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2017-2018 Meeting Schedule
May 11, June 8
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
52 Bascom Hall
Members Present: Caroline Alexander, Lara Collier, Alex Dressler, Kristin Eschenfelder, Michael Graham (left before final two voting items), Yu Hen Hu, William Karpus, Steffen Lempp, Christa Olson, John Pfotenhauer, Parmesh Ramanathan, Leslie Smith III, Monica Turner, Earlise Ward

Members Absent: Christopher Livanos, Lisa Martin, Nicole Perna, Tracy Schroepfer, Steph Tai

Guests: Cynthia Czajkowski, Ken Genskow, Travis Flohr, Elaine Klein, Sarah Luba, Gloria Mari-Beffa, Alan Sidelle, Eric Wilots, Michelle Young

Staff: Judy Bauman, Eileen Callahan, Meghan Chua, Kelly Haslam, Michelle Holland, LaRuth McAfee, Emily Reynolds, Matthew Zinsli

Dean William Karpus called the meeting to order.

The minutes of February 9, 2018, were approved as a matter of automatic consent.

Information Item
1. Dean Karpus introduced Academic Planner Michelle Young from Academic Planning and Institutional Research, who presented the timeline for the Lumen project. She discussed its impact on governance and on curricular and academic programs.

Approvals:

2. Dean Karpus introduced Professor Alan Sidelle from the Department of Philosophy, who presented a request to change the admitting status of the Philosophy MA to non-admitting. The department has in practice not been admitting students directly into the Philosophy MA, though Philosophy PhD students may earn the MA.

Motion: Moved and seconded to change the admitting status of the Philosophy MA. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Dean Karpus introduced Professor and Chair Ken Genskow and Faculty Associate Travis Flohr from the Department of Planning and Landscape Architecture, who presented a request to discontinue the capstone certificate in Geodesign, effective Fall 2018. The capstone certificate has had few students. They will be teaching the coursework as in-residence courses to students on campus.

Motion:Moved and seconded to discontinue the capstone certificate in Geodesign effective Fall 2018. The motion passed unanimously.
4. Associate Dean Parmesh Ramanathan presented a request from the Manufacturing Systems Engineering Program to discontinue the doctoral minor in Manufacturing Systems Engineering, effective Fall 2018. This minor has never been awarded and has no students currently enrolled.

Motion: Moved and seconded to discontinue the doctoral minor in Manufacturing Systems Engineering effective Fall 2018. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval Updates:
5. Associate Dean Parmesh Ramanathan presented the Three-Year Progress Check-In for the MA Mathematics named option “Foundations of Advanced Studies.” The program is successful in meeting its goals of placing students in top PhD programs and generating revenue to support the department but relies solely on one faculty member to oversee the named option. Dean Karpus noted the learning goals and assessment plan are not fully developed, and they will expect to see this aspect expanded upon in the Five-Year Review. Associate Dean Ramanathan questioned the lack of diversity in this and other 131 programs. Other GFEC members mentioned that many of the 131 programs are created specifically for the international student population who are able to pay the full tuition. Associate Dean Gloria Mari-Beffa from the College of Letters & Science noted that the department has been in discussion about the problems with relying on a single faculty member to recruit into the program and addressing how the revenue from this program supports diversity efforts elsewhere within the department.

Program Reviews and Updates:
6. Associate Dean Parmesh Ramanathan presented a program review update from the Physiology PhD director, Professor Donata Oertel. Professor Oertel described teaching assistantship practices.

7. Associate Vice Chancellor and former GFEC Member Cynthia Czajkowski introduced the Five-Year Supplemental Review of the Doctor of Nursing Practice. Czajkowski noted the strengths of the program, including a detailed Graduate Student Handbook made easily available to students, student representation on governance committees, satisfied students who report feeling well-supported by the program, strong pass rates of certification exams by students, and well-defined and detailed grievance processes. Dean Karpus noted the School of Nursing is in the process of making efforts to convert the informal clinical specialty tracks into formal named options so that the names will appear on student transcripts. Czajkowski also noted the program was developing its own exit survey for graduates and a survey of alumni. The GFEC commends the program on its strengths and recommends it engage in efforts to address the review committee’s concerns.

Motion: Moved and seconded to accept Five-Year Supplemental Review of the Doctor of Nursing Practice. The motion passed with 1 abstention.

4. GFEC Member Monica Turner introduced the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor in Molecular and Cellular Pharmacology. Turner noted strengths of the program include its transparent and equitable steering committee, an exemplary student services coordinator, satisfied students, excellent student placements into both academic and industry, and strong student funding. Turner also mentioned Director Adjon Audhya has done an excellent job, focusing on community-building, internships and connections to private industry, meeting regularly with every student, and
engaging trainers. Turner mentioned that the program has recently regained T32 (a National Institute of Health training grant) funding. She also noted the committee was impressed with the engagement of all members of the department. Turner also discussed review committee recommendations, including continuing to develop and adhere to performance standards for faculty trainers and pursuing admissions practices that yield a strong student cohort and the recruitment of underrepresented minorities. Turner noted the doctoral minor had only been awarded one time in the last 10 years but that the program wants to retain it for flexibility. The GFEC commends the program on its strengths and recommends it engage in efforts to address the review committee’s concerns.

Motion: Moved and seconded to accept the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor in Molecular and Cellular Pharmacology. The motion passed with 1 abstention.

5. GFEC Member Kristin Eschenfelder introduced the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the MS in Counseling. Eschenfelder noted that the strengths of the program include a high national ranking, competitive acceptance rate, success with diversity, satisfied students, strong professionalization opportunities, good outcomes in terms of employment, and an excellent student learning assessment system. Eschenfelder noted the program is highly sought due to its emphasis on integrating multiculturalism and diversity into counseling and that contributes to its ability to be selective. Eschenfelder also noted that review committee recommendations include continuing to work with Rehabilitation Psychology on smoothing out bumps with course sharing, communicating the changes to the degree and its accreditation status, increasing internship placements for students, and more aggressive pursuit of fellowship funding. The program is also working to increase funding for these students while balancing the time students would need to devote to an assistantship with the amount of practicum hours that are required. The GFEC commends the program on its strengths and recommends it engage in efforts to address the review committee’s concerns.

Motion: Moved and seconded to accept the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the MS in Counseling. The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment

Motion: Moved and seconded to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.
March 22, 2018

TO: Sarah Mangelsdorf, Provost

FROM: Carolyn Kelley, Acting Dean

RE: MS Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis Named Option: Wisconsin Idea Principal Preparation Program

The School of Education has approved the attached proposal to create a new named option for the MS in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis: Wisconsin Idea Principal Preparation Program. The program has been approved for development as a non-pooled (Fund 131) program in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis. The named option proposal was approved by the School of Education Academic Planning Council on March 7, 2018.

The Wisconsin Idea Principal Preparation Program will expand our ability to serve educators in the state and will enable us to take advantage of newly enacted state financial support for school leadership training.

Cc: William Karpus, Dean, Graduate School
Jocelyn Milner, Associate Vice Provost, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Sarah Kuba, Academic Planner, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Jeff Hamm, Associate Dean for Academic Services
Julie Mead, Chair, Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
Elizabeth Jach, Policy/Planning Analyst, School of Education
Diana Hess, Dean
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROPOSING NAMED OPTIONS and USE OF PROPOSAL FORM

A named option is a formally documented sub-major within an academic major program. Named options serve as a convenient way to distinguish a distinct curriculum or delivery format within a major. A named option is NOT a new degree or major. Authorization by the Board of Regents to deliver an academic program is at the degree/major level.

PLANNING A NAMED OPTION

- Planning starts with idea development among the program faculty and staff.
- If you are part of a planning group that thinks a named option is a good idea, start to fill out the Named Option Proposal Form.
- When your ideas are starting to take shape, consult with your school/college dean’s office. If you aren’t sure who to talk to in your school/college dean’s office or if you have questions and want to discuss your plans, contact Jocelyn Milner (Jocelyn.Milner@wisc.edu), Director of Academic Planning and Institutional Research.
- When you have a full draft of a completed Named Option Proposal Form, and ideally before school/college approval, send the proposal to Jocelyn Milner (Jocelyn.Milner@wisc.edu) for a check in and proposal review. This will help make sure that the named option meets all components of the UAPC guidelines and will identify any implementation questions.

APPROVAL STEPS FOR A NAMED OPTION

1. The program faculty who are sponsoring the named option (most often a department) formally approve the named option proposal.
2. The school/college that houses the named option considers the named option for approval, usually at the Academic Planning Council.
3. After school/college approval, the dean forwards the proposal to the provost with a copy to the director of Academic Planning and Institutional Research.
4. The provost will seek a recommendation for approval from the University Academic Planning Council.

FOR INFORMATION AND FORMS: [http://apir.wisc.edu/degreesmajorsoptions.htm](http://apir.wisc.edu/degreesmajorsoptions.htm)

At this URL you will find links to the following information:

- These instructions and the Named Option Proposal Form, which includes detailed instructions
- Policy Guidelines for Named Options within Academic Majors, which is the policy framework for the proposal form (adopted April 2016)

QUESTIONS:

Jocelyn Milner, Director, Academic Planning and Institutional Research ([jocelyn.milner@wisc.edu](mailto:jocelyn.milner@wisc.edu))
Sarah Kuba, Academic Planner, APIR ([sarah.kuba@wisc.edu](mailto:sarah.kuba@wisc.edu))
A named option is a formally documented sub-major within an academic major program. Named options serve as a convenient way to distinguish a distinct curriculum or delivery format within a major. A named option is NOT a new degree or major. Authorization by the Board of Regents to deliver an academic program is at the degree/major level.

This form is to be used in concert with the Policy Guidelines for Named Options within Academic Majors. Complete the form and save as a Microsoft Word document.

1. Overview
   1.1. Named Option: Wisconsin Idea Principal Preparation Program
   1.2. Academic Major: Master’s in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
   1.3. Home Department: Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
   1.4. School/college: Education, School of
   1.5. Partner department(s)/units/schools/colleges: NA
   1.6. Chair of the Major (name, title, email): Julie Mead, Professor and Department Chair, jmead@education.wisc.edu
   1.7. Primary faculty or staff contact for the proposal (name, title, email): Colleen Capper, Professor, capper@education.wisc.edu
   1.8. Primary school/college dean’s office contact (name, title, email): Carolyn Kelley, Senior Associate Dean, carolyn.kelley@wisc.edu
   1.9. Briefly describe the type and purpose of the named option.
       Describe named option type and purpose. (1000 word limit)
       **Type:** Non-pooled tuition revenue program
       **Purpose:** The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis proposes to develop the Fund 131 MS Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, Named Option (Wisconsin Idea Principal Preparation Program), an off-campus version of our 30-credit master’s degree principal preparation program that is modeled after and will be delivered in parallel with the campus version. Before briefly outlining the proposed program and its requirements, it would be helpful to explain how this request came to be and why the department is asking for an expedited review.

