A G E N D A

Introduction

1:30  Introduction of New Members (William Karpus)

1:35  Automatic Consent approval of the minutes from June 9, 2017  GFEC20170908.01

Information Items

1:40  GFEC Overview and Charge (William Karpus)  GFEC20170908.02

1:55  Guide Publication Schedule and Impact on Governance Actions (Jocelyn Milner, Scott Owczarek) GFEC20170908.03

2:20  Proposed Data Retention Plan for Retiring D2L and Moodle LMS (Brian McNurlen, Elizabeth Harris)

Approvals

2:30  Request to change the admitting status of the M.S. Human Ecology named options in Consumer Behavior & Family Economics and Human Development & Family Studies (Constance Flanagan) GFEC20170908.05

Program Reviews and Updates

2:40  Program Review Updates (Lisa Martin)

   •  Response from Art M.A./MFA/Doctoral Minor and Art Education M.A./Doctoral Minor GFEC20170908.06
   •  Response from Zoology M.A./M.S./Ph.D./Doctoral Minor  GFEC20170908.07
   •  Update from Chemistry M.S./Ph.D./Doctoral Minor  GFEC20170908.07-2

2:45  Supplemental Accreditation/Ten Year Program Review of Graduate Programs in Business (Steph Tai) GFEC20170908.08

   •  Arts Administration M.A./MBA
   •  Finance Investment and Banking M.S./MBA
   •  Management and Human Resources M.S./MBA
   •  Marketing M.S./MBA
   •  Operations and Technology Management M.S./MBA
   •  Real Estate and Urban Land Economics M.S./MBA
   •  Risk Management and Insurance M.S./MBA
   •  Supply Chain Management M.S./MBA
2017-2018 Meeting Schedule
October 6, November 10, December 1, January 12, February 9, March 9, April 13, May 11, June 8
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
52 Bascom Hall
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Graduate Faculty Executive Committee
1:30 pm – 3:30 pm, Room 52 Bascom Hall
June 9, 2017

MINUTES

Members Present: Caroline Alexander, Susan Babcock, Kristin Eschenfelder, Mary Louise Gomez, Lea Jacobs, William Karpus (Chair), Lisa Martin, Christa Olson, John Pfotenhauer, Jose Pincheira, Parmesh Ramanathan, Tracy Schroepfer, Stephanie Tai, Fernando Tejedo-Herrero, Monica Turner

Members Absent: Cynthia Czajkowski, Yu Hen Hu, Nicole Perna, Kirstin Wolf

Guests: Anna Andrzejewski, Ann Archbold, Elaine Klein, Jocelyn Milner, Steve Smith, Susan Zaeske

Staff: Judy Bauman, Katie Block, Eileen Callahan, Becky Chapman, Marty Gustafson, Kelly Haslam, Elena Hsu, LaRuth McAfee, Meghan McMackin, Emily Reynolds, Tori Romba

Dean William Karpus called the meeting to order.

The minutes of May 12, 2017, were approved as a matter of automatic consent.

Approvals:

1. College of Letters & Science Associate Dean Susan Zaeske introduced the request to suspend admissions to the Graduate/Professional Certificate in Material Culture Studies in the Department of Art History. The program is in low award status, which prompted a focused review to determine its long-term viability. Suspension was requested to allow time for the program to consider how it can retool and strengthen if it desires to enroll new students.

   **Motion:** Moved and seconded to suspend admissions to the Graduate/Professional Certificate in Material Culture Studies. The motion was passed unanimously.

2. College of Letters & Science Associate Dean Susan Zaeske and Art History Professor Anna Andrzejewski introduced the request to discontinue the Ph.D. in Art History Named Option “Architectural History.” This motion previously came to GFEC in February 2017, but was tabled until the June meeting to give the department time to ascertain if there was no other option than to discontinue. The department and college consider this named option to be a unique, well-regarded program dealing with a lack of administrative support, and requested a year to consider strategies for continuing to offer the Architectural History program in some form.

   **Motion:** Moved and seconded to take from the table the request to discontinue the Ph.D. in Art History Named Option “Architectural History”. The motion was passed unanimously.
The GFEC considered the updated information and request from the department and College regarding discontinuing the named option.

Motion: Moved and seconded to withdraw the request to discontinue the Ph.D. in Art History Named Option “Architectural History”. The motion was passed unanimously.

Program Reviews and Updates:

GFEC member Kristin Eschenfelder introduced the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the Counseling Psychology Ph.D./Doctoral Minor. Eschenfelder noted the strengths of the program, which include scholarly excellence, social justice and cultural diversity including a higher than average percent of underrepresented targeted minority students, employment record for graduates, an impressive student evaluation/feedback system, and committed and engaged faculty and staff actively assessing and improving the program. Eschenfelder also discussed review committee recommendations, including a need for more equitable teaching assistantships and funding, better course sequencing and overlapping of courses with other related departments, and working to balance the research-practice with regard to licensing and uneven advising loads. The GFEC commends the program on its strengths and recommends the department engage in efforts to address the concerns.

Motion: Moved and seconded to accept the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the Counseling Psychology Ph.D./Doctoral Minor. The motion was passed with 14 for, 1 abstention.

2. Associate Dean Ramanathan introduced an update on the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the Theatre and Drama MFA. Ramanathan met with graduate students from the department to follow up on the review committee’s concerns, and hear how problems have been addressed by the department. Students reported an improved climate and increased communication with department leadership.

Additional Approvals:

1. Department of Theatre and Drama Professor Ann Archbold introduced the request to suspend admissions to the MFA/Doctoral Minor in Theatre and Drama and to discontinue the Doctoral Minor in Theatre and Drama. Archbold reported that the department’s recent program review has highlighted a need reinvent the degree program with a focus that better matches current faculty interests and improves its visibility. The program has communicated with all current students and is committed to supporting them through degree completion while they undergo this new degree planning process.

Motion: Moved and seconded to suspend admissions to the Theatre and Drama MFA/Doctoral Minor. The motion was passed unanimously.

Motion: Moved and seconded to discontinue the Theatre and Drama Doctoral Minor. The motion was passed unanimously.

Program Reviews:

1. GFEC member Caroline Alexander introduced the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the Population Health M.S./Ph.D./Doctoral Minor and Named Option Epidemiology MS./Ph.D. Alexander noted the
strengths of the program, which include a mission integral to the Wisconsin Idea, committed leadership and administrative support, accomplished students who show high employment after graduation, collaborative faculty with robust research programs and substantial extramural funding, and a well-designed curriculum. Alexander noted challenges facing the program, including faculty departures leaving key areas of expertise underserved, decreasing administrative support, and a lack of program accreditation which limits funding options. Alexander also discussed review committee recommendations, including securing better classroom space, working with the School of Medicine and Public Health to create a sustainable plan for replacing faculty members and maintaining a critical mass of educators and mentors for the graduate program, creating a better annual assessment of students, and having students write fellowship applications as part of their training. The GFEC discussed concern with their Ph.D. attrition rate and questioned the need for the named options in Epidemiology. The GFEC commends the programs on their strengths and recommends the department engage in efforts to address the review committee’s concerns.

Motion: Moved and seconded to accept the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the Population Health M.S./Ph.D./Doctoral Minor. The motion was passed unanimously.

2. GFEC member Kristin Eschenfelder introduced the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the Development Ph.D./Doctoral Minor. Eschenfelder noted the strengths of the program, which include fostering greater internationalization of UW-Madison, enthusiastic and appreciative students, good time to degree, and a required proposal for admissions which provides guidance in an otherwise very flexible program. Eschenfelder also noted that the virtual nature of the program, including a lack of physical space or courses makes it difficult to foster community, and that the program cannot provide adequate funding for students. Eschenfelder discussed review committee recommendations, including creating a student handbook, discipline-specific learning outcomes and assessment plans; ensuring that affiliate advisors have the information they need to do advising; taking modest steps to re-establish community among students and faculty; considering discontinuing the degree program and converting it into a doctoral minor or some other type of degree or certificate program; establishing undergraduate courses that can support the program’s graduate students through teaching assistantships; and developing an alternative exit strategy for students by building a master’s degree. The GFEC questioned the degree completion rates, attrition due to program transfer and the inability to fund PhD students as well as if the faculty had the capacity to continue the program given their commitments to other programs and departments, and expressed concern over its history of the aforementioned challenges over the course of the past 25 years. Associate Dean Martin recommended the program consider engaging other faculty on campus doing related research to bolster the program’s support. The GFEC strongly recommends the department engage in efforts to address the review committee’s concerns, and requests a copy of the follow-up report due to L&S and CALS in February 2018.

Motion: Moved and seconded to accept the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the Development Ph.D./Doctoral Minor. The motion was passed with 14 for, 1 abstention.

