

Minutes

College of Letters and Science Academic Planning Council Meeting in Joint Session with College of Agricultural and Life Sciences Academic Planning Council

Meeting Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2014
Meeting Time: 1:00 - 3:30 p.m.
Location: 260 Bascom Hall

Present at meeting

Chair: John Karl Scholz and Kate VandenBosch, Deans

L&S Members present: Harry Brighthouse, Jan Edwards, Clark Johnson, Anna Gemrich, John Hawks, Matt Turner, Betty Harwood, Jennifer Noyes, Diane Gooding, Tom Broman

L&S Observers present: Sue Zaeske, Kimbrin Cornelius, Anne Gunther, Maria Cancian, Elaine Klein, Susan Ellis-Weismer, Nancy Westphal-Johnson, Gery Essenmacher, DeVon Wilson

CALS Present: Karen Wassarman, Robin Kurtz, Tom Schwab, Ken Raffa, Leann Tigges, David Eide, Ann MacGuidwin

CALS Absent: Sundaram Gunasekaran, Carrie Laboski, Tom Crenshaw

CALS Ex-Officio: Kate VandenBosch, Sarah Pfatteicher, Dick Straub, Rick Lindroth

CALS Guests: Jess Gilbert, Karen Schechter, Ivan Rayment

JOINT SESSION

1. Announcements. KS and KV congratulated Rhodes Scholar (Drew Birrenkott) and L&S and CALS faculty receiving Research-Service Grants: Laura Hernandez (Dairy Sciences) and Jenell Johnson (Comm Arts). KS also congratulation Maria Cancian, who was nominated by President Barack Obama to serve as Assistant Secretary for Children and Families (Family Support) in the U.S. department of Health and Human Services.

2. Request for Comment: Proposal to Create a New Certificate in Nelson Institute Sustainability Certificate. Guest, Professor Eagan. KS reviewed concerns previously identified by L&S and CALS Academic Planning Councils and the proposal revisions to address them. The required number of credits was reduced from 19 to 12 to address concerns about time to degree; the list of courses was reduced to a much smaller core, to address concerns about program coherence and focus. In discussion, committee members continued to express concern that the course array does not seem to align with the proposal's "biological" definition of sustainability. Members suggested that either the definition or the course array could be revised to align the definition and the curriculum. Committee members also wondered how the certificate differed from the certificate or major in Environmental Studies, given that courses used meet requirements in all of these programs. Since the CALS committee did not receive the most current copy of the proposal, all committee members tabled further discussion until such time as all members could review that draft. Members also recommended that Professor Benson be invited to join the discussion to address any final questions.

3.Information Items: (a) Deans' Report to the Provost concerning progress made implementing changes to the Biology Major. KS and EW provided updates, including finding a new space, hiring advisors, and meetings of the Biology committees. **(b) Proposal to Consider Biology Core Curriculum Program as an “Honors” Program. EW led discussion.** Guests: Jeff Hardin (Director of Biocore), Sissel Schroeder (Director of L&S Honors), Janet Batzli (Biocore). EW led discussion. Biocore has essentially always been considered an honors program, yet it recently became clear it was not administratively considered one. This has led to the proposal to formally recognize Biocore as an honors program. JB noted the Biocore aligns with L&S Honors founding criteria –significant interaction with faculty, inquiry based learning, going deeply into a subject matter, allowing students to choose areas of depth learning, opportunity for independent study. SP noted CALS honors is a sustained research experience that doesn't necessarily involve coursework; CALS students can participate in Biocore but the course series won't also help CALS students meet the CALS honors requirements. L&S committee members unanimously approved the proposal to consider Biology Core Curriculum Program as an “Honors” Program, with transcription notation of “Biology Core Curriculum Honors” for students that meet the requirements of completing the program

c. Request to Discontinue the Community and Environmental Sociology MS program. Guest Jess Gilbert, Community and Environmental Sociology. KVB led discussion. Sociology and C & E Sociology currently have a jointly held MS program. There is also a rarely used and redundant C & E Sociology MS program with identical requirements. LT assured committee members students will continue to have the option of being awarded the MS in Sociology. Committee members unanimously voted to support the proposal to discontinue the Community and Environmental Sociology MS program.

d. Proposal to Create a New Undergraduate Certificate in Development Economics. Guest, Laura Schechter, Agriculture & Applied Economics. LS noted that Ag & App Econ has historically been the home for most development economics courses offered, and that the L&S Economics department supports the proposal. The certificate would allow students the opportunity to explore the field of development economics, without having to complete a full major. KVB noted CALS and L&S Curriculum Committees support the proposal. Committee members unanimously moved to support the proposal to create a new Undergraduate Certificate in Development Economics, as proposed by the CALS Agriculture and Applied Economics.

CALS SESSION

Revisions to current agenda

No changes to agenda.

Review minutes, February 3, 2014

Changes to minutes requested:

- Ken Raffa not present;
 - Eau Claire not consent item; drop the second sentence
- Ken moved to approve minutes with revisions; Karen second; passed unanimously

Discontinue the Community and Environmental Sociology MS program

Leanne noted the proposal was prompted by outside sources. The purpose of the proposal is adherence to consistency. David entered a motion to approve; Ken second; the motion passed unanimously with no abstention or opposition
From here the proposal goes to GFAC for approval and UAPC as a consent item

New Undergraduate Certificate in Development Economics

Proposal was revised from an original that would serve 30 students, to serving 10 students and contains course overlap limits.