   Approximately four years ago, the faculty responsible for the courses in our k-12 leadership programs began meeting with leaders of the Association for Wisconsin School Administrators (AWSA), the professional organization for the state’s school principals, and the Wisconsin Association of School District Administrators (WASDA), the professional organization for the state’s superintendents. Led by Professors Carolyn Kelley and Colleen Capper, we sought their guidance and that of a number of school district superintendents to re-design our principal preparation master’s degree program. That program, though having a long history, was struggling to attract students. Moreover, all involved shared the concern that Wisconsin has persistent racial achievement gaps in measured student performance that are the largest in the nation. The collaborative result was the development of a 15-month cohort program that has an explicit equity focus, is informed by research (much of it done by departmental faculty), includes a series of assignments that examine local school data, and embeds guided field experiences throughout the academic year. Program course work is delivered through a blend
of online and face-to-face experiences. Academic year courses meet five weekends (Friday/Saturday) each semester, and summer courses are delivered through three week-long intensive sessions spread throughout the summer. This delivery pattern permits working teachers to participate in the program and minimizes travel to campus. Finally, the program permits students to take a series of four optional courses for those interested in earning two additional administrative licenses: Director of Instruction and Director of Special Education and Pupil Services. We admitted our first cohort of 18 students in June of 2017.

As that program developed, we began to get overtures through AWSA from some northern school districts that wanted the Department to bring the program “out state” as a way to maximize its reach, influence, and accessibility. In particular, we were asked to explore providing the program in the Green Bay/Fox Valley area. We had begun conversations about how we might respond to those requests, but were unsure that we could marshal sufficient departmental resources to support such an expansion.

Then the state legislature provided what we believe presents just such an opportunity for support. As part of the 2017-19 biennium budget, the state legislature took action to encourage and support the development of school leaders by enacting the “School Leadership Loan Program” (Wis. Stat. §39.397). This forgivable loan program allocated a total of $500,000 to support the training of school leaders for Wisconsin’s elementary and secondary schools. Moreover, the provision was written in such a way as to make it a recurring allocation. In other words, unless the legislature takes action to revoke it, $500,000 will be available through this program in this and subsequent biennia. To take advantage of this funding opportunity, individuals need only to satisfy two criteria: 1) be nominated by a superintendent of a school district; and 2) apply to and be admitted to a program delivered by a UW-System School that trains students in an accelerated program. The statute designates the Higher Education Aids Board (HEAB) to administer the loan program. After completing the program, individuals who receive this special financial support will have 25% of the loan and the interest on the loan forgiven for each year successfully served as a Wisconsin school leader until the entire loan is forgiven.

With the support of UW-System, ELPA faculty met with HEAB officials in early January to determine how to make the loan program available to prospective students. HEAB officials agreed that our program met the requirements of the statute. They also worked with us to develop a memo to notify all state school superintendents of the availability of this special financial support. To date, our program is the only one approved by HEAB for this funding.

That leads us to this request. We propose to develop a Fund 131 program to provide the necessary resources to respond to the needs of the state for leadership development. The program would parallel the campus program, meaning that the same set of courses would be delivered in the same sequence.

Named option types are described in the Policy Guidelines for Named Options within Academic Majors: 1. Area of curricular emphasis within the major for undergraduate programs; 2. Honors in the major for undergraduate programs; 3. Area of curricular emphasis within the major for graduate programs; 4. Non-pooled tuition revenue programs; 5. Distance/Online Programs; 6. Off-Campus Location for graduate, professional, or undergraduate programs

1.10. Date form completed: 2/14/2018

2. Approval Implementation and Expectations for Review
2.1. School/College Approval Date: 3/7/2018
2.2. GFEC Approval Date (graduate level named options only): Click here to enter a date.
2.3. UAPC Approval Date: Click here to enter a date.
2.4. Expected first term of student enrollment (typically the first fall after UAPC approval): Summer 2018, if possible. If not, Fall 2018.
2.5. Year of three year progress report to GFEC (3 years after first student enrollment; graduate level named options only): Academic Year 2022
2.6. Year of first program review (5 years after first student enrollment): Academic Year 2024
2.7. Are all academic programs in the home department up to date for program review? Yes

APIR will provide a list of programs and most recent review date if needed.

If no, program reviews need to be completed before a new proposal is advanced at campus level (GFEC and UAPC). Please provide and information related to plans for completion of program reviews:
Type an explanation here. (1000 word limit)

3. Background/Rationale
3.1. How does the named option relate to the major and to other named options in the major, if relevant?
Describe how the named option relates to the major and other named options in the major.
(1000 word limit)

This named option is a specialized program of study within our Master’s degree program. It provides all coursework necessary to meet the requirements of for licensure as a school principal in the state of Wisconsin (licensure also requires a Master’s degree). It replicates the campus program resulting in the same degree and eligibility for licensure. The UW-Whitewater Cooperative Program, an existing departmental named option, similarly provides training for school administrators. A second departmental named option resulting in a Master’s degree, the Global Higher Education Program, serves a different population of students who are training for work in post-secondary education.

3.2. What is the purpose of the named option? How does the named option contribute to the mission of the sponsoring unit?
Describe the purpose of the named option. (1000 word limit)

“The mission of the department [of Educational Leadership and Policy Anlaysis] is to create, evaluate, exchange, and apply knowledge about leadership, learning, and organizational performance to prepare scholars and scholar practitioners who cultivate equity and educational opportunity in a diverse and changing world.”
http://elpa.education.wisc.edu/

The purpose of the Wisconsin Idea Principal Preparation Program directly relates to this mission as the program is designed to train school leaders in a program with an explicit emphasis on equity and opportunity for all children in elementary and secondary schools. The purpose of this named option is to replicate our existing campus master’s program for principal preparation for a remote audience. We are creating the program in response to the needs of the field to train and license school leaders in elementary and secondary schools throughout Wisconsin. As described in section 1.9, this program was developed in collaboration with professional organizations and school leaders in the state. We recognize that we must obtain approval from the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) before we may deliver 50% or more of the program’s courses off-campus. Our current plan is to deliver 18 credits in a combination of on campus and online delivery (see section 4) and 12 credits off-campus. We will also apply to the HLC for approval to deliver 50% or more of the program in location other than campus.

3.3. What is the evidence that there is a student demand for the named option?
One of the Department’s professional partners, AWSA, approached faculty with the request to bring our program to other parts of the state. We are currently in conversations with them and some districts in the Green Bay and Fox Valley area to offer the first cohort there.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that nationally the need for employment of elementary, middle, and high school principals will grow 8 percent from 2016 to 2026 (https://www.bls.gov/ooh/management/elementary-middle-and-high-school-principals.htm#tab-6). Projections Central (a service linked by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) projects that Wisconsin will average annual openings for school principals of 220 positions per year during the same period. In 2015, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction reported a 17% attrition rate for school administrators

Named Option Proposal Form v 5-2-16
Recognizing the importance of and need for strong school leaders, the state legislature created as part of the state budget a new program to support school leader training. The School Leadership Loan Program (Wis. Stat. §39.397) provides $500,000 for forgivable loans for students nominated by a Wisconsin superintendent and enrolled in a UW System training program approved by the Higher Education Aids Board (HEAB). HEAB has approved ELPA’s program for this purpose. Currently, we are the only program approved for this purpose. This year, up to 40 students will be eligible for $12,500 of support, meaning a teacher could become certified to be a principal through UW-Madison’s program with only $7,761 in out-of-pocket costs for tuition and fees (given current tuition rates). The proposed 131 program is, in part, our department’s response to state needs, that would also capitalize on the availability of student support through the School Leadership Loan Program by making our program more accessible to other parts of the state. It is also important to note that the statutory provision is a recurring budget allocation, meaning the funds likewise be available in the next biennium.

4. Curriculum

4.1. Delivery modality:
Distance Courses will be delivered in a combination of face-to-face and online delivery as noted in response to 4.3. A total of 4 courses or 12 credits (ELPA 863, ELPA 845, ELPA 770, ELPA 840) will be delivered off-campus.

*Distance-delivered programs are those programs in which 50% or more of the required courses may be taken as distance-delivered courses. If the option is intended to provide a way to distinguish between students in a face-to-face or an online/distance delivered program, the provide information on how the distance program is developed and supported in 10.1.

4.2. Provide a complete list of named option requirements.
List named option requirements here.

Completion of required coursework as noted in 4.3. As part of the practicum course, students prepare a portfolio to document learning.

*Program requirements should provide content that leads to the completion of major learning goals. See section 5 Assessment.*

4.3. ☒ Attach a full curriculum including all required and elective courses.
All courses are required. There are no electives in the program.

1st Summer - 9 credits, 1 week-long face-to-face intensive (activities on UW-Madison campus with online work to follow)

**Critical Instructional Rounds**
ELPA 847 Instructional Leadership and Teacher Capacity

**Equity Analysis and Plan**
ELPA 735 Leadership for Equity and Diversity

**Finance/Resource Equity Audit and Plan**
ELPA 822 Resource Allocation for Equity and Social Justice

1st Fall Semester - 9 credits, Friday/Saturday - 5 weekends of face-to-face instruction with online activities between scheduled weekends.

**Inequality**
ELPA 863 Race, Class and Educational Inequality (delivered off-campus)
Understanding Practices to Improve Student Equity and Opportunity
ELPA 845 School-Level Leadership (delivered off-campus)

School Board Meetings, Principal Shadow, Staff Employment Equity Analysis
ELPA 700 Practicum

1st Spring - 9 credits, Friday/Saturday - 5 weekends of face-to-face instruction with online activities between scheduled weekends.

Engaging Parents and Community Plan
ELPA 770 School Community Engagement (delivered off-campus)

Examining the Legal Foundations for Equity and Justice
ELPA 840 Public School Law (delivered off-campus)

School Board Meetings, Principal Shadow, Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness Toward Equity
ELPA 700 Practicum

2nd Summer, 3 required credits, 1.5 week long intensive on UW-Madison campus with online work to follow

Student Work Correlations to Instruction
ELPA 703 Evaluating and Supporting Quality Classroom Teaching

4.4. ☐ For undergraduate named options, attach a four year roadmap. NA

Named options for undergraduate majors will have requirements totaling 120 credits and students should be able to complete the degree/major within four academic years.

4.5. ☒ For graduate named options, attach a chart outlining minimum degree requirements and elements for satisfactory progress.

Master’s level programs will include at least 30 credits of requirements. Doctoral level programs will include at least 51 credits of requirements.

Checklist for Verification of Curricular Policy Requirements *
You will have an opportunity to provide explanation and rationale for any Curricular Policy Requirements that have not been affirmed in the text box that follows the check list, below.