3. GFEC member José Pincheira introduced the Five-Year Review of the Real Estate and Urban Land Economics M.S. Named Option “Global Real Estate.” Pincheira noted the strengths of the program, including accomplishing its main goals of visibility, partnerships with top-rated institutions abroad for access to highly qualified international students, and utilizing existing faculty and administrative resources to be financially sustainable. Pincheira noted the program’s greatest challenge is its reliance upon one faculty member, which results in fluctuating enrollment due to highly personal recruiting efforts. There is also no systematic assessment of student outcomes. Pincheira discussed review
committee recommendations, including engaging one additional faculty member to support increasing enrollment to a more sustainable level, conducting alumni exit and post-graduation surveys, and developing a plan for systematic recruitment that could involve alumni. The GFEC requested hearing more about student assessment and feedback. The GFEC commends the programs on their strengths and recommends the department engage in efforts to address the review committee’s concerns.

Motion: Moved and seconded to accept the Five-Year Review of the Real Estate and Urban Land Economics M.S. Named Option “Global Real Estate”. The motion was passed unanimously.

Adjournment:
Motion: Moved and seconded to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.
Graduate Faculty Executive Committee

Graduate School Dean William J. Karpus
Graduate Faculty Executive Committee Membership

- Faculty membership representative of divisions, departments, and school/college
- 4-year terms
- Red font = GSAPC member

*Indicates sabbatical in Spring 2018

Please let the Graduate School know as soon as possible if you anticipate an absence or sabbatical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Dept/Program</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Last Acad Yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander, Caroline</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>Oncology</td>
<td>SMPH</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham, Michael</td>
<td>PHY</td>
<td>Chemical &amp; Biological Eng</td>
<td>Engr</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroepfer, Tracy</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf, Kirstin*</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>German, Nordic, and Slavic</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschenfelder, Kristen</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Library and Information Studies</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perna, Nicole</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>Genetics</td>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfotenhauer, John</td>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Engr</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith III, Leslie</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>Library and Information Studies</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu, Yu Hen</td>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Engr</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson, Christa</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai, Stephanie</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Resources</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, Monica</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier, Lara</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Pharm</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lempp, Steffen</td>
<td>PHY</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livanos, Christopher</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>Comparative Lit. &amp; Folklore</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward, Earlise</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Nur</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) Duties

- Read meeting agenda materials
- Participate on 1-2 program review committees per year
- Attend GFEC meetings
- May serve on subcommittees. Serve on GSAPC in Year 4
Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) Meetings

- Discussion of Agenda Item (Approvals, Program Reviews, Discussion Items)
  - Items will be introduced by the Dean
  - Description of the item will be done by either a GFEC member or a guest

- Motions and Voting
  - The Dean will call for a Motion to Approve (motion must be moved and seconded).
  - The Dean will invite opportunity for further discussion, then a vote will be called
  - Approval of an action requires more than half of the votes cast

- *Conflict of interest*:
  - Speaking: Please ensure you disclose relationship to program before commenting on proposal/review
  - Member should vote “abstention” if relationship to program presents a conflict of interest

- Meeting Schedule, Agendas and Minutes posted online at [http://grad.wisc.edu/gfec/meeting/](http://grad.wisc.edu/gfec/meeting/)
New Program Proposals - Consider:

- Is there a robust job/career market and student demand that warrants the new program?
- Does the Program’s support structure have ample resources, including active faculty, funding guarantees for PhD students and comprehensive plans for student services and advising resources (without harming existing programs)?
- Will the Program provide a detailed, high-quality (mentored) educational/research experience for students?
- Does the addition of the program reinforce the UW’s high-caliber reputation?
- Is the proposed program redundant with existing UW-Madison programs?
- Are the degree requirements in compliance with institutional policy and practices?
Program Review Committee Reports and Presentations *(template available)*

- **Admissions**: Are admissions practices and enrollment levels consistent with plans, program resources *(e.g. first four year funding guarantee for PhD students)* and career outcomes?

- **Program Information**: Do students have clear and simple access to information concerning requirements and processes? Is there a date-stamped student handbook?

- **Assessment**: Are students regularly and consistently assessed across the program, and does the frequency improve the mentoring experience?
Diversity: Does the program foster diversity, a climate of respect and inclusion, and community?

Funding: Is student funding (level and duration) adequate?

Degree completion: Does the program adequately focus on retention, resulting in timely progress to degree and high PhD completion?

Professional Development: Are professional development efforts, including the use of the IDP, used to enhance mentoring and career development? Are a range of student career outcomes supported?
Graduate School Academic Planning Council (GSAPC)

The GSAPC advises the Dean of the Graduate School on policy and budgetary planning and presents faculty views and opinions to the dean. It also assists the graduate faculty in understanding budget and policy decisions and constraints. GSAPC considers:

- Program review and future development or contraction of graduate programs
- Allocation of flexible resources to various uses, such as fellowships
- Appointments of committees of the Graduate School

2017 – 2018 GSAPC Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>Dept/Program</th>
<th>S/C</th>
<th>GSAPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander,</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>Oncology</td>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>Sr Div</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham,</td>
<td>PHY</td>
<td>Chemical &amp; Biological Eng</td>
<td>Engr</td>
<td>Sr Div</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroepfer,</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>Sr Div</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf, Kirstin</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>German, Nordic, and Slavic</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>Sr Div</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson, Christa</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guide Content Update Principles

General Rules/Assumptions

- Foundational expectation: changes should not generally be made once Guide is published
- Any significant/major change will take effect with a new Guide publication
- Any creation/deletion/renaming of tabs requires proposal to and approval by ACPRAC and, once approved, will take effect with the publication of a new Guide
- Academic structure revisions cannot be made without governance process and approval and, when required, Board of Regents and State Legislature approval
- Dates/public archives will list each term if there are changes (continues current practice)

Undergraduate Content Update Guidelines/Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Content/Tab</th>
<th>Update with new Guide publication</th>
<th>Requires governance approval to change</th>
<th>May be changed effective at start of a term; archival required</th>
<th>May be updated any time; no archival needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Matter</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/College</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entering the College</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin Experience</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policies &amp; Regulations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources/Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Undergraduate Content Update Guidelines/Rules (con’t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Content/Tab</th>
<th>Update with new Guide publication</th>
<th>Requires governance approval to change</th>
<th>May be changed effective at start of a term; archival required</th>
<th>May be updated any time; no archival needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree/Major/Cert</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How to Get in</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four Year Plan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advising &amp; Careers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin Experience</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certification/Licensure</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduate Content Update Guidelines/Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Content/Tab</th>
<th>Update with new Guide publication</th>
<th>Requires governance approval to change</th>
<th>May be changed effective at start of a term; archival required</th>
<th>May be updated any time; no archival needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Matter</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree/Major/Cert</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Non Degree Content Update Guidelines/Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Content/Tab</th>
<th>Update with new Guide publication</th>
<th>Requires governance approval to change</th>
<th>May be changed effective at start of a term; archival required</th>
<th>May be updated any time; no archival needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Matter</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Study</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How to Get In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstones/Short Course</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non Degree awards)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How to Get In</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Guide Update Cycle

The Guide Coordinator Core Implementation Team (CIT) formally endorses the Guide Content Update Principles matrix, as well as a Guide update cycle that will take place annually. The annual update cycle will more seamlessly align with the University’s curricular change proposal and approval cycles and serve to initially reduce and hopefully eventually eliminate the need for mid-cycle updates in the future. The CIT also endorses a June 1, 2018 publication date for the next Guide, with a more detailed update cycle timeline to be discussed and reviewed at our next meeting. Finally, the CIT requests that the matrix and the initially established target publication date of June 1 be reassessed annually to determine if stakeholder needs continue to be met.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 28, 2017</td>
<td>Target deadline for school/college Guide Coordinators to send updated Editor/NetID lists to Guide Admin</td>
<td>Guide Admin and Guide Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2 - 13, 2017</td>
<td>Guide Editor training sessions (GRAD and UGRD)</td>
<td>Guide Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2, 2017</td>
<td>Next-guide environment open for Guide Coordinators and/or editors</td>
<td>Guide Coordinators and Departmental Editors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10, 2017</td>
<td>Target date for email reminder of editing deadline sent to Guide editors</td>
<td>Guide Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 22, 2017</td>
<td>Deadline for completion of content edits by Guide editors in distributed schools/colleges</td>
<td>Departmental Editors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4, 2017</td>
<td>Front-matter updates to university-level material initiated; separate timeline will be followed</td>
<td>Guide Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2, 2018</td>
<td>Deadline for submission of all Front-matter content changes</td>
<td>Guide Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30, 2018</td>
<td>Deadline by which governance approval actions, including all course proposal actions, effective for Fall 2018 must be communicated in order to be incorporated into the 2018-19 Guide published on June 1</td>
<td>Governance groups, Guide Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 2018</td>
<td>Access to next-guide environment available to SOAR advisors in advance of SOAR training</td>
<td>Guide Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 2018</td>
<td>Guide published to public</td>
<td>Guide Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
<td>Deadline to submit any content approved too late for inclusion in June 1, 2017 publication of Guide or approved for mid-cycle updates* effective for Spring 2018 to Guide Admin Team</td>
<td>Guide Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 19, 2017</td>
<td>2017-18 Guide archived</td>
<td>Guide Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20, 2017</td>
<td>Changes approved too late for inclusion in June 1, 2017 publication of Guide or approved for mid-cycle updates effective for Spring 2018 published in 2017-18 Guide</td>
<td>Guide Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20, 2017</td>
<td>Spring 2018 Schedule of Classes available online</td>
<td>Office of the Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 22, 2017</td>
<td>Deadline to submit any content approved too late for inclusion in Spring 2018 mid-cycle update of Guide or approved for mid-cycle updates* effective for Summer 2018 to Guide Admin Team</td>
<td>Guide Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 5, 2018</td>
<td>Summer 2018 Schedule of Classes available online</td>
<td>Office of the Registrar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only content approved for mid-cycle update, per the Guide Content Update Principles, can be included
MEMORANDUM