The committee noted a lack of supporting letters.

Karen motion to support the proposal, Ann second; the motion passed unanimously with no abstention or opposition

CIAS Governance guidelines (1st time, info/discussion)

The purpose of creating the guidelines was to get a balance of internal and external partners, and include faculty governance. The guidelines provide a mechanism for appointing individuals to the board.

Questions the committee has:

- Would like a list or current org chart for the center itself to understand membership, who belongs from which group, their affiliations (department, program, institution)
- A lot of info is distributed through CIAS, what peer review or process does that information go through?

Committee would like to Invite Michael Bell to the next meeting to get a sense of the extent to which governance would support or hinder their mission by helping to balance their the need for autonomy to do their work, but the structure a University requires

It was noted that campus requires centers go through review and CALS strategic planning is undertaking a review of all centers, both formal and informal (just named).

30-Credit Masters update (info)

The Higher Learning Commission has a set of assumed practices around credits that UW MS programs need to be aligned with. The Grad school has asked colleges to take the lead on preparing the required audit documents and report back to grad school by August 1. A template was provided from the grad school for credit breadth and numbers and a plan to transition if the program does not meet the requirement. CALS has about 24 MS programs that will need to be evaluated.

It was noted that campus has no official repository for MS requirements like we do for undergrads, it is difficult to find current state of programs. Student credit audits are done via a paper form one-by-one, and student transcripts don't contain all the coursework they may have taken (transfer courses).

The committee noted the term "credit" does not mean the same between programs and the requirements for research vs non-research programs may be different. Departments will need to justify 500 and 600 level courses as grad courses. This level of scrutiny may discourage the teaching of low-enrolment courses or courses that mix grads and undergrads.

Guidelines for undergraduate independent/directed study update (info)

These guidelines were approved through campus governance; the purpose is not to create new rules but to codify current practices. Committee members have received pushback at faculty meetings regarding the guidelines—faculty may not take students because of increased paperwork. Faculty were told there would be a template/form and if not collected would hurt the students.

The process was clarified for the committee: Students should have something in writing about expectations for their work and credit, it can be an email. CALS Academic Affairs is not collecting or filing forms.

There was concern about who would be allowed to supervise an independent study (emeritus and adjunct faculty). Campus has said departments have the appropriate expertise to decide who can guide an independent study with faculty and instructional staff assumed to be experts. If departments have someone else they think has the expertise, the department can ask to have that person added to the instructor table.

There was a question of what to do with people who are not on the payroll and the liability of supervising students. We may not know if people are teaching with no appointment (no pay) and are therefore not employees. Will need to talk with HR about this issue.

Biochemistry IBiP review (integrated graduate program, discussion)

This is an integrated Phd program with the SMPH.

The committee raised a few concerns:

Potential for outside trainers as part of the program, review document suggest it should be considered. Historically Biochem has not had an outside trainer but Bio-Molecular Chem has. Biochem would add a trainer where the faculty perceives a weakness in the program and it would benefit from the outside

expertise. The committee suggests the program put in place guidelines for becoming trainer.

As part of their IPiB training, PhD students are considered Research Assistants (RA) but are required to gain experience by teaching undergraduate courses. The teaching is considered a practicum effort designed to complement their research, and is not treated as or compensated as an official Teaching Assistant (TA).

The students do their teaching during their later years, when they are paid by faculty research grants, so the students are functioning as teaching assistants in undergrad courses, while largely being paid on NIH grants to faculty.

The committee was concerned that IPiB was not using TAs for teaching and that the activity was designed primarily to benefit the PhD student, not the undergraduate. They noted that the College *does* have a pool of funds for TA support, but that IPiB has never applied for those funds.

Overall, the committee thinks the program is strong and well regarded. A motion to accept the report with concerns about trainers and TA's was entered from David, Karen second; the motion passed unanimously with no abstention or opposition

APC self study subcommittee report (discussion)

4 major issues in the report:

- Need to communicate better—posting minutes to ecals; annual report; firmer lines of communication by identifying specific individuals in each department
- Continue to play an advisory role in faculty hiring? APC is not deciding the hires, but advisory with the final decision being the deans; very few hires made in the last years and a lot of work goes into proposing new hires; past deans have not always taken APC advice
- Website—make it more accessible and updated
- Proposed change in structure: 5 divisions maintaining proportion of faculty numbers to elected members; no 2 from same department; AS has 2 positions with CASI rep having full voting rights as an APC member who serves on CASI elected for 3 year term

APC Reps have not yet spoken to their constituencies about the report, there is concern about implementation at the department level, so before moving forward need to make a transition plan to share with departments

The college will need to hold an all faculty in-person vote with 51% of the faculty present in order to move ahead with proposed changes.

David motioned to bring the document forward for circulation to faculty and staff for comment; passed unanimously

Chairs meeting; recommend be placed on department agenda meetings;

Strategic Planning Priority Theme updates (info)

Dean VandenBosch gave a quick overview noting priority theme workshops were taking place and that several committees were ready to submit their final reports.