☒ Courses are offered on a regular basis.
☒ Courses have enrollment capacity for students in the named option.
☒ All courses required for the named option are fully approved.
☒ Units must maintain Named Option requirements so that they are up-to-date; all curriculum changes must be approved through the appropriate school/college academic planning council (APC) or curriculum committee. The school/college APC or curriculum committee will notify the Office of the Registrar and the Graduate School (graduate level named options only) about approved curricular changes to the named option. Typically, any changes in requirements will be effective no sooner than the fall semester after approval.

*Provide explanation and rationale for any Curricular Policy Requirements that have not been affirmed.

All Curricular Policy Requirements have been met.

5. Assessment

5.1. ☒ Attach a program assessment plan when submitting this proposal.
Assessment plans for a named option should be integrated with the assessment plan for the major. See the Basic Assessment Plan for instruction and accompanying template. The Basic Assessment Plan and Template are minimum expectations for this information. Programs that have developed plans that exceed what is specified in the basic plan may provide that information.

We will use the same assessment plan used for all departmental master’s degrees.

5.2. Provide a summary of the program assessment plan, including learning goals for the major and any additional learning goals that are specific for the named option, key methods and assessment approaches, and how assessment information will be reviewed and acted on. Type summary here. (1000 word limit)

The assessment summary should highlight how the named option is included in the overall assessment plan for the major. The named option must adhere to all learning goals for the major and may also have additional learning goals that are specific for the named option.

We will use the same assessment plan used for all departmental master’s degrees.

Student Learning Goals (What)

1. Students will articulate, critique, or elaborate the theories, research methods, and approaches to scholarly inquiry or practice in educational settings.
2. Students will identify sources and assemble evidence pertaining to questions or challenges in the field of study or field of practice.
3. Students will demonstrate understanding of the primary field of study or field of practice in a historical, social, or global context.
4. Students will demonstrate understanding of how to identify and address social inequalities in educational opportunities and outcomes through a field of study or field of practice.
5. Students will select and/or utilize the most appropriate methodologies and practices.
6. Students will evaluate or synthesize information pertaining to questions or challenges in the field of study or field of practice.
7. Students will communicate clearly in ways appropriate to the field of study or field of practice.

Plan for Assessing Each Student Learning Goal

For each of the degree major/program student learning goals, we indicate how the program plans to assess whether or not students are meeting the expectation, as well as when each learning goal will be assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Planning (How)</th>
<th>Learning Goal #1</th>
<th>Learning Goal #2</th>
<th>Learning Goal #3</th>
<th>Learning Goal #4</th>
<th>Learning Goal #5</th>
<th>Learning Goal #6</th>
<th>Learning Goal #7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method for assessing learning (at least one direct method required)</td>
<td>Capstone/portfolio rubric¹</td>
<td>Capstone/portfolio rubric¹</td>
<td>Capstone/portfolio rubric¹</td>
<td>Capstone/portfolio rubric¹</td>
<td>Capstone/portfolio rubric¹</td>
<td>Capstone/portfolio rubric¹</td>
<td>Capstone/portfolio rubric¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni survey²</td>
<td>Alumni survey²</td>
<td>Alumni survey²</td>
<td>Alumni survey²</td>
<td>Alumni survey²</td>
<td>Alumni survey²</td>
<td>Alumni survey²</td>
<td>Alumni survey²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Overlap and Related Programs**

6.1. Specify any other degree/majors, named options, or certificates that may not be earned in combination with this named option.

This is a stand-alone program, so students will not be enrolled in any other degree/majors, named options or certificates in combination with this program.

List overlapping programs here.

The proposed program creates an off-campus version of the on-campus MS Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis for students seeking a master’s degree with principal certification who find it more convenient to attend in Green Bay. Students may not enroll in both programs. ELPA also has a Wisconsin Idea Cohort PhD program. Entrance into the PhD program requires that applicants have already completed a master’s program and have achieved a principal license or comparable leadership experience in K-12 education. Students in the new named option will not be able to enroll in both programs simultaneously. However, after graduating, these students may provide an important pipeline to the PhD cohort program.

*Overlap restrictions must be managed at the program level as part of the advising process.*

When proposing a named option that has the same name as an existing degree/major certificate or doctoral minor at the same level, the program will be required to put in place processes to ensure that students do not enroll in both programs with the same name. If the program faculty choose to limit any other overlap with other degree/majors, named options, or certificates a list must be specified in the proposal and the program faculty/staff will be responsible for monitoring and enforcing overlap limits.

7. **Admissions & Enrollment**

7.1. For graduate programs proposing a named option with admissions requirements that are distinct from the major with no named option, explain the admissions criteria and process.

Explain the admissions criteria and process here. Undergraduate and unrestricted admissions to a named option, enter N/A. (1000 word limit)

We will use the same admissions requirements and processes as are used for admission to all departmental master’s programs.

7.2. What is the projected annual enrollment in the named option? 20-25 students

7.3. What is the maximum enrollment (using existing instructional and student resources)? 30 students

7.4. What are the contingency plans for supporting enrollments higher than the stated maximum enrollment?

The department will control enrollments through the admissions process. This control is necessary to have adequate staffing for the field experience portion of the program. If demand for the remote delivery of this program exceeds estimates here, it is possible that an additional cohort could be admitted, but only if revenues generated could support additional staffing.

*Checklist for Verification of Admission Policy Requirements for Undergraduate Named Options*

You will have an opportunity to provide explanation and rationale for any Admission Policy Requirements that have not been affirmed in the text box that follows the checklist.
Named option admission requirements are consistent with admission requirements for the major with no named option, if the major has any admission requirements beyond admission to the University. Admission limits should be related to interest or aptitude for the content and not based solely on a high GPA cutoff.

The named option will be declared and canceled using the e-Declaration process in the student information system.
Undergraduates will not be advised to declare or remain enrolled in a named option if it will extend their time to graduation. Undergraduate students are to be discouraged from earning more than one named option that represents an area of curricular emphasis within the major.

*Provide explanation and rationale for any Admission Policy Requirements that have not been affirmed in the above checklist.
All Admission Policy Requirements have been met.

8. Advising
8.1. List name(s) of major and named option advisor(s) with title and departmental affiliation(s).
List major and named option advisor(s) here.
Colleen Capper, Professor
Bruce King, Clinical Professor
Art Rainwater, Clinical Professor
Shari Smith, Student Services Coordinator

8.2. Describe how there will be sufficient advising and academic support for all students in the major (both the existing major’s students and the new students that will be served by the named option).
Describe advising and academic support here. (1000 word limit)
Since this program is prescribed and all students take the courses in the same sequence as a cohort, our experience with existing master’s students informs us that advising needs and requests will be minimal. Therefore, we are confident that the faculty and staff listed as advisors will be able to serve students in this named option well. We are also confident that department resources are sufficient to accommodate the needs of all existing and new students.
8.3. ☒ Confirm that major and named option advisor(s) have been consulted and reviewed this proposal.

9. Governance & Faculty
9.1. ☒ The named option must be governed by the same department or academic unit that oversees the major. Any sub-committee governing the named option must report to the faculty governance committee for the major.
9.1.1. If a sub-committee governs the named option, describe procedures including how faculty are identified and provisions for transitions in the committee.
Describe sub-committee procedures here. (1000 word limit) NA

9.2. List core faculty and staff with title and departmental affiliation(s).
List faculty and staff with title and departmental affiliation(s) here.
All faculty and staff are in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis.
Colleen Capper, Professor
Eric Camburn, Professor
John Diamond, Professor
Peter Goff, Assistant Professor
Richard Halverson, Professor
Bruce King, Clinical Professor
Julie Mead, Professor
Peter Miller, Professor
Art Rainwater, Clinical Professor
Shari Smith, Student Services Coordinator
Julie Underwood, Professor

10. Fiscal Structure and Ongoing Commitment
10.1. Provide an overview of plans for funding the named option including but not limited to program administration, instructional/curricular delivery, technology needs, and program assessment.

Overview of funding plans (1000 word limit)
Please see proposed budget (section 10.3). All program costs will be funded through student tuition (minus segregated fees).

10.2. How will the named option impact staffing needs beyond the immediate program? How are those needs being met?

In addition to utilizing department faculty to deliver some of the courses, our staffing plan is to utilize program alumni and school leaders from AWSA, WASDA, and our district partners to provide supplemental instructional support for the program. Each part-time temporary staff member would teach from a syllabus developed by the ELPA faculty member and would teach the course at the same time as the faculty member. To illustrate this approach, the table shows teaching assignments for the 3 required summer courses for summer 2018 and summer 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Program/Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Program/Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2018</td>
<td>K-12 Principal Campus (year 1)</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Summer 2019</td>
<td>K-12 Principal Remote (year 1)</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELPA 847 – Instructional Leadership &amp; Teacher Capacity</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELPA 847 – Instructional Leadership &amp; Teacher Capacity</td>
<td>Capper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELPA 735 – Leadership for Equity and Diversity</td>
<td>Goff</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELPA 735 – Leadership for Equity and Diversity</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELPA 832 – Resource Allocation for Equity and Social Justice</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELPA 8320 – Resource Allocation for Equity and Social Justice</td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delivering courses in this parallel manner provides several advantages: 1) consistency of program delivery between the two simultaneous cohorts; 2) a means to provide support for and develop a corps of part-time temporary instructional staff; 3) an opportunity to link the cohorts in some online discussion assignments to further broaden perspectives; and 4) controlling the faculty travel while still ensuring that the remote cohort has significant faculty contact. As this corps of part-time temporary instructional staff develops, the revenues received would allow us to add clinical faculty to the department to deliver remote courses. In particular, those revenues would eventually permit the hiring of a clinical faculty member to oversee field experiences (practica) and recruit new students to the program. We also plan to hire one of our full-time doctoral students, preferably one who holds a principal’s license, as a TA to assist the part-time temporary instructional staff with course delivery (e.g. maintenance of Canvas website).