May 31, 2017

TO: William Karpus, Chair Graduate Faculty Executive Committee

FROM: Soyeon Shim, Dean

RE: Approval of recommended SoHE Graduate Program actions

The School of Human Ecology Academic Planning Council met on April 24th, 2017 to consider two recommendations from the SoHE Graduate Program Committee:

- Transition of two Master of Science named options to “non-admitting status”
- Removal of Human Ecology MFA application option

The SoHE APC approved the recommendations by unanimous decision and I concur with their recommendation. We look forward to approval by the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.
REQUEST FOR CHANGES TO THE APPLICATION OPTIONS FOR
GRADUATE STUDY IN THE SCHOOL OF HUMAN ECOLOGY

1.0 REQUESTED ACTION

1.1 Transition to Non-Admitting Status for Two Master of Science Named Options
Approval from the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee is requested by the School of Human Ecology with support from the Academic Planning Council and academic departments of Consumer Science and Human Development & Family Studies to transition their respective Human Ecology MS named options into non-admitting degree options effective for the Fall 2018 (Term 1192) graduate application (which opens in Fall 2017).

The proposal to transition the MS Human Ecology: Consumer Behavior & Family Economics to a non-admitting degree option was approved by the department of Consumer Science within the School of Human Ecology on October 24, 2016 by unanimous voice vote.

The proposal to transition the MS Human Ecology: Human Development & Family Studies to a non-admitting degree option was approved by the Graduate Program Committee of the Human Development & Family Studies department within the School of Human Ecology in Fall 2016.

1.2 Removal of Human Ecology MFA Application Option
Approval from the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee is requested by the School of Human Ecology with support from the Academic Planning Council to remove the Human Ecology MFA application option from the graduate application.

2.0 BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

2.1 The request to transition Human Ecology MS: Consumer Behavior & Family Economics and Human Ecology MS: Human Development and Family Studies to non-admitting degree options does not remove the degree options entirely. The degree options themselves should remain so that doctoral students in the respective named options may earn the MS along the way to their PhD. The non-admitting status is intended only to remove the stated named degree options from the graduate application to Human Ecology.

This request stems primarily from a recognition that the curriculum required to earn those degree options is highly tailored toward students seeking research and academic positions after graduation. While that focus is appropriate for students intending to continue on toward the PhD, the academic departments recognize that many of their master’s students are seeking a more applied, terminal master’s degree that prepares them to be practitioners first and foremost. In lieu of overhauling the required curricula of these two named degree options to accommodate those students, prospective applied master’s students will be encouraged to apply directly to the “Human Ecology MS” degree without a specified named option. This plan takes advantage of the inherent interdisciplinary nature of the Human Ecology MS curriculum, allowing students the flexibility to choose courses from among the Human Ecology disciplines and named options without being required to take a number of research and/or statistics courses that do not necessarily align with their academic and professional goals.

This change in non-admitting status may also provide a more well-defined cohort experience for those master’s students pursuing the Human Ecology MS—an experience that was identified as a weakness of the Human Ecology graduate program in a 2014 program review. Moreover, the Human Ecology MS: Consumer Behavior & Family Economics saw an average enrollment of just 2.3 students from Fall 2013 – Fall 2015. The Human Ecology MS: Human Development &
Family Studies saw an average enrollment of 6 over that same span. By comparison, the average number of students enrolled in all Master of Science degree options in Human Ecology over that time period was just 16 (down significantly from an average of 25 students over the previous 5 years). By organizing the vast majority of Human Ecology master’s students within the same degree option (“Human Ecology MS”), as opposed to separating them by their named options, the School feels that it can offer a more meaningful cohort experience. Clearly defining the Human Ecology MS as an applied, terminal degree option should also help in marketing the graduate program to prospective students with the goal of increasing graduate applications.

2.2 As a matter of practice, graduate students pursuing an MFA through the School of Human Ecology may only do so through the Human Ecology MFA: Design Studies named option. The existence of the “Human Ecology MFA” application option serves only to confuse prospective MFA applicants and may, in fact, harm students by inadvertently enrolling them in a degree option that does not reflect their focus on Design Studies. The removal of the “Human Ecology MFA” application option is requested to ensure that all MFA students in Human Ecology are properly routed through the application process into the Design Studies named option.

2.3 Summary of Current versus Proposed Human Ecology Graduate Application Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current:</th>
<th>Proposed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology MS</td>
<td>Human Ecology MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology MS: Consumer Behavior &amp; Family Economics</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology MS: Design Studies</td>
<td>Human Ecology MS: Design Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology MS: Human Development &amp; Family Studies</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology MFA</td>
<td>Human Ecology MFA: Design Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology MFA: Design Studies</td>
<td>Human Ecology PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology PhD: Civil Society &amp; Community Research</td>
<td>Human Ecology PhD: Civil Society &amp; Community Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology PhD: Consumer Behavior &amp; Family Economics</td>
<td>Human Ecology PhD: Consumer Behavior &amp; Family Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology PhD: Design Studies</td>
<td>Human Ecology PhD: Design Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 REQUEST FOR APPROVAL

It is respectfully requested that the committee review and approve the proposed changes to the application for graduate study in Human Ecology, beginning with the application for Fall 2018 admission.
July 15, 2017

William J. Karpus
Dean of the Graduate School

Dear Dean Karpus,

I am writing in response to your letter of March 23, 2017 regarding our decadal assessment. We greatly appreciate Professor Schroepfer’s service as well as the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee’s thoughtful consideration of the review. I have included the first part of each of your questions with my response below:

1) The graduate program is experiencing declining application numbers
   Over a number of years, as funding for graduate students declined, the Art Department actively sought to right-size our graduate program in order to increase the percentage of funding overall for our prospective students and to match our studio space availability. We have held at approximately 61 students (total of all three years combined) in our grad program as we retooled our application process and reviewed the TA and funding situations. Our incoming class of graduate students for the coming academic year will be 30 students.

2) The review committee noted that, while recruiting is successful, the effort and effectiveness varies by faculty member.
   We formed a recruitment committee in the last year which was charged with assessing our efforts to date and making recommendations pertaining to our goals of attracting more undergraduates and enhancing and growing our graduate program as well. We have had good results with recruitment efforts garnering a 25% increase in both undergraduate and graduate applications to the Art Department in the academic year 2017-18. We have retooled our graduate student application process which allows students to apply not only for admission, but also for Graduate funding within the dept. and across campus simultaneously. This has allowed the dept. to make more concise determinations regarding the student’s position in the applicant pool and also expedites funding decisions as well.

3) Only 57% of MFA students are funded through their first two years.
   Upon review, the funding data point used for this analysis was based on a ten-year average (58% funded for the first two years). New data shows that in the last 4 years, 85% of first and second year graduate students have some degree of funding. We are working diligently with the UW Foundation and our Board of Visitors to raise Scholarship funds for our Graduate Students. We have raised over $400,000 through a Nichols Match and a generous donation from a BOV member and will continue to focus on fund-raising efforts.
4) Graduate students report health and safety concerns with regard to equipment and facilities in the Humanities Building. We have focused a significant amount of resources toward this issue. As a result, we have corrected a majority of the health and safety concerns as reported by campus. Most notably, we have ameliorated most of the problems associated with air quality in the printmaking area specifically. We have upgraded major areas of Humanities and created a much safer environment for our students. We continue to be focused on this issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Rosenberg
Chair, UW Madison Art Department
Dear Professor Rosenberg,

An important part of the University’s continuing commitment to academic excellence is evaluating graduate programs by the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC). When the School of Education assembled a review committee to conduct a decadal assessment of the Art M.A./MFA/Doctoral Minor and the Art Education M.A./Doctoral Minor, Professor Tracy Schroepfer was asked to serve as the GFEC representative. Professor Schroepfer led a discussion of the review at the GFEC meeting on March 10, 2017. In this letter, I summarize the GFEC discussion.

A number of programmatic strengths were indicated, including interdisciplinarity, bi-annual graduate student forums and a new teaching assistant application process responsive to graduate student concerns about funding. Students reported being satisfied with faculty mentoring and had easy access to program information. The GFEC also learned that the program has a history of highly personalized recruiting that has resulted in a diverse faculty and graduate student body, and this model can serve as an example for campus. The GFEC would encourage the program to sustain this recruiting excellence.

The many strengths of the program notwithstanding, the review revealed items for consideration:

- The graduate program is experiencing declining application numbers. The GFEC agrees with the review committee that the program should consider how it will position itself for the future and study if the recommendations for greater interdisciplinarity and joint programming fit with the program’s goals and expertise.

