April 26, 2018

To: Sarah Mangelsdorf, Provost
   William Karpus, Dean of the Graduate School

From: Richard Straub, Senior Associate Dean, CALS

Re: Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics Program Reviews

Cc: Nikki Bollig, Dominique Brossard, Jeremy Foltz, Sarah Kuba, Jocelyn Milner, Parmesh Ramanathan

On April 17th, the CALS Academic Planning Council reviewed and voted to accept as complete the review of the academic programs in the Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics. The self-study was completed in the summer of 2017, and the review team’s report was submitted in March 2018, with the department response completed in early April. Copies of the latter two documents are attached, and additional documents are on file in the college and available on request.

The review covered the following programs:
- Agricultural & Applied Economics, BS, MS, PhD, Doctoral Minor (10-year review)
- Agricultural Business Management, BS (10-year review)
- Undergraduate Certificate in Development Economics (5-year review)
- Undergraduate Certificate in Business Management for Agricultural and Life Sciences (5-year review; joint program with Department of Life Sciences Communication)

In addition, although the MS named option in Resource and Energy Demand Analysis (REDA) is not yet due for its 5-year review, the CALS deans asked the department to discuss the status of that program in their self-study. (Note that the PhD in Development, which is administered by the AAE department, completed its last review in June of 2017 and was not considered further in the present review.) As in all CALS program reviews, we ask departments not only to address the status of the academic programs themselves, but also to provide “a concise overview of other aspects of the department, including the faculty, facilities, and research and Extension/outreach missions…emphasizing not only how they affect and intersect with the academic programs under consideration, but also how they impact the overall strength of the department.”

The review committee chair noted the complexity of the review resulting from the number of programs under consideration, but the overall state of the department and its programs is excellent. The review committee noted as particular strengths of the department’s academic offerings the growth in undergraduate enrollments and CFI, the strategic assessment of learning conducted across the programs, and the positive climate and good placement results described by students.

The committee noted several challenges being faced by these programs, most of which are not unique to this department.
• Desire for more faculty, especially in specific sub-disciplinary areas (e.g., trade, applied econometrics). Much of AAE’s hiring in recent years has been through opportunistic hiring, which has enabled their faculty numbers to remain more stable than most departments in the college, but has constrained the areas in which they have been able to hire. Given current hiring patterns and projections in the college, this situation is unlikely to change significantly in the near future. The department’s successful engagement in 131 programs has the potential provide them some future hiring flexibility if these programs can bring sufficient revenue to support additional faculty lines.

• Climate between ABM and AAE undergraduates. The review committee found some evidence to suggest that tensions exist between undergraduates in the ABM program and those in the AAE program, and there is some anecdotal data that these may result in part from differences in the demographics and life experiences of the two groups. The APC recommended that the department investigate the root causes of this concern and ways to continue to improve climate for all students.

• Undergraduate time-to-degree is > 4 years for ABM. The college’s average time-to-degree across all undergraduate programs is 3.9 years. The average in AAE is 3.85 but in ABM is 4.09, above the average of 3.98 for AAU peers. We encourage the department to look into the situation for ABM students in more detail to determine whether curricular or structural changes might help bring time-to-degree closer to or below 4.0 years.

• Access to faculty mentorship/advising for undergrads. In the undergraduate programs, the department has opted to rely significantly on an academic staff advisor rather than faculty advisors (a not uncommon pattern in recent years in CALS, and fairly typical of programs elsewhere on campus). A benefit of this arrangement is the consistency of the content and availability of advising, but a downside is the limited faculty engagement with and mentorship of undergraduates. We encourage the department to participate in college-wide discussions that are underway to strengthen undergraduate advising (in part through partnerships that cross department boundaries) and also to seek ways for faculty to continue to work closely with students so students can benefit from the expertise of both academic staff and faculty.

• Lack of racial/ethnic diversity across programs. Like many departments, AAE has struggled to see significant improvements in racial and ethnic diversity in its faculty and graduate student populations. We recommend working with the Equity and Diversity Committee through your diversity department representative, Dan Phaneuf, to develop strategies for recruitment and outreach.