*If there is no change in staffing, please describe how the duties of current employees will evolve to support this named option.*

10.3. For named options supported using non-pooled tuition, provide a fiscal annual summary including planned enrollment, estimated paid tuition, instructional costs, and estimated excess tuition available for reinvestment in keeping with the separate guidelines for non-pooled programs.
For graduate programs supported using pooled tuition, provide a plan for how new graduate students will be funded. NA

Required attachments
☑ Cover letter from the Dean of the school/college that will be the home of the named option
When a proposal for a new named option is forwarded for approval, it will have a cover letter to the provost from the supporting dean.
☑ Supporting letters/memos
Proposals must be accompanied by letters or memos submitted by the chair or director of other academic units that have overlapping interest. These notes may comment on shared resources, competition for students or other ways in which the programs will interact surrounding the named
Named options supported using non-pooled tuition must attach:
- Core Criteria Checklist
- Additional Requirements Checklist

See the current Non-pooled Program Requirements Process document posted at https://kb.wisc.edu/vesta/page.php?id=59300
**Required Attachments**

**Section 4.5 Chart Outlining Minimum Degree Requirements and Elements for Satisfactory Progress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisconsin Idea Principal Preparation Program</th>
<th>MINIMUM DEGREE REQUIREMENTS &amp; SATISFACTORY PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Schools/Colleges, Departments and Programs may set more rigorous expectations and requirements than the Graduate School</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If describing multiple degree plans at the same level (M.A. and M.S.) or multiple named options and tracks within a plan, indicate requirements for all plan variations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Please note that “Example” in the chart provides an example of policy – but is not necessarily reflective of Graduate School’s policy. For the actual Graduate School policies, you may consult the Graduate School Degree Requirements chart at <a href="http://grad.wisc.edu/catalog/degreq_criteria.htm">http://grad.wisc.edu/catalog/degreq_criteria.htm</a> to ensure program compliance with Graduate School degree requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If the program policy aligns with Graduate School degree requirements, please reiterate the policy in your program’s degree requirement chart – do not simply provide “Follow Graduate School Policy”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Programs are responsible for monitoring more restrictive requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Master’s Degrees:**

M.S., with available named options in Cooperative Program with UW–Whitewater, and Global Higher Education

This plan would add a 3rd option: Wisconsin Idea Principal Preparation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Graduate Degree Credit Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Graduate Residence Credit Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Graduate Coursework (50%) Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 credits out of 30 total credits must be completed in graduate-level coursework; courses with the Graduate Level Coursework attribute are identified and searchable in the university’s <a href="http://grad.wisc.edu/catalog/degreq_criteria.htm">Course Guide</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Coursework Requirements: Graduate Work from Other Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With program approval, students are allowed to count no more than 9 credits of graduate coursework in educational leadership from other institutions and 6 credits of graduate coursework in areas other than educational leadership from other institutions. Coursework earned five or more years prior to admission to the master’s degree is not allowed to satisfy requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Coursework Requirements: UW-Madison Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With program approval, 6 credits of coursework numbered 500 or above from a UW–Madison undergraduate degree are allowed to count toward the degree. Coursework earned five or more years prior to admission to a master’s degree is not allowed to satisfy requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Coursework Requirement: UW-Madison University Special</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With program approval, students are allowed to count no more than 9 credits of coursework numbered 300 or above taken as a UW–Madison Special student. Coursework earned five or more years prior to admission to a master's degree is not allowed to satisfy requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits per Term Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program-Specific Courses Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact the program for information on any additional required courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Graduate GPA Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00 GPA required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Grade Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Graduate School requires an average grade of B or better in all coursework (300 or above, not including research credits) taken as a graduate student unless conditions for probationary status require higher grades. Grades of Incomplete are considered to be unsatisfactory if they are not removed during the next enrolled semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probation Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Graduate School regularly reviews the record of any student who earned grades of BC, C, D, F, or Incomplete in a graduate course (300 or above), or grade of U in research credits. This review could result in academic probation with a hold on future enrollment or in being suspended from the Graduate School.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor / Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every graduate student is required to have an advisor. To ensure that students are making satisfactory progress toward a degree, the Graduate School expects them to meet with their advisor on a regular basis. An advisor generally serves as the thesis advisor. In many cases, an advisor is assigned to incoming students. Students can be suspended from the Graduate School if they do not have an advisor. An advisor is a faculty member in the department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments and Examinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No formal examination required. Students are required to submit a portfolio of work products and reflections that are then assessed via an established rubric. Students whose work does not meet the standards set are provided feedback and support to bring the work up to standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree students who have been absent for five or more consecutive years lose all credits that they have earned before their absence. Individual programs may count the coursework students completed prior to their absence for meeting program requirements; that coursework may not count toward Graduate School credit requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No language requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5.1 Program Assessment Plan

Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis Assessment Plan, M.S

Identifying Information
School/College: School of Education
Graduate Degree/Major Program Name: Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
Graduate Degree Level (M.S., M.A., Ph.D., DMA, etc.): M.S.
Faculty Director Contact/Title: Eric Camburn, Department Chair
Primary Contact Information: camburn@wisc.edu

Student Learning Goals (What)
1. Students will articulate, critique, or elaborate the theories, research methods, and approaches to scholarly inquiry or practice in educational settings.
2. Students will identify sources and assemble evidence pertaining to questions or challenges in the field of study or field of practice.
3. Students will demonstrate understanding of the primary field of study or field of practice in a historical, social, or global context.
4. Students will demonstrate understanding of how to identify and address social inequalities in educational opportunities and outcomes through a field of study or field of practice.
5. Students will select and/or utilize the most appropriate methodologies and practices.
6. Students will evaluate or synthesize information pertaining to questions or challenges in the field of study or field of practice.
7. Students will communicate clearly in ways appropriate to the field of study or filed of practice.

Plan for Assessing Each Student Learning Goal
For each of the degree major/program student learning goals, we indicate how the program plans to assess whether or not students are meeting the expectation, as well as when each learning goal will be assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Planning (How)</th>
<th>Learning Goal #1</th>
<th>Learning Goal #2</th>
<th>Learning Goal #3</th>
<th>Learning Goal #4</th>
<th>Learning Goal #5</th>
<th>Learning Goal #6</th>
<th>Learning Goal #7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method for assessing learning (at least one direct method required)</td>
<td>Capstone/portfolio rubric</td>
<td>Capstone/portfolio rubric</td>
<td>Capstone/portfolio rubric</td>
<td>Capstone/portfolio rubric</td>
<td>Capstone/portfolio rubric</td>
<td>Capstone/portfolio rubric</td>
<td>Capstone/portfolio rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Capstone/portfolio rubric: Master’s students’ capstone paper, course performance, and/or culminating portfolios will be assessed using a rubric. This is a direct measure of assessment.

2. Alumni survey: Every three years, ELPA will conduct a short online survey examining alumni’s perceptions of the extent to which their ELPA M.S. experience contributes to each of the intended learning goals since their graduation. This is an indirect measure of assessment.

**Who is responsible for assessment?** The ELPA assessment coordinating committee will consist of the department chair (currently Eric Camburn), program committee chair (currently Pete Miller), and Professor Xueli Wang who has professional expertise in conducting and teaching assessment in higher education. The committee will coordinate assessment efforts and provide updates to all ELPA faculty and staff members teaching and advising students. The committee will be assisted by the senior student services coordinator (Shari Smith) who will help compile student learning data.

**What is the plan for review of the assessment information?** Data from the capstone/portfolio evaluation forms will be tallied on a yearly basis. Initial reviews of capstone/portfolio rubric data will be performed by the assessment coordinating committee. Analysis of alumni survey data will likely be performed by a graduate research assistant under the supervision of a member of the assessment coordinating committee. Preliminary interpretation of alumni survey data will be performed by members of the assessment coordinating committee or other ELPA faculty with relevant expertise.

**What is the plan for production of an annual summary report?** The assessment coordinating committee will produce a preliminary summary report of assessment activities that will be provided to faculty members at a regular faculty meeting. In addition to reporting the findings of assessment activities, members of the assessment coordinating committee will also prepare guiding questions to facilitate faculty discussion. At the faculty meeting, it may be helpful for the ELPA faculty to also review enrollment information, course progression, degree completion, and other structural features of the student experience in addition to the evidence about student learning. After the faculty meeting, members of the assessment coordination committee will draft a preliminary annual assessment summary report which will include faculty feedback from the meeting. The report may also include recommended changes in the curriculum and student assessment. The annual summary report will include the materials that form the basis of discussion at the faculty meeting, and recommendations emerging during the faculty meeting. Based on feedback and comments from this meeting a final version of the assessment annual report will be produced.

**How will recommendations be implemented?** Based on the recommendations included in the annual assessment summary report, the department chair and program committee will facilitate faculty members’ implementation of report recommendations. The ELPA department chair and the program committee chair will also informally monitor implementation of report recommendations through conversations with faculty members. The student assessment activities described in this document will be part of an ongoing, recursive review cycle in which we collect data on how students are meeting learning goals, we collectively review the data and develop needed changes, we implement the changes, and the cycle begins again with another round of data collection.

**Graduate Degree Program Curriculum Mapping Worksheet (Where)**

**Curriculum Map.** Our Masters curriculum is organized around six categories. The table below shows how each course category and field/culminating experiences contribute to each of the Department’s seven learning goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program Required Course Category</th>
<th>Learning Goal #1</th>
<th>Learning Goal #2</th>
<th>Learning Goal #3</th>
<th>Learning Goal #4</th>
<th>Learning Goal #5</th>
<th>Learning Goal #6</th>
<th>Learning Goal #7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses with a primary focus on practice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses with a primary focus on principles, theory, context or history</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research methods &amp; design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical &amp; culminating experience (field experience/capstone)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To Whom it May Concern,

The Association of Wisconsin School Administrators (AWSA) is pleased to support the development of the Wisconsin Idea Principal Preparation Program by the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. AWSA and the Wisconsin Association of School District Administrators partnered with the Department to develop this innovative program. We met with departmental faculty members to co-construct an accelerated preparation program explicitly designed to teach school leaders to focus on equitable practices and eliminate inequities to ensure that each child receives an equal opportunity for a high quality education. We have continued to work with the Department as faculty welcomed the first cohort to campus and have been pleased to engage with them in evaluating the program. We are proud of the program we developed together and are pleased to partner with the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis.

We are also pleased that the Department was willing to replicate the campus program and deliver the program in the Green Bay area. The preparation of school leaders, particularly school principals, is important for schools and school districts throughout Wisconsin. By delivering the Wisconsin Idea Principal Preparation Program in Green Bay, more students will have access to this quality program.

In summary, we emphatically endorse the development of the Wisconsin Idea Principal Preparation Program by the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Sincerely,

Jim Lynch
Executive Director
March 26, 2018

To Whom It May Concern,

The Green Bay Area Public School District is pleased to support the development of the Wisconsin Idea Principal Preparation Program by the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. We believe this program has the potential to help our district and our region to train the next generation of school leaders. The Green Bay Area Public School District serves more than 21,000 students in grades 4K through 12th grade. As the fourth largest school district in Wisconsin, we need strong, committed school leaders to ensure that we fulfill our mission “to educate all students to be college, career and community ready in order to succeed in our diverse world.”

We are pleased to work with the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis to deliver the program in the Green Bay area. To that end, we have committed to providing classroom space in our facilities when courses are offered here. We also look forward to nominating our teachers for admission to the program.

In closing, the Wisconsin Idea Principal Preparation is worthy of your full consideration.

Sincerely,

Michelle S. Langenfeld, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools and Learning
APPENDIX A. CORE CRITERIA CHECKLIST
FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS WITH NON-POOLED TUITION

1. New and Additional Student Enrollments to Support Program Costs

The program must bring in NEW and ADDITIONAL students. Overall enrollment in all other school/college programs must not be eroded. The program cannot compete with or draw students away from existing programs that support the central tuition pool. As this program will be delivered off-campus in parts of the state not currently served, this program will attract students not currently served by the campus program due to distance and travel times. Accordingly, the program will run parallel to, but not in competition with the current campus program.

