first self-study for the program as noted in the submitted report.

N/A (First Audit and Review)

General Comments related to Section I.A

I wonder how this degree could also be attractive to those beyond the MBA program- perhaps this would be something to think about.

Consider working with other COBE programs in responding to some of the items in a more standardized way.

I. Program Purpose & Overview: B. Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments

1. The program’s mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program and aligns with the mission of the School of Graduate Studies.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.B.1

Very thorough

There may be too much evidence here. Nonetheless, too much is probably "sufficient."

2. The program established and worked to accomplish goals designed to improve the quality of the program.

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

Comments for I.B.2

Appendix B was very helpful to me as a reviewer. In addition, I think the program will find the data helpful as well in ways to improve and strengthen the program.

The example of revising the DBA 830 course was helpful. Student comments also indicated a lack of coordination between the courses. Was this addressed?

In terms of practitioners, yes, but in most of the discussion, there is a reference to the need for tenure-track faculty in the area. This market and the need of those who intend to compete in it needs further definition. If this is a market that is currently being targeted, its needs and its relationship to the other students needs further explicit development.

3. The program has a process for setting and evaluating progress on achieving program-level goals, and making decisions about program changes based on assessment data.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.B.3

A strength of the program is that there is an ongoing committee of stakeholders that meets regularly to review the program and address concerns.

The survey conducted with students (Appendix B) is a terrific first step in establishing a system for evaluation.

The description on how the program changed to address difficulties the first year students were having with their papers is not sufficiently explained. It's clear that they took steps to deal with the students difficulties with research including statistical analysis. The pre-enrollment Research Methods course is notable. So, is the inclusion of more literature review in the classrooms. Nonetheless, it seems that the students may require more writing -- as was originally assumed. More assessment in the area of writing research papers in an applied mode should be considered.

4. The program is considering potential revisions to the mission, goals, or objectives (i.e., the program has a “vision” for the next level and how to get there).

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

Comments for I.B.4

The program is new, so there are no revisions to the mission, goals, or objectives. However, the program continues to target areas for improvement.

They have clear data that indicates that while their overall mission and goals are intact, adjustments need to be made. Perhaps comparing this data to the original mission and goals would be a worthy first step.

Nice website celebrating the achievements of graduates.

As an outsider, I am curious as to whether all functional (disciplinary) areas are the same or whether "research" or "scientific" method even differs in terms of some disciplines and others. In any case, one wonders whether there is any area that may require further development in terms of its own "vision" or even its own target audience. In terms of what was written above, it would help to drill down on the student who is attending to become a university professor.

5. The program achieved and/or earned special recognition or awards during the review period.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for I.B.5

Is the submitted report missing specific quote(s) from the accreditation report? Currently the end of the first paragraph in this section reads: The AACSB review team noted that "..."

Was a quote from AACSB supposed to be included where it says "..."?

6. The program earned (or retained) specialized accreditation (if applicable) during the review period.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments for I.B.6

AACSB accreditation

General Comments related to Section I.B

Good support of efforts to keep the program moving forward based on needs to students and faculty. Good job on accreditation.

You have some terrific data that can help the program develop and strengthen.

II. Assessment: A. Curriculum & the Assessment of Students' Learning

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

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

Comments for II.A.1

Very clear criteria.

The curriculum includes a teaching statement and a statement on consultant. If this is applied, there should be more explicit linking to their professional life. A teaching statement seems more or less unnecessary for someone who will continue in her or his professional field, but quite necessary and even enhanced for those who want to go into (or advance in) teaching. More explicit focus on the integration of their work-life (or future work-life) into their DBA might be useful. Also, more of a consideration of ethics as in a statement of their professional commitment may enhance the practical aspect of the degree.

2. Expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students in dual-listed courses.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	6

Comments for II.A.2

All courses are DBA specific

The DBA does not offer any dual-listed courses.

The DBA program does not offer dual listed courses.

Graduate level only program.

No dual listed courses.

3. Changes to the curriculum were based on assessment data.

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

Comments for II.A.3

As the program is just getting started, and this is the first A&R, the example of changing a course already to reflect the needs of students bodes well for continued curriculum improvement.

While their answer clearly addresses changes that were made or considered, it was unclear if these decisions were based on assessment data. Given that students in year one had to exhibit certain levels of proficiency, it seems that there is data to use in these decisions.

Not really applicable at present, but sufficient insofar as there is a conscious consideration of relevant data.

4. The program offers additional opportunities for students, and students make use of these in ways that impact the University, community, and/or region.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.A.4

They seem to have quite a few options for students to participate in. Is there any data on how many students choose a particular option?