In short, the academic programs are generally well-functioning, but the department personnel are spread thin, more by the number of programs being managed than by the combined enrollments across all the programs. We encourage the department to continue to work toward articulating how the programs they offer come together in a coherent whole that draws on the strengths of the department faculty rather than existing as a diffuse set of discrete activities. In addition, it will be important for the department and the deans to pay close attention to the 131 programs of the department (current and planned) to ensure that department and college human and financial resources are being wisely deployed and well leveraged.
April 10, 2018

Dear CALS Deans and APC,

The department of Agricultural & Applied Economics has read through the report of the 10-year review committee. We have a number of minor factual corrections, some added data to address questions that came up in the APC meeting, and reactions that show how we plan to respond to the recommendations of the review committee.

We have the following factual corrections. These corrections are important in that they go to issues brought up in the recommendations.

1) In item 3d “climate” and “changing demographics” says that the number of AAE majors is declining relative to ABM majors. This is not true.

2) Also in 3d and in the recommendations the assumption is that AAE majors are “students who come from farm communities” and focused on farming and agriculture, while the ABM are business students from non-rural areas. This is not the case. Our students focused on farming end up majoring in both AAE and ABM. Students from rural areas are about equally represented in each of our majors.

3) In item 4c we’re said to be “getting involved with GERS and other campus programs”. The department has had a member of the Sci-Med GRS advisory committee since its inception a decade ago.

4) In 3) Undergraduate Program, c) Growth and Success, the committee left out the field of environmental economics. In the second paragraph of c) Growth and Success, they have incorrect names for our 2 certificates. The correct names are Business Management for Ag & Life Sciences and Development Economics.

We are attaching below a number of data sheets from the university websites to provide better information on some of the questions that the APC had in the first reading of our 10 year review.

In terms of suggestions for the department, we have the following reactions the recommendations made by the committee.
a) Hiring new faculty: the committee finds that AAE will need to hire more faculty members to meet the demands of continued growth in enrolling more majors and serving more students from across campus.

We are in strong agreement with this suggestion. CALS and past APC demands that we hire production agriculture faculty has hampered AAE’s ability to be a top research and teaching department and is inconsistent with the campus level drive for more undergraduates and high indirect cost grants. We hope that the new CALS budget planning will give AAE more flexibility to choose faculty hires that can address our needs.

b) We recommend the department pay deliberate attention to the distinctions some students feel between those enrolled in ABM and those in AAE. We recommend the department comes up with a predetermined strategy to address this aspect of the departmental climate. There is an opportunity to enrich both "groups" of students through constructive engagement.

We will work with faculty in key courses to improve the cross-major socialization.

c) We also recommend the department start developing a strategy for dealing with the demographic shift of the student population: less students from rural and agricultural populations and more interest in agricultural business. This shift might be an opportunity, but it requires strategic rethinking of the undergraduate program: its certificates, majors, and courses.

We will work to develop a strategy for the coming demographic shift. That strategy will seek to provide new learning opportunities for this new population.

d) Advising: we recommend that more faculty advising be available to students. A strategy that has been successfully implemented in other departments is to have an administrative advisor responsible for the technical requirements of the program while at the same time having a faculty advisor who can be a resource for thinking about life questions that are relevant to disciplinary interests.

We have just conducted a survey or our soon to be Spring 2018 graduates and identified some issues and places for improvement in our advising policy. We will be implementing them in the near future.

e) Diversity: the committee was impressed with the department’s accomplishment in filling the gender gap and in diversifying the community by recruiting many international students, especially those from Africa. We also understand the difficulties inherent in trying to reduce the racial gap. However, the committee feels that more deliberate effort needs to be made and that more can be done in this domain. We think a predetermined and thought-out strategy for covering recruiting targeted minorities should be developed and that resources should be given to that effort. We also call on CALS to increase the resources available for such efforts.
Our investigation of the data shows that our graduating class in the last 3 years has had 10 – 11% targeted minorities (see attached data sheets). This is better that the 9% average overall at UW-Madison, 9% in CALS, and the 4 – 8% level in Economics. We are thus doing much better than we, or the review committee had thought. We will nonetheless continue our efforts to increase our targeted minority population.