- The review committee noted that, while recruiting is successful, the effort and effectiveness varies by faculty member. Moreover, the response to the review indicates a recruitment committee has been formed and is designing strategies to employ consistency and uniformity. Additional clarification is requested on the composition of the recruitment committee and what process for graduate application review and admissions will be used should it be included in the strategy.

- Only 57% of MFA students are funded through their first two years. This low level of funding should be addressed, and a plan that includes increased funding, alterations in enrollment to achieve full funding or a combination of multiple strategies should be articulated.
• Graduate students report health and safety concerns with regard to equipment and facilities in the Humanities Building. The program should continue to work with the School of Education on this situation since it can impact student recruiting and performance.

As a final note, the GFEC did not have a substantive discussion on the Art Education MA due to its recent suspension of admissions; the Doctoral Minor in Art Education, due to its recent discontinuation; or the Doctoral Minor in Art, which is also recommended for discontinuation.

The GFEC would like to see a response to these concerns in the form of draft plan by August 1, 2017, in advance of the 2018 admissions and recruitment cycle.

The GFEC commends the program on its strengths and thanks you for your commitment to graduate education.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William J. Karpus
Dean of the Graduate School
Professor of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine

Cc:  Diana Hess, School of Education
     John Baldacchino, Arts Institute
     Carolyn Kelley, School of Education
     Beth Janetski, School of Education
     Nancy Mladenoff, Department of Art
     Branden Martz, Department of Art
     Jocelyn Milner, Office of the Provost
     Sarah Kuba, Office of the Provost
     Marty Gustafson, Graduate School
     Emily Reynolds, Graduate School
July 28, 2017

Dean William J. Karpus
Dean of the Graduate School
217 Bascom Hall
CAMPUS

Dear Dean Karpus:

We are writing to respond to the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) evaluation of the Graduate Programs in the Department of Zoology (Integrative Biology). We were pleased that the committee identified many strengths, and we appreciate the suggestions for improvement. We thank the review committee for a thorough and insightful report. Below we address each of the concerns raised by GFEC and detail progress and plans for progress in these areas.

GFEC concerns

Concern 1: The program review revealed that the Zoology Ph.D. program has lower completion rates than peer AAU institutions. GFEC was pleased to hear that Zoology has investigated the reasons for attrition and asks for continued monitoring of reasons for students leaving the program.

Response 1: We examined records of graduate student completion spanning the last 10 years and were able to identify some patterns for graduate student departures without earning the degree for which they had originally enrolled. In some cases, this occurred for students who were wavering between enrolling in the PhD vs MS programs. Because enrollment in the PhD program qualifies students for awards or support not available to MS students (e.g., guaranteed TA support), our historic default was to recommend enrollment as a PhD student. Some of these students elected to stop with the MS. We will now request that such students enroll in the MS program (and switch to the PhD if needed).

Second, we found that students leaving the program tended to come from specific labs. We are closely monitoring students from these labs and are working on ways to improve completion (e.g., asking a 2nd advisor to sign on as a backup if the student decides to leave the original lab) and we are more carefully screening students applying to these labs prior to admission. Finally, though rare, we also identified two students who felt that “Zoology” did not reflect their academic identity and switched programs but not advisors. Hopefully, this issue is resolved with the recent departmental name change.
**Concern 2:** GFEC was concerned by low numbers of underrepresented minority (URM) students in the program and requests that Zoology’s Director of Graduate Studies meet with LaRuth McAfee, the Graduate School’s Assistant Dean for Diversity, Inclusion and Funding, to develop a plan to increase and retain a diverse graduate student population. GFEC also recommends that the program use the new campus Diversity Inventory Program to learn more about practices here at UW-Madison related to diversity, inclusion and climate that may directly benefit its recruiting and retention efforts.

**Response 2:** To increase the number of qualified underrepresented applicants to our PhD program, we have expanded our efforts by contacting the Bioscience Opportunities (BOPs) program to participant in the fall preview weekend. The BOPs program was developed to increase numbers of underrepresented minority graduate student applicants to UW graduate programs in the biological sciences, and it has been very successful. We continue to provide support to Dr. Theresa Duello to represent the department at minority recruitment events. We note that among applicants in the past year, the number of AOF-eligible applicants, though modest, had increased. We were able to extend fellowship offers to 2 students, and 1 of these offers has been accepted.

LaRuth McAfee, Assistant Dean for Diversity, Inclusion, and Funding in the Graduate School, presented at the department’s Graduate Student Informal Seminars on March 14. As a result of the seminar, the iBio Graduate Student Organization is developing a mentoring program in which a 2nd or 3rd year graduate student is paired with a 1st year student outside of their lab starting in the fall 2017.

**Concern 3:** The committee learned that the program does not have a graduate student handbook. Handbooks are required by our accrediting body and the Graduate School to ensure that students have access to all requirements and policies needed to make satisfactory progress toward their degree. Handbooks also connect students with university resources and processes and help answer questions should a grievance arise. The handbook can also provide clarifications on preliminary examination requirements, as requested by students during this review. A template is available to ensure all necessary sections are included.

**Response 3:** The Director of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Student Services Coordinator have developed a draft Handbook. We recognize this as a priority and are steadily progressing. We anticipate completion by the end of fall semester. Meanwhile, all critical material that will be provided in the Handbook is available to students via the Graduate Program web page.

**Concern 4:** GFEC agreed with the review committee’s recommendations to implement the use of an individual development plan (IDP). Resources toward this goal can be found on the Graduate School’s website ([https://grad.wisc.edu/pd/idp/](https://grad.wisc.edu/pd/idp/)).

**Response 4:** We have made information about the IDP resources available online on our Graduate Program website and announced this to faculty members and graduate students. We also provide information about IDP resources to graduate students during orientation.
and will send a reminder at the beginning of fall semester. Furthermore, our Graduate Program Coordinator (Kayla Pelland) enrolled in the Career Development Facilitator training through UW-Madison this summer to assist graduate students with IDP and career development efforts.

**Concern 5:** While stable program leadership is often a strength, GFEC would like to see the specific process for leadership transition should the need arise and also requests clarification of the various graduate program committee leadership roles.

**Response 5:** Determining how to structure the faculty interests with graduate program efforts and service in other areas of the department is a priority. In response to GFEC concerns, as a first step, we performed a departmental survey to assess faculty interest in changing leadership roles in the department. Many expressed interest in assisting with our graduate program. Specifically:

1) Graduate Program (e.g. assessment of learning goals, monitoring student progress, assisting with participation of Graduate School & instructional reports and endeavors): Damschen, Ives, McIntyre, Orrock, Ritters, Sharma, and Turner

2) Graduate Student Admissions: Blair, Ives, Orrock, Stanley

3) Graduate Student Recruitment: Blair, Damschen, Turner, Orrock

Although our Department Chair has not finalized the faculty’s departmental service roles for 2017-18 this should be completed before the start of the fall 2017 semester. In addition, we plan to more formally clarify the various graduate program committee leadership roles and process for transition.

The Department of Integrative Biology thanks you for the thorough review, and we look forward to strengthening our program further as a result of this process.

Sincerely,

Jeff Hardin
Professor and Chair
Department of Integrative Biology

Lauren V. Ritters
Professor and Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Integrative Biology
March 22, 2017

Jeffrey D. Hardin, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair, Department of Zoology
College of Letters and Science
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Sent Electronically

Dear Professor Hardin,

An important part of the University’s continuing commitment to academic excellence is evaluating graduate programs by the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC). When the College of Letters and Science assembled a review committee to conduct a decadal assessment of the Zoology M.A./M.S./Ph.D. and Doctoral Minor, Professor Cynthia Czajkowski was asked to serve as the GFEC representative. Professor Czajkowski led a discussion of the review at the GFEC meeting on March 10, 2017. In this letter, I summarize the committee’s discussion.

The GFEC learned of the many strengths of the program, including a strong graduate applicant pool; consistently high first four-year funding rates; department funding for student research travel; and stable program leadership. Students reported consistent meetings with faculty to assess their progress as well as positive and productive faculty-student dynamics.

The many strengths of the program notwithstanding, the program review revealed a few areas of concern:

- The program review revealed that the Zoology Ph.D. program has lower completion rates than peer AAU institutions. The GFEC was pleased to hear that Zoology has investigated the reasons for attrition and asks for continued monitoring of reasons for students leaving the program.

- The GFEC was concerned by low numbers of underrepresented minority (URM) students in the program and requests that Zoology’s Director of Graduate Studies meet with LaRuth McAfee, the Graduate School’s Assistant Dean for Diversity, Inclusion and Funding, to develop a plan to increase and retain a diverse graduate student population. The GFEC also recommends that the program use the new campus Diversity Inventory Program to learn more about practices here at UW-Madison related to diversity, inclusion and climate that may directly benefit its recruiting and retention efforts.

- The committee learned that the program does not have a graduate student handbook. Handbooks are required by our accrediting body and the Graduate School to ensure that students have access to all requirements and policies needed to make satisfactory progress toward their degree. Handbooks also connect students with university resources and processes and help answer questions should a grievance arise. The handbook can also provide clarifications on preliminary examination requirements, as requested by students during this review. A template is available to ensure all necessary sections are included.