Faculty/staff must plan for sufficient enrollments to have enough tuition to cover instructional, direct student support costs, and any other fixed or required costs. Experience shows that enrollments of at least 30 students are necessary to have enough tuition to meet direct program costs. The budget modeling (included in response to 10.3) demonstrates that an enrollment of 20 students will be sufficient to cover program costs and produce revenue that can be used to support departmental needs. Courses will be delivered with a combination of faculty and part-time temporary instructional staff. Program alumni currently working in leadership positions throughout the state will serve as the part-time instructional corps for courses.

School/college Budget Officers must be involved in planning and must approve plans and budgets for these programs before the program is submitted to the school/college APC for academic approval. Assistant Dean Melissa Amos-Landgraf has reviewed and approved the projected program budget.

2. Designed for Non-Traditional Students

Has an applied, practice-oriented curriculum, or integrates practice with theory

The program prepares school leaders through a program devised with professional partners, the Association for Wisconsin School Administrators (AWSA) and the Wisconsin Association of School District Administrators (WASDA). In addition to the Master’s degree, course content satisfies all Wisconsin Department of Instruction requirements for licensure as a school principal. Key to the program are a series of embedded assignments where students complete projects for courses that examine local school district data and issues. Students also complete field experiences each semester, thus integrating theory and practice.

Is offered in a modality that allows non-traditional audiences to attend (evening, weekend, online, intensive, or some combination)

All courses in the program are delivered in a blended online and face-to-face format. Summer courses in the first summer will be delivered through an intensive week-long session, followed by online activities to spread throughout the summer. Academic year courses are delivered in a Friday/Saturday weekend format. Students will meet for 5 weekends each semester.
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Has demonstrated a workforce demand for the program graduates
One of the Department’s professional partners, AWSA, approached faculty with the request to bring our program to other parts of the state. We are currently in conversations with them and some districts in the Green Bay and Fox Valley area to offer the first cohort there.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that nationally the need for employment of elementary, middle, and high school principals will grow 8 percent from 2016 to 2026 (https://www.bls.gov/ooh/management/elementary-middle-and-high-school-principals.htm#tab-6). Projections Central (a service linked by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) projects that Wisconsin will average annual openings for school principals of 220 positions per year during the same period. In 2015, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction reported a 17% attrition rate for school administrators (https://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/tepdl/pdf/2015-16%20Administrator%20Turnover%20%26%20Attrition%20Brief.pdf).

Recognizing the importance of and need for strong school leaders, the state legislature created as part of the state budget a new program to support school leader training. The School Leadership Loan Program (Wis. Stat. §39.397) provides $500,000 for forgivable loans for students nominated by a Wisconsin superintendent and enrolled in a UW System training program approved by the Higher Education Aids Board (HEAB). HEAB has approved ELPA’s program for this purpose. Currently, we are the only program approved for this purpose. This year, up to 40 students will be eligible for $12,500 of support, meaning a teacher could become certified to be a principal through UW-Madison’s program with only $7,761 in out-of-pocket costs for tuition and fees (given current tuition rates). The proposed 131 program is, in part, our department’s response to state needs, that would also capitalize on the availability of student support through the School Leadership Loan Program by making our program more accessible to other parts of the state. It is also important to note that the statutory provision is a recurring budget allocation, meaning the funds likewise be available in the next biennium.

Has defined learning goals that are oriented to market considerations
The program’s learning goals are directly and explicitly designed to prepare individuals for positions as principals and is an approved licensure program with the Department of Public Instruction.

Has a clearly defined curriculum that is “self-contained”, meaning that program students are confined only to courses from the approved, prescribed curriculum
Program content is prescribed and tightly coupled to initial administrative licensure requirements. Students would be admitted as a cohort and take the prescribed course of study as a closed cohort.

Has a clearly defined (often lockstep) curriculum with few options or electives that follows a predictable timeline for offerings and completion
The program curriculum is clearly defined and includes no electives. Students engage in a rigorous set of courses delivered over 15 months with a prescribed timeline for completion.
3. Distinctly Identifiable Program (Code) With Governance Approval

The program must be distinctly identifiable in the student record system, either as a degree/major or as an option of a degree/major, or as a Capstone certificate. 
We are applying for approval as a named option program.

The program must develop a proposal for the academic approval process, during which it must demonstrate that the school/college Dean and Budget Officer are aware and supportive of the program being run on a non-pooled tuition model. 
The Department approved the plan the faculty meeting held on January 22, 2018. We have scheduled the materials for discussion and approval by the School of Education’s Programs Committee and subsequently by the Academic Planning Council before submission to the UAPC. Dean Hess is supportive of this proposal and Associate Dean for Business, Melissa Amos-Landgraf has approved the financial projections for the program.
APPENDIX B. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST
FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS WITH NON-POOLED TUITION

Use this checklist in conjunction with the Core Criteria Checklist

If core criteria are met, the program must adhere to the additional requirements below.
Note: Not all new programs are suited for the non-pooled program requirements. New programs that seek to take advantage of a wide range of course and curricular/program offerings on campus and are not market-oriented should be developed under traditional (101) pooled tuition funding models.

1. Fiscal Requirements:
   School/college budget officer has approved the budget and fiscal plan. **YES**
   School/college dean and budget officer are committed to assuming fiscal responsibility for costs not covered by non-pooled tuition to the program. The school/college will back up the budget with a commitment to cover any costs not met from tuition from other sources. **YES**
   The program structure fits within standard academic administrative structures and allocates expenses of the program so that the program does not create additional burdens on traditional/101 program resources or student services such as advising, ESL, Registrar’s Office, Bursar’s Office, Graduate School and other support services. **YES**
   Programs have two options for tuition. One option is to charge standard graduate tuition according to the UW-Madison tuition schedule. This includes standard rates for WI resident, MN, and non-resident students and any compulsory fees that apply. Or, for fully online programs, they have the option of charging all students one of tuition tiers (Appendix D). Although not currently allowed, it is potentially possible in the future the tiered tuition may be available to face-to-face programs. **YES. The program will charge standard graduate tuition according to the UW-Madison tuition schedule.**
   Because students who have graduate assistantships receive tuition waivers, some non-pooled tuition graduate degree programs choose to prohibit students from accepting a graduate assistantship (RA/TA/PA). If a program allows their students to take graduate assistantships they it must forgo the tuition revenue. To ensure full receipt of non-pooled tuition and to counter challenges from students, the program must adhere to the following:
   The program faculty/staff must disclose this program policy to students in the recommendation of admission letter, program website, program handbook, and program orientation. **YES.**
   Please see Appendix E for links and Appendix F for a sample of a specific non-pooled program template for a recommendation of admission letter and a general template for a program handbook. The program faculty/staff must provide details on this and any other program policies the program handbook in at least the following areas: satisfactory progress (good standing) requirements, any ways to return to good standing, and a program grievance process if done does not already exist. **YES.**
2. Requirements for International Students: NA

Programs may not admit students who need ESL services without building sufficient ESL support into their fiscal model, and having an explicit MOU with the ESL provider about funding to support the ESL services.

Graduate degree/major programs must use Graduate School standards for English Proficiency. Capstone certificates should be designed so that admission requirements ensure that ESL support is not needed.

If the program is NOT completely online and admits international students, the program is responsible for honoring federal visa regulations related but not limited to: length of stay requirements for visa requests, online course restrictions for visa holders, and waiting for federal program approval (up to a year) if the program represents a new degree type or capstone certificate previously not offered at UW-Madison.

3. Requirements for Program/Course Enrollment:

Non-pooled tuition program students can only be enrolled in one program at a time; enrollment in a second major, named option, certificate program, or courses beyond the prescribed program curriculum is not permitted. Non-compliance with this requirement will jeopardize the receipt of tuition for a non-pooled program. Regular audits will be conducted to ensure these requirements are met. Yes, students in this program may only be enrolled in this program.

To ensure full receipt of non-pooled program tuition and to counter challenges from students who want to be dually enrolled, the program must adhere to the following:

The program must provide information to students about prohibitions on concurrent program enrollment and out-of-program course enrollment. Programs must note this in recruiting materials, in recommendations of admission, on the program website, program handbook, and program orientation.

Please see Appendix E for links and Appendix F for language for a specific non-pooled program template for a recommendation of admission letter and a general template for a program handbook. The program faculty/staff must provide details on this and any other program policies in the program handbook in at least following areas: satisfactory progress (good standing) requirements, ways to return to good standing, and a program grievance process if one does not already exist.

The program communicates to students each semester prior to course enrollment the expectation that students can enroll only in program courses and not in courses outside the approved, prescribed curriculum.

For students who enroll in the non-pooled program and then decide they want to pursue traditional/101 programs that allow dual enrollment, the program must help the student transfer to a different program(s) that allow such activity. We will adhere to each of these requirements.
14 December 2017

William Tracy, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Department of Agronomy
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Sent Electronically

Dear Professor Tracy,

An important part of the University’s continuing commitment to academic excellence is the evaluation of graduate programs by the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) during Program Review. When the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences assembled a review committee to conduct a decadal assessment of the Agronomy M.S./Ph.D. and Doctoral Minor, Professor Nicole Perna was asked to serve as the GFEC representative. Professor Perna led a discussion of the review at the GFEC meeting on December 1, 2017. In this letter, I summarize the committee’s discussion.

The GFEC learned of the many strengths of the program, which include high research productivity among faculty, excellent career outcomes for students and generally satisfied students that lead to a strong alumni network. The GFEC also noted that the program’s handbook was recently updated and thanks the program for providing students with this required information.

In addition, the GFEC had a substantive discussion on the program’s challenges:

- The GFEC noted that the program receives very few applications and currently has low graduate student enrollment. This has led to little sense of program-specific community for current students, which can have an impact on retention, student satisfaction and professional development. At a minimum, a weekly seminar, along with inclusion of graduate students in department meetings, could help increase program cohesion for the small number of students in the program.

- Graduate students report a decreasing number of graduate course offerings in Agronomy, and, as a result, most students take the majority of their courses outside of the program. The department also appears to have few faculty available for instruction in needed disciplines. The program should work with the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences (CALS) to consider how it can enrich these intellectual opportunities and increase its instructional capacity to a point where a graduate program can be sustained.
GFEC recommends the department explore if alternative paths for training students in agronomy, such as a doctoral minor, a merger with other departments, or a named option within another major, would serve students equally well given the faculty constraints.

The GFEC recommends the department engage in efforts to address these recommendations and those of the review committee and requests the program provide an update on its current strategy for sustainability by March 31, 2018. Thank you for your commitment to graduate education.