We appreciate all the hard work of the review committee, CALS Deans, and CALS APC to analyze and make recommendations to improve our department.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Foltz
Professor and Chair
The 10-Year Review
Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics

Review Committee: Samer Alatout (Chair), Kenneth Albrecht, Robert Anex, Mike Graham (GFEC Representative)

1) Review Process
The committee was charged by CALS Senior Associate Dean Richard Straub to review the Academic programs of the Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics (AAE). AAE provided a self-study for this review. The committee reviewed the self-study, the previous external review of 2006, the different pages of the AAE website, and additional information prepared by the Graduate School. AAE also responded to a questionnaire of 50+ questions that was prepared by the review committee. The review committee held two meetings to discuss the review process and met with the Chair, DGS, faculty members, administrative staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students. The committee’s comments below come at the conclusion of this review process.

2) Executive Summary
Since the external departmental review in 2006, the Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics succeeded in building its undergraduate program in terms of the number of undergraduate students it serves, better defining its curriculum, and enhancing its student learning goals and objectives. In particular, AAE successfully increased the undergraduate student body that it is serving, and as of 2016/17, AAE is serving 250 students as majors (137, up from 82 ten years ago) and as certificate students (113). Equally impressive is the seriousness with which AAE deals with assessing students’ academic achievements: streamlining of the curriculum and creatively inserting embedded assessment questions in tests for multiple courses, on the undergraduate and graduate levels. Undergraduate time to completion was reduced, and the students successfully compete for relevant jobs. The department also increased its offering, adding two certificates, and increasing enrollment in many of the courses offered (five courses enroll more than 100 students and one course has an enrollment of 250+). The graduate program (PhD and PhD Minor, two master degrees and one professional master) continues its successes. For example, the number of graduate students increased since last review in 2006 from 50 to 70 and the PhD completion time was reduced from 5.7 to 5.3 years. The main hurdles facing the department and its plans for growth are staffing, especially in terms of flexible faculty hires, and the changing student demographics on the undergraduate level.

3) Undergraduate Program
a) Overview
AAE offers multiple programs that serve many student needs, from undergraduates (with two undergraduate majors and two undergraduate certificates), a PhD and a Doctoral Minor, two MS programs, and a professional MS program in Resource and Energy Demand Analysis, REDA. The department’s offerings contribute to UW’s and CALS’

---

1 Note that this review concerns the seven programs run by AAE, including: undergraduate majors AAE and Agricultural Business Management (ABM), AAE MS, PhD in AAE, PhD in AAE Minor, Certificate in Development Economics (5-year review), Certificate in Business Management for Agricultural and Life Sciences (5-year review).
excellence in agricultural business management, the economics of international development, environmental and resource economics, and community development economics. In all of these dimensions, the department distinguishes itself by its applied approach to economics. The department offers a number of large-enrollment introductory classes (three are near 100 students and one has enrollment over 280 students). There are also small classes for advanced undergraduates, and capstone classes aimed at encouraging students to integrate the knowledge they acquire through their undergraduate careers in comprehensive projects.

b) Analysis of the Program
AAE is a central component of the social science scene offerings within CALS, especially by providing an economic foundation for understanding agricultural business and international development. AAE undergraduate programs provide introductory understanding of the economics of agricultural business and community development to students within the department, in CALS more generally, and throughout campus.

c) Growth and Success
Faculty members constitute the main strength of the department with their active research and teaching in diverse areas of the field: development economics, agricultural applied economics, and agricultural business economics. In all of these areas, they contribute heavily in terms of research (a look at the citation patterns reflects a very positive effect of the impact of their research) and instruction (as evidenced by their active teaching profiles). The department actively and successfully runs multiple programs on the undergraduate level including two majors (AAE and ABM) and two certificates (Development Economics and Business Management for Agricultural and Life Sciences).

The AAE undergraduate program’s growth is impressive in a number of ways. The number of undergraduate students enrolled in both majors grew since the last external review of 2006 from 82 to 119-137 (depending on the semester and the number of graduating seniors) students. In addition, the department has been running two undergraduate certificates, Agricultural Business Management and International Development Economics that between them serve 101 students (fall 2017). In addition, the department has been serving an ever-larger body of undergraduates in the department, the college and on campus. AAE has been teaching a number of large undergraduate courses (with three courses near 100 students and one course more than 280). All of this led to an impressive increase in CFI (credit follows instructor) where in 2016/17 the department had 5,586 in CFI, an increase of 15% over 2012-13. Relative to FTEs, this means 294 CFI per faculty, an increase of 33% during the same period. Compared to the rest of CALS, AAE represents 7.3% of the number of faculty and 8.5% of CALS total CFI.