How do assignments or courses integrate real-life application of research in applied business areas?

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

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	6

Comments for II.A.5

No online courses offered

The DBA program is completely face to face.

Not a large component. Even if not stated explicitly, it was assumed that this kind of program requires face-to-face and intensive work. Perhaps most important now is the degree to which it depends on the student's own motivation. I know this is an area that is being considered by examining those students who don't make it through to the end. However, the student who does so has improved her or his skills in project management.

General Comments related to Section II.A

II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program has clearly articulated learning performance outcomes for students, which are "mapped" to the curriculum.

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

Comments for II.B.1

The chart in Appendix D was clear and helpful.

The attached document appears to focus on learning that occurs outside of the coursework to support research skills. This is indeed valuable, but not map of the coursework toward the SLOs was included.

See comments above about ethics. The definition of ethics in terms of how the student understands her or his self in a professional context could be enhanced. Perhaps group work ensures that the student learns to work in a diverse environment?

2. The program has an Assessment Plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the learning outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	5
---------------------	---

Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.B.2

I saw that were a few students that were rated as below standards. Beyond the remedial work and consulting with relevant faculty, are there follow-up assessments for these students? Are the measures in place if the student is still below standard?

3. Research/scholarly activity, as defined by the program, is incorporated in the achievement of student learning outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for II.B.3

Are there requirements for publication beyond conducting scholarly activity?
 Reflective seminars appear directed at continuous improvement for the program.

4. The program collected a variety of assessment data, allowing judgments to be made about the extent to which students are achieving learning performance outcomes.

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

Comments for II.B.4

Summary of internal and external data provided.
 See above about thinking about different markets of students as needing a different form of assessment.

5. The program has developed a process for using assessment data in making changes to students' learning outcomes.

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

Comments for II.B.5

Changes appear driven by student feedback and industry information through advisory groups.

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

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

Comments for II.B.6

I imagine that to maintain the accreditation mentioned previously, that some data would need to be given to that agency. What type of data is shared with them. This, I believe, would be a stronger answer to Q6 than what was supplied in this report.

I commend the program for setting up the structure of the DBA Committee and holding regular meetings. It would be helpful to know how often or regular DBA update or issues are discussed in individual department meetings. The report mentions 'regular' but more specific information, preferably the frequency of dedicated department meetings for discussing DBA issues, would be helpful.

This could be stated, "yes," since the advisory board and others are consulted.

General Comments related to Section II.B

Continue to expand on a more formalized assessment plan with specific ways of evaluating and utilizing data to make decisions.

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

Comments for III.A.1-2

The program is definitely growing. However, given some of the student responses (have engaged and committed faculty) is the program going to struggle in having graduates complete the program in a timely manner (a goal stated earlier) if it grows at this rate (double enrollment in 4 years) with the current faculty.

Congratulations to the program for having very high graduation rate for its students.

3. Composition of students reflects the diversity of the University, and the program has developed methods of recruiting and retaining students and to enhance diversity among students in the program.

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

Comments for III.A.3

It was good to see that 20.5% of the DBA students are URM while for the University the URM population is 14.3%

Can the program share what it means by providing underrepresented students 'with strong mentorship and are encouraged by all faculty'? Is there a formal structure for this mentorship and encouragement? Similarly, the program mentions the students provide support to each other. Does the program provide intentional opportunities/structures to facilitate this form of peer support?

The program has done very well at recruiting a diverse student body.

This is demonstrated, as are the recruitment areas. Retention is the area that could perhaps be addressed more.

4. Graduation rates indicate that students complete the program in a timely manner.

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

Comments for III.A.4

While, yes, the program did answer this question, my concerns regarding available faculty and the double enrollment over a 4 year time period could pose a problem. Has this been reflected upon by the program?

Somewhat N/A.

A clear strength of the program is the speed of completion. Is there a plan for students who might progress more slowly based on family and other lifestyle needs? Is there a plan for those who have to step away to return?

5. Program level has provided evidence to support its claim of being oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level.

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

Comments for III.A.5

I am not sure if the "success rate" is graduation rate? Need more of an explanation for this 90%.

Earlier in the report (when describing recognition of faculty and the program), the report noted that one faculty member in particular was the chair of "several" (words in the report) dissertation committees. Is there a way to balance the workload of the faculty? These thoughts also coincide with student responses of suggesting you have willing and committed faculty teaching in the program.

This section talks about marketing in order to get a stronger pool, but it's unclear what is meant by that.

General Comments related to Section III.A

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

1. Graduates of the program find employment or continue their education.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for III.B.1

Impressive list of accomplishments (positions) for the graduates.