Office of the Dean
Email: GraduateSchoolDean@grad.wisc.edu; Phone: 608-263-1353; Fax: 608-265-9505
217 Bascom Hall 500 Lincoln Drive Madison, WI 53706-1380 www.grad.wisc.edu
The GFEC agreed with the review committee’s recommendations to implement the use of an individual development plan (IDP). Resources toward this goal can be found on the Graduate School’s website (https://grad.wisc.edu/pd/idp/).

While stable program leadership is often a strength, the GFEC would like to see the specific process for leadership transition should the need arise and also requests clarification of the various graduate program committee leadership roles.

The GFEC commends the program on its strengths and thanks you for your commitment to graduate education. The GFEC requests that you provide specific plans for URM recruitment, a completed handbook and a response to the additional questions by August 1, 2017.

Sincerely,

William J. Karpus
Dean of the Graduate School
Professor of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine

Cc: John Karl Scholz, College of Letters and Science
    Eric Wilcots, College of Letters and Science
    Elaine Klein, College of Letters and Science
    Emily Stanley, Department of Zoology
    Lauren Ritters, Department of Zoology
    Kayla Pelland, Department of Zoology
    Jocelyn Milner, Office of the Provost
    Sarah Kuba, Office of the Provost
    LaRuth McAfee, Graduate School
    Marty Gustafson, Graduate School
    Emily Reynolds, Graduate School
Here is the first version of the Chemistry Graduate Student Handbook. We have gotten input from graduate students and our graduate recruiting committee, but we do understand there is still work to be done. I wanted to make sure you saw the progress we've made in response to the GFEC review.

Matt

---

From: Alan Joranlien
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2017 11:07 AM
To: Robert J. McMahon
Cc: John Karl Scholz; Eric Wilcots; ELAINE M KLEIN; MATTHEW J SANDERS; ARRIETTA W CLAUSS; Jocelyn Milner; Sarah Kuba; WILLIAM J KARPUS; LaRuth McAfee; Marty Gustafson; Emily Reynolds
Subject: GFEC Review Response Follow-Up - Chemistry Graduate Program

Dear Professor McMahon,

Please see the attached GFEC memo from Dean William J. Karpus.

Thank you,

Al Joranlien
Dean William J. Karpus’ Assistant
UW-Madison Graduate School
217 Bascom Hall
608 263-1353
alan.joranlien@wisc.edu
March 23, 2017

Robert J. McMahon, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair, Department of Chemistry
College of Letters and Science
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Sent Electronically

Dear Professor McMahon,

At its March 10, 2017, meeting the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) reviewed the letter received from the Chemistry graduate program responding to recommendations following the 10-year program review.

The committee was appreciative of the efforts the program has taken to enhance its climate and thanks the department for meeting with LaRuth McAfee, Graduate School Assistant Dean for Diversity, Inclusion and Funding, to discuss recruiting and retention practices for underrepresented students. The GFEC reviewed the activities summarized in your email dated December 12, 2016. However, additional clarity is requested regarding the status of plans and implementation schedules for climate and retention improvement initiatives.

The GFEC also remains concerned that the program does not have a comprehensive graduate student handbook. Handbooks are required by our accrediting body and the Graduate School to ensure that students have access to all requirements and policies needed to make satisfactory progress toward their degree. Handbooks also connect students with university resources and processes and help answer questions should a grievance arise. While the Chemistry graduate programs have much of this information online, the GFEC requests that the program review the handbook template to ensure all necessary sections are provided to students.

The GFEC very much appreciates the work the program does to advance graduate education and the interests of our students. The committee requests that both a report on the status of climate improvement initiatives and the handbook update be complete by August 1, 2017, in time for the start of the new academic year and upcoming campus accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission.

Sincerely,

William J. Karpus
Dean of the Graduate School
Professor of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine
Cc: Karl Scholz, College of Letters and Science
Eric Wilcots, College of Letters and Science
Elaine Klein, College of Letters and Science
Matthew Sanders, Department of Chemistry
Arrietta Clauss, Department of Chemistry
Jocelyn Milner, Office of the Provost
Sarah Kuba, Office of the Provost
LaRuth McAfee, Graduate School
Marty Gustafson, Graduate School
Emily Reynolds, Graduate School
As follow-up to the Wisconsin School of Business AACSB 2017 re-accreditation, a campus program review committee successfully completed the supplementary program review of the graduate programs listed above. Alan Sorensen, Professor of Economics, served as chair of the committee. The Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) representative was Steph Tai, Associate Professor of Law. The review committee's charge was to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the programs, and to provide recommendations for future direction/improvement of these programs. At its May 24, 2017 meeting, the School’s Academic Planning Council (APC) reviewed and discussed the report. Based on my review of the review committee's report and the APC's response, I am providing the following executive summary of the program review.

**Overview**

**Summary of Strengths and Weaknesses**

Based on the AACSB report and the supplemental materials reviewed, each of the programs appear to be doing well. Applications to most programs have been increasing in recent years, which indicates the programs’ attractiveness to students. In addition, the graduating students’ employment outcomes look good: most are finding jobs in areas/industries directly related to the programs in which they trained.

Based on exit surveys of students, the programs’ relative strengths appear to be in academics. Students consistently rate the faculty teaching and advising as excellent. The AACSB Continuous Improvement Report also indicates recent successes at hiring and retaining excellent faculty, and shows evidence that faculty in each area are producing high-quality research. Various centers at the school appear to support both the research and teaching objectives of the faculty.
Students report high satisfaction with the faculty and the curriculum. However, their satisfaction with the social climate is not uniformly high, and some students express concerns about whether the school is sufficiently open to diversity of opinion and background. We think these matters deserve careful consideration.

Recommendation for Future Directions

Based on the program review committee’s comments, the Wisconsin School of Business would benefit to improve upon several areas. First, there is room for improvement in communicating program goals and requirements to students. The recommendation was to publish an official graduate student handbook (either online or in print or both) that thoroughly outlines everything a student would need to know about degree requirements, curricular options, schedules, available resources, etc.

Second, the school should continue promoting diversity in these programs. The program review committee encourages additional efforts to admit high-quality students from diverse backgrounds and to promote a student culture that is inclusive. They used the Business Emerging Leaders program for undergraduates as an initiative that could be effective for the graduate programs. An additional recommendation is a comparison with peer institutions for ideas in both developing and strengthening internal approaches, and assessing the comparative effectiveness of current approaches regarding diversifying these programs.

Third, the program review committee suggests the school continue, and possibly improve, its tracking of students’ post-graduate outcomes, in order to determine whether the students’ investments in graduate training are delivering high returns. This is suggested as perhaps the best way to measure the overall success of the programs.

Follow Up
The APC discussion of the supplementary program review noted the efficiency of the supplemental review being conducted in conjunction with the robust and rigorous AACSB re-accreditation process. In addition, the awarding of MS degrees in instances where PhD students do not persist to the PhD degree was given as the reason for having more MS degrees on the books than are actively awarded.

We developed an online handbook during the past academic year and plan to update and improve it regularly. In the spirit of the Business Emerging Leaders program for undergraduates, the Wisconsin School of Business actively participates in the Consortium for Graduate Study in Management, which works to enhance diversity in business education and corporate leadership. We plan to engage in a variety of efforts to enhance diversity and inclusion. We also plan to continue, and possibly improve, our tracking of students’ post-graduate outcomes.

Attachments
Program Review Committee Report

Copies
Ella Mae Matsumura, Associate Dean of the FT MBA program
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Narrative
Dean François Ortalo-Magné charged the committee to complete a supplementary review of eight graduate programs in follow up to the Association of the Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) accreditation completed in January 2017. Alan Sorensen (Letters and Science) and Steph Tai (Law School) prepared the analysis and report. Alan Sorensen served as the chair and Steph Tai represented the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) on the committee. (A committee of two representatives was acceptable due to the solid accreditation report the Wisconsin School of Business received from AACSB.) Ruth Lillie served in an administrative role for the committee, and was instrumental in facilitating the program review process.

The committee received the following documents:
- Charge from Dean François Ortalo-Magné;
- Final Accreditation Report from the AACSB Peer Review Team;
- Continuous Improvement Report, A Self Study Document, submitted to AACSB in fall 2016

The committee met on April 3, 2017 for roughly an hour to discuss and analyze the accreditation review and the supporting documents. Steph Tai attended the accreditation visit on January 23, 2017 and added comments based on her listening notes from the Peer Review Team sessions. Additionally, she shared data points that GFEC will want assessed in this report. We also reviewed the following data to aid our analysis:

1. Data files regarding the eight programs created by Kelly Haslam and located in Box.
2. Information regarding external and accreditation reviews considered a “Supplementary” Graduate Program Review.

Response to Charge

In this section, we answer the specific questions put forth in Dean Ortalo-Magné’s charge.

Summary of Strengths and Weaknesses

Based on the AACSB report and the supplemental materials we reviewed, each of the programs appears to be doing well. Applications to most programs have been increasing in recent years, which we take as an indication of the programs’ attractiveness to students. In addition, the graduating students’ employment outcomes look good: most are finding jobs in areas/industries directly related to the programs in which they trained.