The department succeeded in setting goals and learning objectives for undergraduate programs. In addition, the department also developed strategies to assess the degree to which the programs meet those goals. In part, that has been done through senior capstone courses in which the students complete projects and presentations with a predetermined
rubric. Assessment is also done through embedded questions and pre- and post-testing in core courses: AAE 215 and 421.

The average time to completion for undergraduates in AAE is 4.33 and for ABM is 4.27. With the new restructuring of requirements and programs, the hope is that students (other than transfers) will be able to complete their degrees in 4 years.

From the department’s self-study report and from conversations with the undergraduate students, it seems that most of the students find work in their field at graduation.

d) Challenges and Needs

Faculty recruitment: the main challenge faced by the department’s growth is probably the number of faculty serving an increasing number of students. While the department has been very successful in hiring new faculty members to teach environment and resource economics, it has not been allowed to hire for an open position in the last ten years. One of the priorities the department has set for itself is hiring a faculty member whose specialty is trade, but other possible hires include experts in econometrics.

Climate: while the collegial atmosphere in the department should be acknowledged and appreciated, there seems to be a distinction and low-level tension in the undergraduate program between students enrolled in ABM (many coming with business interests and after trying for the Business School) and those who enroll in AAE (students who come from farming communities).

Changing demographics: the department’s demographics are changing and that might cause difficulty in the coming decade. The number of AAE students, those presumably focused on farming and agriculture, has been decreasing as a percentage of those majoring in the department. This might pose a future problem for both the AAE major and the AAE certificate.

Time to completion: time to completion for undergraduate students is more than four years for both majors (4.33 for AAE and 4.27 for ABM).

Advising: there is only one advisor for undergraduate students and that cannot be sufficient for a program of this size. In addition, the advisor is administrative, which means there are very limited chances of the students to interact with faculty members outside their courses. The students seem to suggest that is a problem.

Diversity: While there is something to be celebrated in the department’s success filling some of the gender gap by hiring a number of women faculty members and increasing women’s participation in the undergraduate and graduate programs, the lack of diversity of targeted minorities is still a problem. Diversity in the undergraduate and graduate student body, as well as in faculty, needs to be addressed.
4) **Graduate Program**

a) **Overview**

The PhD program in Agricultural and Applied Economics enrolls about 12 students per year and the MS program about 5. These enrollments have been stable over the past several years. The program assesses itself to be roughly in the top five in the country, with peers being UC-Berkeley, UC-Davis, U of Maryland, and Cornell. They generally lose admitted students to Berkeley. The department has four research thrusts: environmental and resource economics, economics of agriculture, development economics and community economic development. The department has an integrative emphasis that they find is attractive to many students – they really bring together economic theory and practice. A relevant point is their relation to the Economics department: the department writes “There is a big difference in departmental missions and philosophy between the Economics department and the Agricultural and Applied Economics department. In AAE we seek to apply economic theory and tools to answer real world applied problems. Typically we work from the problem to the theory and produce empirical research that almost always has relevant policy implications. The Econ department has a more theoretical tradition, which is about developing the tools that can be used in economic analysis. In this sense combining the departments would be like combining physics and engineering: they are both physical sciences, but one would not think they do the same thing…. We do not offer the 6 subfields they offer (Micro, Macro, Econometrics, Labor, Trade, Public) and they do not offer the 4 subfields we offer…. In AAE we also perform an important function in doing the applied economics outreach for UW-Extension, which is also a function unlikely to be done by the Economics department.” That said, the PhD students are competing in the same academic job market as the straight Econ students.

b) **Curriculum, evaluation and student support**

About 90% of students are admitted with 4 years of guaranteed funding (and almost always receiving 5). Mostly RAs, some TA support – REDA program helps with this – there is some TA support through that program. Other admitted students have support from their home country.

The graduate students we talked to had been supported by multiple mechanisms over their tenure in the program: USDA, Hatch Grants, TAs. They were comfortable with this situation. Funding is available in the department and university for conference participation. Students are not admitted to work with a specific advisor. They are assigned an advisor upon admission but this is not necessarily their ultimate advisor – about 50% of students will change advisors.