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

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for III.B.2

Reference to AACSB documents and arguments about supplying academic qualifications for small universities are made.

3. Program is cognizant of differences in student populations (e.g., full-time/part-time students, working adults, recent undergraduate degree recipients, etc.).

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

Comments for III.B.3

The information provided seemed to repeat previous information and didn't really answer this particular question.
 Given that the classes are all in-class ones, is there information about class scheduling that would help students continue their studies?

See above -- is there a track or way of doing this for those who need to do it more slowly? Is this perhaps not necessary because the nature of the program requires intense engagement from professionals who will progress through the program in the same way. What is the advantages of the cohort model to a DBA and the practitioner? Could that be marketed -- the networking and close relationships.

4. The program effectively tracks graduates of the program.

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

Comments for III.B.4

General Comments related to Section III.B

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	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for III.C.1

It is interesting, but unclear, as to why PhD students must be full time whereas, I gather, the DBA do not have to be full time. There was some confusion about how this is defined in the report and may be an ongoing concern.

The program could list main competitors for DBA students (not required by the prompt).

The accreditation and value are important, but more focus on emotional arguments (student demand) might help too.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Graduate Faculty Characteristics

1. Characteristics of the faculty (e.g., gender, ethnicity, rank, percentage of time devoted to the program and course responsibilities) are clearly indicated.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for IV.A.1

Given student feedback of having willing and committed faculty, and that the program has doubled in 4 years, the fact that only 2 faculty are 100% DBA focused instructors, does this pose a problem in the future?

2. Expectations, preparation, and work experience of the graduate faculty are conducive to the effective delivery of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for IV.A.2

It is good that the expectations for DBA faculty are more extensive than for other faculty. Perhaps this is why only 2 are 100% DBA faculty?

3. The program has identified how changes in the composition of the graduate faculty have affected the program (if relevant).

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	0

No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	4

Comments for IV.A.3

No changes since inception of program	
This is the DBA program's first A&R.	
This is the first self-study for the program.	
New program.	

4. The program has identified staffing needs and pending changes that may affect the delivery of the program.

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

Comments for IV.A.4

Specifics on how faculty are "quickly" meeting needs might be helpful.	
In the answer to this question, the report noted: "As such, the DBA has the appropriate number of faculty. " However, this does seem to have a short term vs. long term view. I saw this because of student comments in the survey about having willing and committed faculty, and the fact that the program has doubled in 4 years.	
Is there any demand within the business specialties that one might see as increasing (or decreasing)? Is there any area that might require more staffing in the future?	

General Comments related to Section IV.A

I would suggest that the program incorporate data from all areas in considering its future needs. If the program only considers an "as is" view, there could be potential consequences for accreditation and national rankings.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement

1-2. Graduate faculty engage in activities to enhance teaching, advising, involvement in course or curricular revision, new course development, etc.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for IV.B.1-2

Good mix of UWW and UW system PD and external opportunities.

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

1-2. Graduate faculty engage in scholarly/creative activity in ways that support or advance the graduate program.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for IV.C.1-2

This is impressive given the higher criteria for DBA faculty.
 The faculty have impressive scholarship credentials.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding

1-2. Graduate faculty pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts in ways that support or advance the graduate program.

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

Comments for IV.D.1-2

The explanation makes sense in terms of NSF not funding business research. The list of grants is good documentation of creative funding faculty have found.
 It seems like a sound argument that there are fewer grants in this area. Is there any possibility that students can be incorporated into consulting projects?

IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service

1-2. Graduate faculty engage in professional and public service in ways that benefit internal and external constituencies.

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

Comments for IV.E.1-2

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 graduate student population.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for IV.F.1

Included in their response is: "With regards to faculty, the current body is adequate to satisfy teaching needs. However, occasionally, the DBA program has needs with regards to dissertation committee members." This counters a previous answer that the faculty amount is adequate but coincides with student survey responses about willing and committed faculty.

With regard to the inclusion of external faculty members in dissertation committees, what are the criteria for approving such inclusion? Does the program foresee any increased need for such service and if so, does the program have a plan/pipeline for recruiting such faculty members?

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	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited	0

Comments for IV.G.1

This statement was included in the report: " Despite some challenges with regards to specific databases." These challenges do not need to be described here, but my hope is that these challenges become part of the program's long-term analysis of improving the program. In addition, these statements was included in this answer: " The college of business and economics also provides access to EBSCO Host and Proquest and both databases have access to most of the reputable required peer reviewed journals in the field. There have been rare instances where students need an article that is not available in the UWW library. In such cases, the library has been able to work with other libraries for access." If access to EBSCO host is one of the expenditures noted in the earlier chart, the program may be able to save money because the University library offers access to EBSCO and UB borrowing is available at no cost to students as it interlibrary loans.