Based on exit surveys of students, the programs’ relative strengths appear to be in academics. Students consistently rate the faculty teaching and advising as excellent. The Continuous Improvement Report also indicates recent successes at hiring and retaining excellent faculty, and shows evidence that faculty in each area are producing high-quality research. Various centers at the school appear to support both the research and teaching objectives of the faculty.

To the extent, the materials we reviewed indicate any weaknesses; we might categorize those as falling in the student life department. In the same surveys where students report high satisfaction with the faculty and the curriculum, their satisfaction with the social climate is not uniformly high, and some students express concerns about whether the school is sufficiently open to diversity of opinion and background. Absent a meaningful comparison group, it is difficult to say whether this should be regarded as a weakness: for all we know, peer institutions fare much worse in this dimension. Nevertheless, we think these matters deserve careful consideration by the school’s leadership.

Recommendation for Future Directions

As outsiders reviewing a limited amount of information, we are reluctant to make any strong recommendations here. However, from our point of view there are a few areas to highlight.

First, there may be room for improvement in communicating program goals and requirements with students. For instance, we recommend publishing an official graduate student handbook (either online or in print or both) that thoroughly outlines everything a student would need to know about degree requirements, curricular options, schedules, available resources, etc.

Second, the school should continue promoting diversity in these programs. We encourage other efforts to admit high-quality students from diverse backgrounds and to promote a student culture that is inclusive. The Business Emerging Leaders program for undergraduates is a good idea, and perhaps another initiative like it could be extended to the graduate programs. We also think that conducting a comparison with peer institutions might be helpful, in both developing and strengthening internal approaches, and assessing the comparative effectiveness of current approaches.
Third, we recommend that the school continue and possibly improve its tracking of students’ post-graduate outcomes, in order to determine whether the students’ investments in graduate training are delivering high returns. This is perhaps the best way to measure the overall success of the programs.

We understand that the AACSB has ratified the programs’ re-accreditation, which we think is appropriate and well deserved. Congratulations on having developed and maintained these high-quality programs.
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TO: Mark Hill, Chair, Department of Computer Sciences

FROM: John Karl Scholz, Dean

RE: Completion of Review of Computer Science Academic Programs:
   • BA/BS Computer Science
   • MS, Ph.D. in Computer Sciences

CC: Marty Gustafson, Assistant Dean, Graduate School
    Elaine M. Klein, Associate Dean for Academic Planning, L&S
    Jocelyn Milner, Associate Provost and Director, Academic Planning & Institutional Research
    Eric Wilcots, Associate Dean for the Natural and Mathematical Sciences, L&S

On April 4, 2017, the L&S Academic Planning Council considered the various materials related to the decennial review of academic programs offered by the Department of Computer Sciences, including the baccalaureate major as well as the master’s and doctoral programs in CS. Associate Dean Eric Wilcots led discussion of the self-study, review committee report, and the notations on that report which you supplied. Overall, council members appreciated what appears to be a thoughtful review, and found the review committee report to be particularly useful. We know that engaging in constructive review is not a trivial endeavor, and hope that you and your colleagues found value and good advice in this process.

In discussion, council members were extremely impressed by the efforts CS has taken to respond to increasing student demand for the major and for CS courses, and the growth in enrollment that puts the department on a par with other large L&S science departments. Though this growth could be cause for concern, CS graduates continue to have excellent job placement in fields that call upon the skills they learn, and high rates of acceptance into graduate schools. The major appears well structured. The council praised the department’s goal of recruiting a more diverse student body, and concurred with the review committee’s praise for the decision not to raise admission criteria so as to reduce access to the major. The APC was impressed by the several strategies in place to increase diversity and support a more diverse student body. Supporting a broader array of pathways into the program via entry points (responding to the reality that incoming students have had different opportunities to learn programming skills), creating a “Wisconsin Emerging Scholars” program in CS to support peer tutoring and group learning, connecting with a national organization supporting women in tech, and creating a “no prior
knowledge needed” post-baccalaureate certificate all reflect your department’s commitment to making CS accessible to a broad variety of interested students. We share your hope that these initiatives will help address the discipline’s ongoing challenge with racial and gender diversity. APC members also commended the department for rising to the challenge to provide essential service at a variety of levels to other areas of study that are becoming increasingly integrated into and dependent on skilled knowledge in your discipline.

At the same time, the APC was sympathetic to concern reported that meeting such demand conflicts with the faculty’s desire to provide students with rich, hands-on and team-based learning experiences. Balancing program and course access with the goal of providing these intensive learning experiences is a challenge. The redeployment of CS TAs to staff a learning center (vs. assigning TAs to individual courses) is an example of a creative way to stretch resources that seems likely not only to give students access to additional instruction, but also to provide an excellent training ground for graduate students who (regardless of their career plans) will likely be called upon to teach or train others. We encourage you to continue to think creatively about how best to support your goals, and acknowledge that the impact of non-pooled tuition programs bears watching, to ensure that these do not detract from the traditional programs.

Council members were pleased to see that CS has articulated learning outcomes for all of your programs, and these have been mapped onto courses in the CS curriculum. The current assessment plan is well structured and appears to be efficient, calling upon student work completed in courses (e.g., exam questions, student projects), evaluation of student work at “milestones” (e.g., qualifying and prelim exams, oral exams), as well as surveys of students and alumni. This plan has not yet been implemented; please remember that CS will nevertheless be expected to report assessment activity to the Provost’s Office (due November 1, 2017). Council members encouraged the department to move forward with implementing the plan, which seems to be viable and likely to provide you and your colleagues with evidence that can be used for program improvement. In addition, what you learn from assessment may offer insights into the impact the non-pooled programs have on the traditional programs, and on whether efforts to diversify the student body have an impact on the nature of learning in it. Efforts to assess learning will also be an important element in your next series of CS program reviews: the Capstone Certificate, “Computer Science for Professionals” is scheduled for review in 2018-19, and the MS-Computer Sciences, Option: Professional Program is scheduled for review in 2019-20.

The L&S APC unanimously approved a motion to consider the L&S portion of this program review complete, noting that the review committee offered good advice for each of the programs, and that the department should consider carefully which recommendations would elicit the best effects. The next step of the review process will involve discussion of the graduate programs by the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee and administrative review by the Provost’s Office, to which all review activity is reported. Academic program review affords us an opportunity to identify strengths as well as areas needing improvement: it is a process that keeps a great university great. Please accept my thanks for seriously and thoughtfully embracing this opportunity.
I. Introduction and charge

The Department of Computer Science (CS) Review Committee was composed of Kristin Eschenfelder (Chair, Library and Information Studies), Sebastian Heinz (Astronomy), Sunduz Keles (Statistics), John Pfotenhauer (GFEC representative and Mechanical Engineering), Ananth Seshadri (Economics), Benedek Valko (Mathematics). The committee was charged with review of the CS campus (pooled) bachelors, masters and PhD programs.

Given the size of the program and the review team, three members of the team focused primarily on undergraduate issues (Eschenfelder, Keles, Valko) and three focused primarily on graduate issues (Heinz, Pfotenhauer, Seshadri).

From mid-January to early February 2017, we conducted nine meetings within CS including: (1) A meeting with the Chair Mark Hill, the Department Manager Susan Gallagher and Michael Swift the Associate Chair, (2) an open meeting with volunteer faculty (@7 faculty attended including 1 faculty associate), (3) a meeting with undergraduate advisors Nikki Lemmon and Madeline Juillard, (4) a meeting with undergraduate curriculum planners Associate Chair Mike Swift and Curriculum Committee Chair Mike Gleicher (5) an open meeting with undergraduate students (@13 students attended including 4 women), (6) a meeting with graduate curriculum managers Mike Swift Associate Chair and Mike Gleicher Curriculum Committee Chair, and (7) a meeting with TA management personnel Associate Chair Mike Swift, and Jonathan Henkel, (8) a meeting with graduate admissions and advising personnel including Graduate Advising Chair Eric Bach, Graduate Program Coordinator Angela Thorp, Graduate Admissions Co-Chair Jerry Zhu, and Mike Swift Associate Chair, and (9) an open meeting with graduate students (@10 attended).

We would like to thank Sue Gallagher, Nikki Lemmon and Angela Thorpe for their work in helping us to arrange meetings, especially their work in recruiting students to meet with us.

II. Undergraduate program

A. Undergraduate student body composition, diversity, enrollment

The CS undergraduate program has experienced significant growth in the last ten years. The number of CS majors increased 4-fold and enrollment rates for CS courses exhibit more rapid growth than the rest of the campus. This is consistent with exploding interest in CS across the country and can be attributed in part to the increase in availability of computer science related jobs. Another partial, and perhaps more likely explanation for this surge is the recent changes that reduced entry requirements for the CS major. Faculty explained that they regularly discussed the question of whether continued growth in enrollment was sustainable. CS has chosen not to raise the entry requirements due to a desire to keep the major accessible for all students.
With increasing enrollments, the computing background of students entering the program has become more diverse, and this generates challenges in supporting students with low computing backgrounds. In response to this, the department has changed the sequence of introductory courses to create a welcoming learning environment for students with little to no programming background so that the students with no programming background can gain necessary competencies before progressing. Students with more experience would not have to take these courses. In addition, the department is planning separate sections of some courses for students with low computing backgrounds in order to minimize intimidation and create a more welcoming learning environment. Further, CS has modified some introductory classes so that instead of a small number of high stakes major projects graded at the end of the semester, the classes include more and earlier lower stakes projects for which students can get rapid feedback. Finally CS established a learning center that provides support for students with programming homework. Student focus group participants were enthusiastic about the changes. They complained that currently CS 302 is too difficult and that it deterred potential majors or certificate students. While students believe 301 will be good preparation for 302, they feared that since 301 doesn’t count toward the major, it will not be as effective as it could be in recruiting majors. Students were enthusiastic about the CS learning center, and agreed that it alleviated stress and increased access to help in coding classes. Recent CS analysis showed that in the new courses the drop rate for their new introductory classes fell from 30 to 19%, and the drop was uniform across groups (women, targeted minorities, first generation).