A distinguishing feature of this program relative to other AAE programs is that, in addition to courses within the department, graduate students are required to take two core graduate Econ courses. These are rigorous and mathematical. The department runs a “boot camp” to help students be mathematically prepared for the core graduate Econ classes. Students who get a B or better do not have to take the microeconomics prelim. There is also a “field prelim” in which students have a week to answer questions posed by the faculty. In recent years all students have passed the prelim. Students are expected
to defend a thesis proposal at the end of the third year – most third year students take a seminar course to aid in developing their proposal. There are consequences such as registration holds and potentially loss of funding if they do not present the proposal in a timely manner.

There is no formal annual feedback mechanism but there is regular interaction with the advisor and committee, largely through student seminars held in the various thrust areas of the department. The students we spoke with felt that expectations for graduation were clear: the rule of thumb is three papers, not necessarily published.

c) Demographics
PhD students in the department are about 65% male, 50% nontargeted minority, and single-digit percentages for targeted minority populations. The MA program has very little enrollment. The MS program, which draws 5 or so students per year has interesting demographics – 50/50 m/f rather than 65/35. The department is well aware of the low numbers of URM students. They have very few applicants from these populations. The department is making a point to work with under-represented minorities (URM) undergraduates to help develop the graduate student pipeline for the field. (Hopefully other universities are doing the same.) They are also getting involved with GERS and other campus programs. As an example of the challenge they face, a department representative went to the McNair Scholars career fair and were not approached by a single student.

Average residence time in the PhD program is similar to peers. However, data from the graduate school shows a long tail in the distribution: 34% > 6 years, 12%>8. This issue deserves follow-up.

d) Student experience
The students who spoke with us were comfortable with the department climate. They have a graduate representative that occasionally attends faculty meetings. They have been able to bring up issues of interest such as a desire for certain courses and increased travel funding. The woman graduate student we talked to did note that she had experienced some form of gender bias or inappropriate behavior from a faculty member, but not in this department. She did not wish to elaborate.

Students felt that expectations were clear and that they had ample opportunities for feedback from faculty, especially through the seminars, at which they give presentations once or twice a semester. There is also an informal student colloquium series that allows for peer feedback. The handbook appears to be very thorough and the students felt it was satisfactory. They also commented that the graduate administrator sends reminders of what to do when.

The department shared results of an exit survey of PhD grads from 2012-2016 that revealed very positive views of the department. Only 50% of students reported a formal annual assessment of progress. Otherwise all looked well. There were no red flags.
PhD students from this program have a very high job placement rate. Many students are in academia, at both undergraduate institutions and research universities. Other students find positions in government, companies and NGOs. The plurality of students responding to the exit survey had positions in Washington, DC.

e) Challenges
Research support in AAE is not growing so neither can their student numbers. The faculty expressed an interest in strengthening faculty/student interactions. The department would like to hire a faculty member with expertise in applied econometrics—this is a core methods area that doesn’t get traction in activities like cluster hires.

5) Recommendations
The department and its graduate and undergraduate programs are functioning well. We see the following recommendations as important for the continued success of the department and for keeping up with the changing landscape of the department’s constituencies and higher education in general.

a) Hiring new faculty: the committee finds that AAE will need to hire more faculty members to meet the demands of continued growth in enrolling more majors and serving more students from across campus.

b) We recommend the department pay deliberate attention to the distinctions some students feel between those enrolled in ABM and those in AAE. We recommend the department comes up with a predetermined strategy to address this aspect of the departmental climate. There is an opportunity to enrich both "groups" of students through constructive engagement.

c) We also recommend the department start developing a strategy for dealing with the demographic shift of the student population: less students from rural and agricultural populations and more interest in agricultural business. This shift might be an opportunity, but it requires strategic rethinking of the undergraduate program: its certificates, majors, and courses.

d) Advising: we recommend that more faculty advising be available to students. A strategy that has been successfully implemented in other departments is to have an administrative advisor responsible for the technical requirements of the program while at the same time having a faculty advisor who can be a resource for thinking about life questions that are relevant to disciplinary interests.