Have the students been surveyed about these resources?

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Program strengths are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for V.1

As is true across the University at all levels, the faculty play a key role in the success of students. The report included this statement: "Furthermore, while there were challenges in the beginning, the DBA program has now found the right mix of faculty from the different functional areas who are caring and who cater to students' needs at the dissertation phase." Does seem to counter student feedback and the growth of the program?

The program sets itself apart as dedicated toward working professionals, providing an integrated (versus overly specialized) curriculum and strong faculty.

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

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

Comments for V.2

The summary bar chart of the exit survey is very clear (and shows significant improvement). However, the questions ask for discussion of areas of improvement as well. I did not see any information related to what students have included for this question.

I commend the program for paying special attention to students who may be challenged to complete their dissertation on time, and having a more structured dissertation schedule would no doubt be beneficial. In general, I think most students, whether challenged or not, would benefit from having an explicit structure/schedule, and having at least periodic check-in with the dissertation committee.

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	6
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments for V.3

The response includes: "Continue working with COBE marketing to more effectively reach potential applicants." Perhaps, at the moment, that should be less of a concern given that the program has already doubled. The report also includes: "The program has been successful in getting academic staff to join the DBA to complete the doctorate. More efforts will be devoted to this area." Does this mean as DBA faculty or as DBA students? If faculty, what about the research expectations of DBA faculty?

What were the specific concerns raised by the Department of Homeland Security in admitting international students? Does the program need additional assistance/resources to remedy the stated concerns?

General Comments related to Section V

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

Comments from Individual Member of the Audit and Review Team:

Format of the program, meeting a unique need

This is the only DBA program in WI. It was created for students who need to continue their employment while pursuing a doctorate.

The program has many strengths in its favor: 1. strong placement of graduates 2. Enrollment has doubled in 4 years 3. Faculty are published and have received external funding.

1. Accreditation 2. Among the few DBA programs in US and the only one in WI 3. Involvement of all departments in CoBE to support the curriculum 4. High graduation rates of students

The DBA is an innovative program that introduced UW-W to doctoral education. It has a well-defined target audience and purpose for existence. Faculty accomplishments and graduate accomplishments are impressive.

Accreditation, breadth of the programs, strength of the faculty.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

Having a streamlined dissertation process in place, continued recruitment and considering the competition

The program notes its continued attention to increasing applicants. The program notes a need to continue to stay competitive with other programs.

It seems that the program is taking a more "as is now" view while there is data that suggests a longer-term view may be called for. A longer-term data plan is needed and would aid in accreditation in the future. As a specific example, student program feedback was discussed and utilized to make changes in the program delivery and courses offered. However, some of the feedback was not included in the discussion, such as students feeling as though faculty were not as engaged as they would like them to be. In discussing data already being gathered, including an honest discussion of both positives and areas where improvement is still being made will be important.

1. Maintain/increase the competitive edge for student recruitment 2. Continue to examine the curriculum and structure of the program to meet students' needs

See above. More conscious discussion of the various cohorts and of percent desired from various business functions and various markets. Is the marketing equally targeting all areas, and if so, would money be better spent on attracting more of one area or another?

3. Recommended Actions

Data Collection and Use:

- Create a Crosswalk of program objectives/outcome/standards and how they are assessed across the curriculum at three different points in time
- Use this data to make program decisions
- Specifically discuss how this data was used to make program changes specifically in the next report

Student Retention and Assistance:

- Documentation of how diverse needs are identified and considered in the program. This may include more demographic data, more formal advisory meetings, etc. Consider a broad range of intersections of identity as part of this discussion.
- Documentation of the process for students with remedial performance and what plan there is in place for that student beyond simply being contacted the next semester by someone.

4. Consultative Feedback

- Continue to streamline the dissertation process to better serve students.
- Report on how the DBA competitive landscape changes between this report and the next self-study; focus on how UW-W's program is distinct and attractive.
- Meet with other graduate programs that have knowledge in related sectors to determine if they could serve on dissertation committees as appropriate. Report on such collaborations in the next self-study.

5. Final Result: *Continuation without qualification*

Continuation without qualification	5
Continuation with minor concerns	1
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress reports to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress in addressing the major concerns	0
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
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
Non-continuation of the program	0
Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	0
Total	6

***Next SHORT self-study will be due to the College Deans on October 1, 2024 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2024**