Sincerely,

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

Cc: Kathryn VandenBosch, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences
    Richard Straub, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences
    Sarah Pfatteicher, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences
    Nikki Bollig, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences
    Kenneth Albrecht, Department of Agronomy
    Joanna Schuth, Department of Agronomy
    Jocelyn Milner, Office of the Provost
    Sarah Kuba, Office of the Provost
    Parmesh Ramanathan, Graduate School
    Marty Gustafson, Graduate School
    Emily Reynolds, Graduate School
17 March 2018

Dean Karpus
Dean of the Graduate School
Bascom Hall

Dear Dean Karpus,

This letter is in response to your 14 December 2017 letter summarizing GFEC discussion of the Department of Agronomy graduate program. We appreciate and agree with your conclusion that faculty members and graduate students within the program have high research productivity, addressing emerging issues in crop production related to economy and environment. We also agree that students are generally satisfied with their training and that they have excellent prospects for jobs upon completing PhD or MS degrees in Agronomy. Over the past 20 years the demand for our students has been greater than our supply and this is incentive to explore opportunities to increase student numbers.

We currently have 21 faculty members, three of whom will be retiring within 2 years and three who are USDA employees. These six faculty members are not currently training graduate students. Faculty members in the Department of Agronomy train graduate students in six programs that offer graduate degrees. At any given time, Agronomy faculty have 40 to 50 students with about a third in Plant Breeding and Plant Genetics and the remainder divided mostly among Agronomy, Agroecology, and Environment & Resources programs. Most of these students are housed in Moore Hall and, together with graduate students in the Department of Horticulture, participate in the Plant Sciences Graduate Student Council (PSGC). The PSGC organizes professional and social experiences for the students within the applied plant sciences disciplines. Student numbers within the Agronomy program have ranged from 8 to 15 over the past 10 years, and these students share offices and interact with a much larger group of students conducting research on agronomic crops. Often an Agronomy faculty member will be advising students in two or more of the graduate programs mentioned above at the same time. Although the Agronomy graduate program may be rather
small, these students are not isolated and have continuous interaction with graduate students in related disciplines.

To address your specific bullet points:

- We currently have an Agronomy graduate student seminar that is conducted jointly with Horticulture. Master of Science students are required to take one semester and PhD students two semesters of seminar. Typically, only students registered for credit attend the seminar. There is opportunity to improve interaction by requiring all graduate students attend seminar, even if not registered for credit. Beginning 2018-19 seminar attendance (but not registration for credit) will be mandatory for all Agronomy graduate students. We have an Agronomy Colloquium with invited distinguished speakers from campus and from around the world that is usually well attended by graduate students from all of the Plant Sciences, but it will be useful for advisors to stress the importance of attending these lectures.

- We are investigating initiatives to improve the sense of community among Agronomy graduate students and to expose them to the diversity of contemporary agricultural, ecological, and life science enterprises and issues. Programs such as the Nelson Institute and Agroecology have efforts like this and it is possible we could partner with and build on those efforts.

- The number of graduate level courses in Agronomy has changed little over the past 30 years. We have lost a graduate level course: "Physiology of Dry Matter Accumulation" but have added two courses: "Environmental Biophysics" and "Agroecosystems and Global Change". We have also lost two 300 level courses, but we have added new 300 level courses.

- Our students select courses from basic science departments such as Botany, Biochemistry, and Genetics, as well as appropriate courses in other CALS departments to match interests and expose them to theory and tools necessary to complete their research. This model is not unusual for agronomy departments around the country, where basic biology, physics, mathematics and chemistry knowledge is applied to solve problems in crop production. We have discussed the need for a whole plant physiologist as a key future hire to support the Agronomy as well as other plant science graduate programs (Plant Breeding and Plant Genetics, Horticulture, Plant Pathology) within CALS. A contemporary course on physiology of crop production would be an important addition to the CALS offering to plant sciences graduate programs.
• CALS is undergoing major redesign and the Department of Agronomy faculty are active participants in this effort. The end result is unknown but will likely include combining graduate and undergraduate programs across similar disciplines. An example could be a graduate program that includes students with production agriculture focus from Agronomy, Soil Science, Horticulture, and Plant Pathology.

We appreciate the thoughts and recommendations of the GFEC and take them very seriously. We will strive to increase our numbers and the graduate student experience for all our agronomy graduate students regardless of the specific program.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William F. Tracy
Professor and Chair
Clif Bar and Organic Valley Chair
in Plant Breeding for Organic Agriculture
wftracy@wisc.edu

c: Kathryn VandenBosch, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences
Richard Straub, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences
Sarah Pfatteicher, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences
Nikki Bollig, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences
Kenneth Albrecht, Department of Agronomy
Joanna Schuth, Department of Agronomy
Jocelyn Milner,
Office of the Provost Sarah Kuba,
Office of the Provost Parmesh Ramanathan,
Graduate School Marty Gustafson,
Graduate School Emily Reynolds, Graduate School
6 February 2017

TO: Mary Trotter, Professor and Director, Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies Program

FROM: John Karl Scholz, Dean

RE: Completion of L&S Portion of Review of Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies programs, including:

- Master of Arts – Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies
- Doctor of Philosophy – Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies

CC: Russ Castronovo, Professor and Chair, English
Marty Gustafson, Assistant Dean, Graduate School
Elaine M. Klein, Associate Dean for Academic Planning, L&S
Sarah Kuba, Academic Planner, APIR
Jocelyn Milner, Associate Provost and Director, APIR
Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean for the Arts and Humanities, L&S

On December 20, 2016, the L&S Academic Planning Council considered the materials submitted concerning the mandated academic program review of the graduate programs in Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies (previously known as the MA and PhD in Theatre and Drama). Associate Dean Susan Zaeske led discussion of the self-study, the review committee report, and the errata document. Council members were impressed by this two-year review, finding many things to praise about the program, and most importantly, noted the hard work of managing a program through a challenging transition, especially one that involves faculty from across multiple departments and schools/colleges. The review committee report offered a remarkable amount of detailed advice, which I’m sure you and your colleagues will consider as you face the future; we highlight below a few matters in particular.

A key issue identified in the external review committee report is the need to cultivate leadership for the program in the future, both in terms of the steering committee and the director. At present there are five core faculty members in the program, with at least one retirement to occur in the next three years and one member unable to participate in program governance due to serving as chair of a department. The external review committee recommends increasing the size of the steering committee to cultivate more faculty participation beyond core members. At the same
time, it suggests clarifying or perhaps dropping the distinction between core and affiliate ITS program members. Cultivating involvement by more faculty members is important for developing a succession plan for the directorship of the program as the same individual cannot be expected to serve in that capacity term after term.

The report praised current efforts to build community, identity, and a sense of belonging for this long-existing program that has a new administrative structure. It also suggested a number of steps that might be taken to clarify the new structure to external and internal audiences. For example, the review committee suggested attending to the ITS program’s online presence on the University Webpage as well as the ability to find its courses online, some issues that may be resolved somewhat in the new digital environment. The review committee also suggested that it would be helpful for graduate students to have a space of their own, which would create a sense of community and facilitate the exchange of ideas among students, faculty, and staff. The report provides a number of additional ideas about improving communication and a sense of identity among graduate students.

Yet another suggestion of the review committee was that the ITS Program develop a Ph.D. minor and also an undergraduate certificate. The L&S APC discussed these suggestions and agreed that there is wisdom in developing programs that attract enrollments, but before doing so there must be sufficient resources available to do so. These resources include the time of faculty and staff to carefully develop the program proposals, the ability to regularly provide the courses in the curriculum, appropriate advising, and so forth.

Learning goals for the master’s and doctoral programs have been articulated, curriculum maps and assessment strategies are on file in the Inside Assessment site, and we anticipate that the program will comply with the required submission of a report reflecting implementation of those plans by November 1, 2017. Planned assessment strategies – e.g., faculty evaluation of theses and proposals, using a standard rubric reflecting the articulated learning outcomes – seem appropriate for graduate-level program evaluation, and aggregating outcomes from individual students should offer some insight into the effectiveness of requirements, advising and mentoring, and other aspects of the program that affect student learning. These plans are, however, still in early stages: by the time the next review is conducted, the council hopes to see that assessment activities are regularly conducted, the findings considered by the faculty, and action is taken to foster improvement.

The L&S Academic Planning Council readily approved a motion to accept this report as complete; however, members also recognized that ITS is still in a period of necessary and important rebuilding work. They therefore asked that the College and council conduct the next review in five years, by which time members hope see a stronger community, continued strengthening of faculty affiliate relationships, and increased quality of students and placements.

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.
November 28, 2016

To:
John Karl Scholz, Dean, College of Letters & Science

From:
Monika Chavez, German, Nordic, and Slavic (committee chair)
Jeff Smith, Communication Arts
Patricia Rosenmeyer, Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies (GFEC Representative)

CC:
Russ Castronovo, Chair, Department of English
Mary Gustafson, Assistant Dean, Graduate School
Elaine M. Klein, Associate Dean of Academic Planning, College of Letters and Science
Sarah Kuba, Academic Planner, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Jocelyn Milner, Associate Provost and Director, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Mary Trotter, Director, Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies
Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean for Advancement, Arts & Humanities, College of Letters and Science

This review was implemented to (a) satisfy the requirement for programs to be reviewed at 10-year intervals (in this case, the former doctoral program in Theatre & Drama); and (b) to assess the Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies program (ITS) in its second year after its separation (completed by Fall 2015) from the former (incarnation of the) Department of Theatre & Drama and its reconstitution as a 'program by committee' that is housed in the Department of English. The review was conducted by a committee that consisted of Professor Patricia Rosenmeyer (Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies), who also served as the GFEC representative on the committee; Professor Jeff Smith (Communication Arts); and Professor Monika Chavez (committee chair; German, Nordic, and Slavic; Second Language Acquisition). The committee received a charge from Dean John Karl Scholz on July 21, 2016 and on August 31, 2016 met with Associate Deans Elaine M. Klein and Susan Zaeske to discuss the task ahead.

The program

So as to better understand the procedures that were selected for the review process, it may be useful to first introduce the current structure of Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies (ITS), a 'program by committee.’ The program, fundamentally, is a reconstitution of the former doctoral program in Theatre & Drama (informally also referred to as 'Theatre Research’), which used to be part of the Department of Theatre & Drama. The doctoral program in Theatre & Drama (now, ITS) in the last 10 years has lost two faculty members (Barbara
Clayton; Robert Skloot) and one academic staff member (Kristin Hunt) and now is constituted of five ‘core’ faculty members (a term that will be explained below). The (now separated) Department of Theatre & Drama has moved to the School of Education while ITS has remained in the College of Letters and Science and has been housed administratively in the Department of English. The program offers both MA and PhD degrees. The program’s faculty, in its current terminology, is divided into five ‘core’ and between 15-20 (depending on faculty’s recent, pending, and anticipated relationships to the university and the program) ‘affiliate’ members. The program is supported by a .50 FTE, Brenda Weiss, who used to be the graduate program administrator for the former Department of Theatre & Drama. Brenda Weiss’s total appointment is 1.0 FTE as she is also tasked with timetabling for the Department of English.