Lack of racial and gender diversity is an ongoing challenge for CS as a field. The department has experienced some success in increasing gender diversity, but still struggles with successfully increasing the number of undergraduate students of color from targeted groups. The department has increased the percentage of female students from 6% to 17% over the last 10 years. The undergraduate certificate is a strong draw and 31% of the students in the certificate program are female. The percentage of targeted minorities in the program has remained largely constant at 4% despite initiatives by the department to improve. Student focus group members reported that the introductory courses were unwelcoming and that “imposter syndrome” is an issue in diversity goals as women and students of color tend to have less computing experience than other students. Women students reported that internships increased their confidence with CS, but noted that internships do not count toward the major.

The department has taken several concrete steps to improve gender and ethnic diversity. In particular, the department developed the Wisconsin Emerging Scholar-Computer Sciences (WES-CS) 1 credit class that can be taken in conjunction with CS 302 and is aimed increasing women and targeted minority’s success by providing a learning enhancement community. Enrollment in this course has grown. The students felt like this program was very useful, especially when taken concurrently with CS 302, but raised concerns that the program was not advertised well enough and did not have enough available seats. CS also developed CS 402 in which CS students introduce programming to K-12 students via after school or weekend clubs. Finally, the department has started working with a consultant from the National Center for Women in IT to improve female participation and has developed an action plan to improve the diversity of the student population including increasing diverse images in marketing, further advertising the certificate and developing joint majors with target departments.
The committee commends the department for making proactive changes to its curriculum to better support the diverse background of its students, and encourages it to keep trying different methods to increase the diversity of the CS major student body.

B. Undergraduate time to degree and program requirements

Time to degree in the undergraduate program is 4.4 years, which is higher than the campus average and AAU averages. Although long waitlists for some courses are potential contributors to this observation, another possible explanation is transfers. Many engineering students who switch to CS majors (or add double majors) have significant catch up work to do to complete the required course sequence. This is also true for students who transfer to UW in their junior year as many technical colleges do not have equivalents to the required CS classes.

CS drop/fail rates are higher, and its average GPA lower, than campus averages. CS analysis compared one year of drop/fail rates for CS courses with other campus departments. Although the CS rates were higher than the campus average, they were comparable with similar sized courses in Mathematics for the comparison year. Longitudinal analysis of comparative drop/add rates would be helpful. CS is taking action to address drop/fail rates including modification of the introductory courses, and argues that these changes are correlated with a decrease in drop/fail rates from 30 to 19 percent. CS advisors also reported that removing seniors from the data pool further reduces drop/fail rates. CS advisors note that the lower GPA may stem from CS being the second choice major of business and engineering students who do not make minimum GPA requirements to continue in their first choice major.

The student focus group emphasized that course availability is a serious concern and students acknowledged that they regularly overenrolled in CS courses out of fear they would not get enough CS credits, leading to very large waitlists. Students complained that 500-level courses get filled up by graduate students and do not offer enough seats for undergraduates. Students seem to feel like there are not enough courses on contemporary and applied topics, such as cloud computing. Students complained about courses advertised as being taught by faculty when they were in fact taught by a graduate student. This resentment was amplified by a recent event where a popular faculty member, who was listed as the instructor for a campus course, ended up teaching in the 131 program at EPIC instead of teaching on campus. They also complained about several popular courses that were only taught by one (or few) faculty members, making access to the course difficult.

The stress caused by the sudden influx of students has led to changes in the curriculum that the faculty accept without enthusiasm. Faculty report that there is less creative problem solving in courses and much less interaction with students. Students have reduced access to office hours. The TAs can spend less time uncovering and correcting design issues like coding errors and must rely more on multiple choice assessments.

The department had very few DARS exceptions over the last ten years. One issue is a topics course (638) that does not count toward the major. CS advisors reported plans to create a topics course that counts for the major to alleviate this problem.
Uneven class sizes are a potential concern. For some courses, the section sizes vary between mid 50s to upper 200s. Naturally, large sections get more TAs; however, the department does not aim to balance out the section sizes, except for capping the size for student instructors. The department however recognizes impact of uneven class sizes on faculty and trying to come up ways of compensation for faculty who regularly teach large sections.

Capacity issues are complicated by the fact that it is difficult to recruit CS instructors in south-central Wisconsin. The department has struggled to fill current academic staff positions as qualified candidates have many high paying career options. The department may consider using online courses and developing relationships with remote instructors who have more incentive to work with UW.

C. Undergraduate advising/handbook/policies

In 2015, CS switched from faculty advisors (a subset of faculty served) to academic staff advisors (although drop-in faculty advising is still available). Currently they have two department advisors. Because of the large number of CS students the current advising system emphasizes throughput. It relies on group information sessions, an online declaration process, and monitoring of peer advising that occurs via social media. The department advisors are available for in person meetings, although this is mostly used by students who are switching into the CS major. Advisors currently focus their one on one efforts to students on academic probation.

Advisors believe the simplicity and flexibility of the current major requirements allow most 4 years CS majors to progress through the program without individual advising. The rules and requirements of the major are very clear, and students often do not need additional advising when they get in. The student focus group confirmed that students do not believe they need additional academic advising assistance as the CS websites provides detailed information and peer advising information sources are widely used. The committee was struck by the high amount of peer advising going on among the students. Students hold regular presentations on the undergraduate catalogue, and they have Facebook and Reddit groups. Although peer advising is natural in all undergraduate programs, it can also lead to misinformation. As noted, the advisors monitor the social media for misinformation, but it may be hard to keep up with all the unofficial information.

D. Undergraduate placement

Most of the career advising is done via the Letters & Science Career Services and the Engineering Career Services. Student feedback about these services was overwhelmingly positive; however students noted that some aspects of the CS job process are unique to the field (e.g., interviewing for CS jobs), and suggested that it would be good to have some CS specific web resources. That being said, students said it would be “more important to spend resources on classes than on career services.”

The department organizes an annual CS job fair where students can meet with potential employers which students valued highly. A significant percentage of CS undergraduate students
are able to find employment after graduation.

One complaint from the students was the short time line in which companies offer positions to UW students after a completed internship. Students explained that they were only allowed a two week period to make a decision on the so-called “return offer,” which puts them at a disadvantage compared to students from other universities who have more time to decide. The students encouraged the CS department to renegotiate the parameters to allow them more time.

E. Undergraduate program assessment

The department has recently developed program level learning outcomes and described an assessment plan based on surveys, course evaluations and evaluation of sample problem sets and projects from capstone courses. The first round of assessments of the learning outcomes is expected in the fall semester of 2017.

In addition to the planned assessment activities, CS regularly assesses itself with data mining, regularly analyzing undergraduate program data to inform decision making or evaluate curricular experiments. The committee comments CS for its use of data to increase the success of the undergraduate program (e.g., the recent redesign of the 302-367 sequence into a three semester sequence.)

Suggestion: they should continue with the data mining, even if it does not fit into the framework of the program level learning assessment. It is extremely important to monitor the effect of the growing size of the majors on the quality of the program.

F. Undergraduate program recommendations

- Further explore how CS could use upper level undergraduate students in tutoring/teaching/peer advising.
- Consider counting internship toward the major to attract more women and targeted minority majors.
- Consider offering more courses on contemporary and applied topics.
- Suggested further data analysis: Look into time to degree data in more detail to identify predictors of longer time to degree (e.g., transfers, addition of double major, international status). Continue data analysis of size of program and student performance, especially low performing students and drop rates.
- Capacity: Consider using the summer semester to alleviate the enrollment pressure in the fall/spring semester. Consider online courses and recruiting excellent instructors with online teaching skills from outside of Madison to increase the number of courses.
- Improve advertisement and outreach of some of programs that will diversify student body (e.g., certificate, CS 402 & WES-CS).
- Increase professional advising capacity especially related to (a) recruitment and retention of target populations and (b) outreach to at risk populations.
- Continue to develop rewards for faculty teaching large courses.
- Consider renegotiation of two week return offer period to give students more time to
consider job options.

III. Graduate program

The CS graduate program offers both Master’s and Ph.D. degrees to about 60 incoming graduate students annually. The program enjoys a 98% placement rate in industry and academia. Driven by the high caliber and competitive research programs of the CS faculty, the graduate program offers students a world-class graduate education in CS. It is consistently highly ranked compared to peer institutions, and the program is currently ranked 11th in the US News and World Report ranking. As one of the oldest CS departments in the world, it carries a world-class reputation and is rightfully regarded as a research powerhouse befitting an R1 institution, attracting many excellent graduate applicants.