e) Diversity: the committee was impressed with the department’s accomplishment in filling the gender gap and in diversifying the community by recruiting many international students, especially those from Africa. We also understand the difficulties inherent in trying to reduce the racial gap. However, the committee feels that more deliberate effort needs to be made and that more can be done in this domain. We think a predetermined and thought-out strategy for covering recruiting targeted minorities should be developed and that resources should be given to that effort. We also call on CALS to increase the resources available for such efforts.
June 30, 2017

Professor Samer Alatout, Community & Environmental Sociology (Chair)
Professor Ken Albrecht, Agronomy
Professor Rob Anex, Biological Systems Engineering
Professor Michael Graham, Chemical & Biological Engineering (GFEC Representative)

Sent electronically

Dear Professors Alatout, Albrecht, Anex, and Graham:

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the committee reviewing the academic programs in the department of Agricultural and Applied Economics. The committee is chaired by Samer Alatout. The programs due for review are as follows:

- Agricultural & Applied Economics, BS (10-year review)
- Agricultural & Applied Economics, MS, (10-year review) including a preliminary review of the Resource and Energy Demand Analysis (REDA) Option.
- Agricultural & Applied Economics, PhD (10-year review)
- Agricultural & Applied Economics, Doctoral Minor (10-year review)
- Agricultural Business Management, BS (10-year review)
- Certificate in Development Economics (5-year review)
- Certificate in Business Management for Agricultural and Life Sciences (5-year review) – joint with Life Sciences Communication; this committee will lead the 5-year review of the certificate but will be required to consult the LSC review committee, chaired by Beth Olson, bholson@wisc.edu.

We expect your work to take place over the next few months and would appreciate receiving your report by November 1, 2017. We will forward your final report to the department chair to review for errors of fact and then to the CALS and University Academic Planning Councils.

The self-study document prepared by the program will serve as your main reference for organizing the review. The committee should work with the department chair, Jeremy Foltz, to coordinate meetings with the program’s faculty, staff, and students and to tour the facilities, if appropriate.

The chair of the committee will be responsible for scheduling and convening committee meetings, setting the meeting agendas, making specific assignments to committee members, getting feedback from the committee, overseeing the writing process, and submitting the final report to academicaffairs@cals.wisc.edu with attention to Nikki Bollig and Sarah Pfatteicher.

The review committee final report should provide a summary of the programs’ strengths and challenges as well as recommendations for improvement or focused attention.

The most important question for the committee to consider is the most general: how well is the department fulfilling its mission of teaching and learning? Are there areas that are exemplary? Are there areas that need improvement? If the latter, do you have particular recommendations for steps the department should take to
strengthen its performance? Paying attention to the following particular issues may help you address the more general questions:

1. **How well are the academic programs functioning?** Are there a sufficient number of students in each program and are the students of high caliber? Is student advising functioning well?

2. **Should the department be taking any steps to improve the quality of its educational programs?** Are student learning goals clear? How is learning evaluated and used for program improvement? How well does the learning assessment plan measure student achievement of learning goals? Are the curricula clear and appropriately designed to achieve the learning goals?

While the focus for the review is the academic programs, it may be useful to briefly address the following questions that provide context surrounding the functioning of the academic programs:

3. **What is the standing of the department within its disciplinary base and within the University of Wisconsin-Madison?** Is it in need of strengthening? If so, what can be done to improve its standing?

4. **How effectively does the department satisfy its outreach and research missions and are these recognized strengths of the department?** Are resources deployed in a way that satisfies its stakeholders?

5. **Is the climate in the department one that encourages productivity and feelings of inclusiveness by staff, students, and faculty?**

6. **Are there issues concerning the department's functions or interactions within CALS that should be considered as part of the College’s ongoing strategic planning process?**

Please do not hesitate to contact me or Nikki Bollig, Assistant Dean for Academic Programs and Policies, if you have any questions as you proceed. We will represent the dean’s office to assist you in the review process.

Thank you again for taking time on this important task. You are performing a valuable service to the department and CALS, and we all appreciate your efforts. I look forward to seeing your final report.

Sincerely,

Sarah Pfatteicher
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

cc: Nikki Bollig
Dominique Brossard
Jeremy Foltz
Marty Gustafson
Sarah Kuba
Jocelyn Milner
Dick Straub
Graduate School Applicants, Admits & New Enrollments
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- Completed Plan: 35.5%
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- Still enrolled: 24.7%
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