The ‘core’ faculty include Professor Aparna Dharwadker, Associate Professor Michael Peterson, Professor Mike Vanden Heuvel, Professor Manon van de Water, and Associate Professor Mary Trotter, who directs the program. Of the five ‘core’ faculty members, (only) two (Professors Dharwadker and Trotter) hold appointments in the housing department, English, which is also their tenure home at 100% even as 50% of their teaching effort has been dedicated to ITS. Similarly, the three other ITS ‘core’ faculty members also have 50% of their teaching effort dedicated to ITS even as they hold their full-time appointments in other departments, i.e., Associate Professor Michael Peterson in the (new) Department of Theatre & Drama; Professor Mike Vanden Heuvel in the Department of Classics and Near Eastern Studies; and Professor Manon van de Water in the Department of German, Nordic, and Slavic. Since ITS is an academic program rather than an academic department none of the ITS faculty hold a percentage appointment in ITS. Members of the ‘core’ (and also of the ‘affiliate’) faculty are dispersed physically as well as in terms of tenure homes. ‘Core’ faculty members regularly teach theatre-themed courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels, none of which have an ITS-specific subject listing and some of which are offered with an English and/or Theatre & Drama (TD) and/or other subject listing, such as ‘Slavic.’ For example, an undergraduate course that is regularly taught by ITS ‘core’ faculty and that most frequently offers graduate students in ITS the opportunity to serve as teaching assistants (TAs), is English/TD 120, Introduction to Theatre & Dramatic Literature. Similarly, another course that is taught by an ITS ‘core’ faculty member (Manon van de Water) and provides TA positions for graduate students in ITS is TD/Slavic/C&I 360.

‘Affiliate’ members include faculty members from diverse departments, including (the current) Theatre & Drama, Art, Art History, Music, Dance, Gender and Women's Studies, English, and the foreign (including classical) languages.

According to the self-study that was submitted on January 1, 2016, one semester into the implementation of the new program (p.3), ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty differ in the regularity with which they offer ITS-relevant courses; their ability to advise dissertations and theses; and their service on the program’s Executive Committee. The same self-study also described the program’s governance structure and the Executive Committee’s responsibilities as follows ‘[...] governed by a faculty-elected Program Chair and an executive committee. The executive committee is currently made up of members of the core faculty. The executive committee’s responsibilities include new student recruitment, course scheduling, budgetary
decisions and contributing to assessments of student progress.’ However, the current practice is for a Steering Committee to govern the program and for that Steering Committee to be composed of two ‘core’ faculty members (the program’s Director, Professor Trotter, and Associate Professor Michael Peterson) and two ‘affiliate’ faculty members (Associate Professor Paola Hernandez, Spanish and Portuguese and Professor Christine Garlough, Gender and Women’s Studies).

As of 2015, the program had 25 graduate students, most of whom were PhD-bound. According to a self-study report submitted to the College of Letters and Science on January 1, 2016, between May 2005 and May 2015 (the program’s last academic semester as the doctoral program in Theatre & Drama), the program – specifically its current five ‘core’ faculty members – guided 40 students to the PhD degree and had another 11 students working toward degree completion, many of whom have since finished. In other words, on average, each ITS faculty member has guided or is guiding one doctoral student to graduation each year. Of these graduates, at least 23 have been placed into tenure-track positions; at least 5 occupy academic staff or adjunct positions; and two are in leadership positions in higher education. Evidently, ITS and its predecessor, the doctoral program in Theatre & Drama, have historically been highly productive and well respected members of the academic community in theatre studies. According to the self-study document, the National Research Council Ranking of 2010, placed ITS (then, the doctoral program in Theatre & Drama) at rank 4 among the top eight programs in the nation.

In summary, ITS is a graduate program that has been structurally reconstituted but has been built on traditions of academic excellence and on a strong national reputation. With the goodwill and tangible commitment (especially in copious amounts of time) of its ‘core’ faculty (particularly its Program Director, Mary Trotter) as well as its ‘affiliate’ faculty (especially the two colleagues - Paola Hernandez and Christine Garlough - who serve on the program’s Steering Committee); the program administrator, Brenda Weiss; the graduate students who, we learned, are enthusiastically committed to the success of the program; the housing Department of English; relatively recent UW-Madison hires, such as Senior Lecturer Jen Plants (English); and administrators in the College of Letters and Science, ITS has been able to create the fundamental structures of a program that can succeed into the future, that is, continue in – and, possibly, improve on - its hard-earned reputation as major contributor in its field as well as on campus. Moreover, Assistant Professor David Ronis, the new Director of the University Opera, also has indicated his support for ITS (currently and practically, by hiring an ITS student as a dramaturg in a production), with the intent to expand and strengthen relations between ITS and the University Opera.

However, despite the fundamentally sound (and potentially stellar) outlook for ITS as a program, there is no denying that it faces serious challenges, particularly those that relate to its intellectual, fiscal, and physical dispersal; the loss of resources (for example, as they concern access to endowment funds and some of the

---

1 According to a response to an inquiry by the committee from ITS Program Director Mary Trotter, 38 students have completed their degrees over the last ten years; however, since the self-study document listed dissertation titles, dissertators, and advisors, the discrepancy of two students is likely to be attributed to the cut-off day (i.e., whether to include graduates from May 2005).
long-standing arrangements for practice opportunities for ITS students) brought on by its separation from the Department of Theatre & Drama; and more generally, the tension between – on the one hand - the potential that is inherent to many superb interdisciplinary programs, namely that for growth in the breadth and depth of its intellectual endeavors and its service to the university community, and, on the other, factual limitations in terms of resources (for which interdisciplinary programs largely depend on the graciousness of other departments and programs) and, one may argue (based on conversations conducted as part of this review as well as personal experiences with administrative matters), a lack of incentivization of sharing that has been brought on by campus-wide fiscal policies.

The review process

The committee approached the review process with particular attention to (a) the challenges experienced by a program that was new and, at the same time, indebted to a long-standing reputation of excellence; (b) the potential for communication difficulties among the dispersed stakeholders in the program; and (c) the program’s need and desire for strengthening or establishing relationships across campus that will support its missions for years to come. We therefore aimed to gain as many perspectives as possible, in part with a view to eventually being able to offer concrete suggestions that the program could consider as it strives to secure its place as a leader in the field.

As a preview, everyone that was personally invited to speak with us did so generously and with a great deal of enthusiasm and trust in that the review would be more than just a formal exercise. It was clear that ITS is a community of diverse yet similarly highly engaged stakeholders. The program’s Director, Mary Trotter, was particularly helpful. She met with the committee twice in person and, in addition, answered thoroughly in writing follow-up questions from the committee (so that the total written document amounted to 18 pages) and helped the committee complete a roster in which we had compiled comparative (relative to ITS’s identity as the doctoral program in Theatre & Drama; the Department of Theatre & Drama, also in its former incarnation as an MFA program; and the PhD Program in Second Language Acquisition, which is also an interdisciplinary program) data about the program’s structure; graduate recruitment, support & placement; faculty appointments; and degree requirements. Professor Trotter also answered numerous email inquiries from review committee members quickly, thoroughly, and clearly.

The committee also received support from (a) Academic Planner Kelley Haslam (Graduate School), who provided the committee with documents pertaining to the graduate program, such as the Program Profile and Exit Surveys of ITS as well as comparable conglomerate data for the Graduate School as a whole and all Humanities programs taken together, and met with the committee on September 21, 2016 to answer questions about the data shown in these documents; she also followed up with additional information via email; (b) the other four ‘core’ faculty members, with each of whom we met individually (three in person, one
via Skype); (c) several graduate students in ITS, some of whom we met with individually and others with whom we met in a group; (d) several ‘affiliate’ faculty members (including the two colleagues, Christine Garlough and Paola Hernandez, who serve on the ITS Steering Committee), whom we each met in individual meetings; (e) the incoming chair of the Department of English, Russ Castronovo; (f) David Ronis, Director of the University Opera, with both of whom we had separate in-person meetings; and (g) program administrator Brenda Weiss. We had also arranged to meet with Senior Lecturer Jen Plants (English) but because of a scheduling mistake by committee chair Monika Chavez, the initial meeting did not take place and scheduling conflicts prevented us from finding an alternative date. The meetings took place between Thursday, September 22 and Friday, October 7, 2016 and lasted between half an hour and two hours. We also offered an open session on Wednesday, October 5 at 2 o’clock in the afternoon but nobody other than committee members attended.

In addition, Associate Dean Elain Klein and Ashley Doebereiner provided the committee with guidelines for the review; self-study documents submitted by ITS on January 1, 2016 (after one semester as a new program); current and past ITS assessment plans; and documents that pertained to the creation of ITS as an academic program. The committee also held several in-person meetings and communicated via email to decide on procedure and to prepare this report. Associate Deans Elaine Klein and Susan Zaeske met with the committee on November 17, 2016 to answer some of the questions about administrative matters that had arisen during the investigative phase.

It should be noted here – and will be revisited later in the report – that in the review process we encountered several instances of mismatches in information between different sources. They concerned, for example, (a) the current governance structure: The self-study document (submitted on January 1, 2016) describes an Executive Committee composed of all ‘core’ faculty and led by a Program Director whereas, in fact, the program is now governed by a Director and a Steering Committee composed of two ‘core’ and two ‘affiliate’ faculty members; (b) the program website: For example, profiles of faculty (both ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’) including their departmental affiliation do not appear to be up-to-date; (c) descriptions of program requirements: The Graduate School website and the Graduate Student Handbook (the version that we had access to) describe somewhat different requirements, e.g. the Handbook calls for 69 credits (or 23 courses) toward PhD; the Graduate School’s description of the program stipulate 51 credits; similar discrepancies were found for the descriptions of requirements for the MA degree; and (d) the tabulation of degree completions: While the self-study documented (not just reported) 40 PhD degrees completed between 2005-2015 (and 11 more as heading toward completion), a report that we received from the (very helpful) Program Director, Mary Trotter, reported 38 completed PhDs, perhaps because of a divergence in accounting methods, such as including or excluding graduates of May 2005.