It is important to explain that CS does not identify incoming graduate students dichotomously as either M.S. or Ph.D. students. Students are encouraged to move between the two degree programs as their professional goals evolve. Given the strong career opportunities of M.S. students, within CS the M.S. is a valued terminal degree, rather than a second choice for those unable to complete a Ph.D.

A. Graduate student body by composition/diversity/enrollments

The graduate program has roughly doubled in size since 2007, partly due to the addition of the professional MS degree (40 students per year). CS has approximately 60 total incoming graduate students per year. The number of Ph.D. students has remained roughly constant over this time period. The addition of the additional professional Masters students has consequences for class sizes and availability.

With approximately 1700 applications, the CS department has the largest graduate applicant pool of any L&S department. CS has seen a significant increase in the pool of campus graduate program applicants, mirroring the general increase in demand for CS degrees at peer institutions. Over the past decade, the demographic composition of this pool has shifted significantly. Approximately ⅔ of applicants are now international, with most of those applications coming from China and India, and with the total number of domestic applications staying roughly constant. This has increased the burden of the admissions process on the department, which now considers applications from US-, Chinese-, Indian-, and all remaining international students in four separate sub-committees to maintain some parity among these different groups and to ensure knowledge about programs in each geographical area.

Both faculty and graduate students expressed concern that the quality of the graduate applicant pool may be declining. Students and faculty report that the program no longer receives many applicants from the top universities in India. On the other hand, it appears that the UW CS graduate program generally continues to gain commitments from the strongest students that apply because the acceptance rate of students offered fellowships appears to be constant, indicating that the program does not lose more top ranked students to peer institutions than it did in the past.

The application-, admissions-, and enrollment data reveal significant deficiencies in diversity,
both in terms of targeted minorities (1% of the student population) and gender balance (15% of all graduate students are women, down from 20% in the 2006-2010 time frame). The department identifies this as a major challenge. As a STEM department in L&S, CS is not atypical in this respect, and CS departments at peer institutions also suffer from similar deficiencies in diversity. The department has taken some steps towards addressing in particular the challenge of attracting students from underrepresented groups, such as applying for AOF fellowships for incoming students, sending posters to conferences for minorities in STEM fields, offering a learning center and peer mentoring programs. The fact that the balance has gotten worse in recent years suggests that recent efforts are insufficient to rectify the problem. CS reports the fraction of women among master’s students has fallen to under 15% and among Ph.D. students has fallen under 10%. It also appears that the department has suffered several departures of women in recent years, further exasperating the gender issue.

The large size of the CS graduate applicant pool presents a logistical challenge. The department has addressed this challenge by exporting data from Graduate School systems to an in-house software solution that provides needed functionality to filter and query the large number of applications. Ongoing changes to GWIS on an annual basis have made it increasingly difficult for CS staff to maintain interoperability between the two systems to facilitate data export. The CS admissions staff has determined that GWIS in its current form is not able to handle the demands of the unique high-volume CS admissions data. It is paramount that the Graduate School either provide an implementation of GWIS that allows the department to handle the large amounts of data or to guarantee a stable API that does not require large amounts of staff time to maintain compatibility between GWIS and CS in-house software.

B. Graduate time to degree

Incoming graduate students are not identified as MS or Ph.D. students and move between degree programs, making degree success metrics slightly ambiguous. The average time to degree in the Ph.D. program is 6.0 years, comparable to the peer average. The average time to degree for MS students is 4.2 semesters.

Due to the increase in cohort sizes, there is increasing competition for enrollment in courses. The graduate students who met with the committee felt that it was difficult to get into classes. Most students eventually get to take their preferred courses, but not in the semester of their choosing.

Graduate students report regularly enrolling in more courses than they intend to take, and subsequently drop their less preferred courses. This over enrollment practice is driven by concerns about satisfying minimum enrollment limits, especially among international students. The over enrollment practice creates large wait lists (especially for shared undergraduate classes) and significant enrollment management problems for CS. CS is experimenting with various strategies to manage enrollment. A recent policy that will be tested this spring will limit the number of courses in which each student may initially enroll in order to force students to only enroll for their top choices. Students are concerned that the policy will make it more difficult to enroll in their desired courses and sufficient courses.
C. Graduate funding

The CS department does an admirable job of distributing appropriate funding to those who are admitted. Offer letters to those students admitted to the graduate program in CS are sent all at one time (228 offers this year), and are comprised of four different types of offers:

- Fellowship offers
- TA position with $8K supplement
- TA position with $4K supplement
- Unfunded

The department utilizes the fellowship support from the Graduate School, along with their own internal funds for the fellowship and TA offers. The first three types of offers represent the ‘guaranteed funding’ offers. 95% of the students receiving guaranteed funding offers receive a TA appointment in their first year. All TA appointments are at the 50% level. The TA support supplement (funded by CS) is included to bring the TA offers more in line with support offered by peer institutions. The graduate students noted that the RA support level for incoming students at UW-Madison is typically ~ $10K less than at other institutions.

TA’s are assigned specific responsibilities through a process that makes assignments based on both TA self-identified skills/interest, and faculty needs for courses. The assignment method is equitable and works well. TA responsibilities are primarily associated with grading due to the large design component in typical class assignments, and the significant time required for assessing such assignments. The ‘grading’ responsibility also requires lots of one-on-one office hour time. RA appointments for subsequent years are negotiated on a one-by-one basis between the students and faculty with research project openings.

Despite the pressure faculty feel from the increase in demand for CS, the committee did not see evidence of TA complaints about being overworked. The department has resorted to greater use of graders as well as undergraduate student assistants to manage student help.

D. Graduate advising/handbook/policies

The CS Graduate Advising Committee (GAC) handles all advising activities for the graduate students. GAC is composed of four faculty and one full time staff graduate advisor. New students meet with the GAC during the first two weeks of their first semester (priority given to TAs). All other students meet at least once per semester for issues such as course selection, degree requirements, etc. The GAC members also maintain regular office hours. Both students and the GAC members comment that the on-line CS Graduate Guidebook does a good job of providing all necessary details, but that the one-on-one meetings are also helpful – especially for the growing number of international students. Along with other information, the guidebook contains details for a grievance procedure, but students and GAC members report these are rarely necessary.

Students comment that the Ph.D. minor requirement is universally disliked, primarily due to the large number of courses required, but also because there is inadequate advising regarding the minor.
E. Graduate placement
The success with which CS students are able to find employment is outstanding and is a department strength -- high quality graduates obtain competitive jobs at top companies, research labs and universities. Of the MS graduates between 2013 and 2015, 70% found full time employment after graduation, and 28% planned to continue in a graduate or professional program. Between 2012 and 2015, 83% of the PhD graduates made employment commitments post-graduation, 61% were in the private sector and 34% in education. Fifteen percent reported accepting a tenure track position.

F. Graduate program assessment
The CS department has robust internal practices for collecting and analyzing data. They have developed a full assessment plan for their graduate program that includes a mix of surveys with current students and alumni, as well as direct analysis of student work, and that is based on articulated learning goals specific to each degree. CS also regularly mines course enrollment data. In terms of topics to assess, the department is mindful of (a) the growth in class sizes, (b) the need for the curriculum to address new emerging topics, and (c) that the communication skills of the graduate students could be improved.

G. Graduate program other
The CS department has experienced rapid growth at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. While demand for their courses has steadily risen, department resources have increased only modestly, and largely through faculty associates. Despite these challenges, the CS department has done an admirable job of accepting the “new normal” of large course sizes. Faculty report that the strain is felt more when teaching at the undergraduate level since faculty are more passionate teaching at the graduate level than in the undergraduate program.

The professional MS program has had positive and negative effects on campus CS graduate programs. The adverse consequences are overworked faculty and staff, and more limited time for faculty research. There is not much evidence of adverse consequences on graduate advising. The regular MS students are no more demanding in terms of time spent with faculty than the professional MS students. On the positive side, there is recognition of the new resources created which will help expand the number of faculty and faculty associates available for all students. Faculty also report that the professional MS students have different life experiences that add to the richness of the classroom.

Graduate students attending the focus group complained shortages of faculty as well as course offerings. Their perception is that many professors have left without being replaced. They raised concerns that the lack of faculty in key emerging areas of computer science, such as computer security and machine learning, have resulted in a lack of research opportunities as well as a lack of course offerings.

H. Graduate program recommendations

- The committee suggests several possible steps towards changing the gender balance in the graduate program including adopting a department code of conduct, increasing the
number of women and minority faculty to model a diverse and supportive learning environment, and prioritizing retaining existing women faculty.

- Graduate School system implementers should work with CS to either provide an implementation of GWIS that allows the department to handle the large amounts of data or to guarantee a stable API that does not require large amounts of staff time to maintain compatibility between GWIS and CS in-house software.
- Enrollment management – the committee encourages CS to keep working on techniques to stem the practice of course over-enrollment among graduate and undergraduate students.
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