The committee notes these discrepancies not as a criticism but rather as a grounds for arguing that, at least on a limited-time basis, the program would benefit greatly from greater administrative support. Although the program is not an independent department (and has no – or only a negligible - budget of its
own) and is relatively small in terms of 'core' faculty - two circumstances that one could take to indicate lesser need for administrative support - it is undergoing a process of re/constitution and, as will be explained in greater detail below, is constituted of a community that essentially is in diaspora, i.e., a community that needs to establish itself as such via a concerted effort rather than the more typical organic means that arise from the benefits of a shared space, time together, and accountability to/within the same hierarchical structures. The committee further believes that ITS has mastered the initial phase of transition and re/constitution and has gained some early insights into how the program can work going forward. ITS is, in our opinion, ready to move beyond crisis management to concerted planning and we hope that our report can give direction just as hopefully available additional (even if on a temporary basis) administrative resources would constitute an investment in the sustainability and, potentially, growth of ITS as a program with a long tradition of excellence and a new shape.

Findings and recommendations

We will summarize our findings by themes, which are: (a) dispersal & community; (b) the use of electronic media to promote & sustain community and the visibility of the program; (c) the governance structure of the program; (d) the situation of graduate students specifically; and (e) outlook. Each theme will be followed by a set of recommendations. These themes are not truly discrete and therefore, some of the same observations will recur just as some recommendations will resemble or be premised on each other. We have composed these recommendations under the assumption that ITS colleagues and campus administrators will examine them for feasibility (and, hopefully, identify resources that increase their feasibility); and prioritize and/or modify them according to the program’s needs and available resources.

(a) Dispersal & community

Since issues of dispersal and community emerged as central in the course of our review activities, we will discuss them first and address several of its most prominent aspects. Since most issues of dispersal, as discussed here, intersect with each other closely, we will offer a list of collated recommendations at the conclusion of this section.

a.1. Overview

We count among immediate stakeholders in ITS its ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty; its graduate students; its graduate administrator (Brenda Weiss); and its administrative home, the Department of English; and as extended stakeholders, academic campus departments, units, or programs that do or could benefit from the intellectual endeavors (including course offerings) of ITS; campus entities that are dedicated to performance that may benefit from or add to the expertise of faculty and graduate students in ITS (examples may include
the University Theatre; the University Opera but also – and we recognize the precarious nature of the historic relationship – the new Department of Theatre & Drama, some of whose faculty still are listed among ITS affiliates); potential employers of ITS graduates; the field of Theatre Studies (loosely defined) as a whole; the local community of the City of Madison; and ultimately, in keeping with the Wisconsin Idea, the State of Wisconsin.

To preview the gist of the report, ITS brings to the table a tremendous amount of faculty expertise in key and nationally unique, (e.g., the Theatre for Youth) areas of research and practice; a respectably sized group of highly engaged graduate students; a dedicated graduate administrator; a recognized tradition of excellence in the field; and a housing department (English) that is, by all indications, very supportive (such as emerged in conversations with the chair of the department, Russ Castronovo, as well as the two ITS ‘core’ faculty that hold appointments in English). Although less explicit than other assets, the work of ITS – in both its graduate and, continued from its being part of the former Department of Theatre & Drama, its undergraduate course offerings, could serve a segment of the campus community that takes an interest in ‘performance’ in the broader, theoretical sense. At the same time, there are notable challenges to the full unfolding of the potential of ITS. In essence, these challenges are attributable to the related issues of (various types of) dispersal and change (which, in this instance, may have been perceived as a diminution of resources and, as a consequence of dispersed tenure homes, a loss of identity). That is, although many interdisciplinary programs face issues brought on by dispersal, ITS has not always been a dispersed program. In this, its early, phase of reconstitution, ITS needs to determine procedures that address this dispersal, specifically (a) whether some types of dispersal (as noted below) and/or their respective degrees can be ameliorated; (b) how to deal with types/degrees of dispersal that are unlikely to change going forward; and (c) whether/which new opportunities for collaboration and/or reconstitution present themselves at this moment and going forward.

Issues of dispersal permeate nearly all of our observations and recommendations. We therefore acknowledge that the dedication of specific section of this report to the matter of dispersal serves as a frame and is not, in fact, truly limited to this section.

a.2. The Department of English as the academic home of the program and the tenure home of two (out of five) current ‘core’ faculty members

In very simplistic but nevertheless descriptively relevant terms, ITS ‘core’ faculty is split between tenure homes in the Department of English Professor Aparna Dharwadker and Associate Professor Mary Trotter) and tenure homes in (three) other departments (Associate Professor Michael Peterson, Professor Mike Vanden Heuvel, and Professor Manon van de Water). Although this distribution already hints at the fundamental issue of dispersal, another dimension of the diaspora becomes evident when one considers that this same distribution also amounts to a split between two faculty having appointments in the department that houses ITS (English) and the remaining three having appointments in departments that have no inherent
relationship with ITS (Classics and Near Eastern Studies; German, Nordic, and Slavic; Theatre & Drama).

As per conversations with ITS ‘core’ faculty members (both, those housed inside and those housed outside of English); the incoming chair of English (Russ Castronovo); Brenda Weiss (who serves both as graduate program coordinator for ITS and as timetable person for English); and a number of ITS graduate students, the relationship between ITS and English is perceived as being to the benefit of both parties. Specifically, ITS sees itself as an asset in teaching a high-enrollment undergraduate course (English/TD 120), which generates credits for the Department of English and, at the same time, provides employment opportunities for graduate students in ITS as TAs. Both ITS ‘core’ faculty (and perhaps less, so ITS graduate students) and the Department of English, which – according to Professor Castronovo – has traditionally taken a ‘big tent’ approach and gladly accommodates multiple language-centered disciplines, discern shared intellectual ground, which all parties appear ready to explore further. In addition, the Department of English has hired an academic staff member, Senior Lecturer Jen Plants, specifically with the view to support the mission of ITS.

Despite the overall very promising collaboration between English and ITS, there appeared to be some instances of mismatched perspectives or miscommunication. The graduate students that we spoke to seemed somewhat confused about their responsibilities toward and the privileges that they might derive from the Department of English. For example, they were not certain whether they might be able to use common social spaces (it seemed that the answer would be, yes) or draw on departmental funds set aside for graduate students of English (it appeared that the answer would be, no). ITS graduate students also were uncertain about their academic (and, to an extent, social) identities. They found themselves in new academic and physical spaces without being able to make out the boundaries (or even, the ability to determine whether there were boundaries). For instance, ITS students were not certain whether students in English recognized them as members of – alternatively - an affiliated, an integrated, or an essentially unrelated community. Moreover, graduate students in ITS told us that they gain access to designated physical spaces (such as desks or mail-boxes) via appointments-for-work (such as TAships) but not via fellowships. They were wondering whether the Department of English could provide students who do not have work-for-pay appointments with mail-boxes and, if possible some minimal (but perhaps secure) storage spaces (such as for coats, bags, and laptops).

Similarly, the fact that two – but not all – of the ITS ‘core’ faculty have their tenure home in English, seemed to give rise to predictable but not quite fortunate dynamics in that (a) the physical proximity between two but not all ITS faculty members facilitates interactions between these two colleagues but not among the full group, which – as can be expected – limits impromptu exchanges of ideas or resolutions of unexpected problems that involve all five ITS ‘core’ faculty; and (b) the question of split tenure homes, which also coincides with a split between tenure homes that are in the housing department, English (true for two ITS members), and tenure homes that are in other departments (as is true for the remaining three ‘core’ faculty and many of the ‘affiliate’ faculty, including the two ‘affiliate’ faculty who serve on the Steering Committee; see report sections further down) complicate several matters, specifically, as they pertain to (b.1.)
departmental service, including program leadership as Program Director and/or service on the Steering Committee; (b.2.) the planning/anticipation of sabbatical leaves; (b.3.) course scheduling and rotation; and (b.4.) long-term planning, such as is needed to manage hiring and retirements. For (b.1), some concerns were expressed about possible inequities between faculty members housed in English and those not housed in English; more specifically, about whether/how service to ITS may be recognized as service to a given faculty member’s home department; in this context, ‘service’ also comprises program leadership, such as serving as Program Director and/or on the Steering Committee. Matters (b.2.), (b.3.), and (b.4) require a degree of coordination that is easier (and more likely) within departmental boundaries but, in practical terms, these issues need to be addressed in concert by all (not just two ‘core’) ITS faculty members and their (multiple) department chairs & colleagues.

ITS graduate program administrator Brenda Weiss holds a 1.0 FTE that is split 50/50 between English and ITS. She shares her office with two colleagues in English so that ITS does not have its own office space. As a result, there is no physical delineation between Ms. Weiss’s duties in ITS and English – which certainly can be advantageous – but which also means that meetings between her and the ITS Program Director, ITS faculty, or ITS students (some of whom might require confidential information) cannot remain separate or ITS-program-internal (or, if needed, private).

In summary, ITS is an intellectual community that exists in physical, administrative, and, to an extent, governance (the housing department serves as tenure & budgetary home for some but all ITS faculty members) and social diaspora. In terms of socio-cognitive theories of intellectual development founded on notions of community, the current state of affairs is problematic in that experts (the faculty; the graduate program administrator) can form an action-oriented group only with difficulty. The group of experts, moreover, is limited in its ability to introduce novices (graduate students) to community practices, which include professional (academic as well as performance-practice) activities. The group’s ability to act together to bring in new members or to bring in more closely affiliated (but not (yet) ‘core’) members is also impeded.

We would like to emphasize that community formation needs to happen at both a synchronic (establishing connections among contemporary stakeholders) as well as a diachronic (establishing connections among stakeholders past, present, and future; linking to traditions and setting visions for the future). Clearly, for an interdisciplinary & dispersed program, community formation & maintenance on the synchronic level already pose special challenges; in the particular case of ITS, however, there is the added experience of rupture (and disruption) as it was formed out of a process of separation. The ability to link to traditions and develop credible and engaging visions of the future is therefore as important as it is difficult to achieve.

a.3. Linguistic diaspora: English and the foreign languages
The UW-Madison is a national leader in research in and the teaching of languages other than English. Indeed, one of the five ITS ‘core’ faculty members, Manon van de Water, has her tenure home in a foreign language department (German, Nordic, and Slavic) as does one of the two ‘affiliate’ faculty members who serve on the
A good portion of ‘affiliate’ faculty (depending on how one counts, approximately one third), too, are housed in a foreign language department. Foreign language departments (including those in the classical languages) include in their mission the teaching and research of various literary forms, including genres that directly pertain to the mission of ITS. Foreign language departments, often as part of their (graduate and undergraduate) course offerings also research, produce, and perform plays – alas, in the foreign language that constitutes their core mission. That is, foreign language departments harbor prominent potential resources in terms of course offerings, mentorship, and – if, explored further – practice opportunities for graduate students in ITS, on the premise that a lack of (foreign) language knowledge does not bar ITS students from accessing these resources. As ITS constitutes its new (now separate from Theatre & Drama) identity, it may find that the research and practice of theatre in (or about) languages other than English can add new and distinctive dimensions.

**Recommendations:**

(1a) In the committee’s conversations with graduate students, we perceived a loss of identity in graduate students, specifically, a sense of confusion about their identity vis-à-vis the Department of English and about the precise nature of their own academic community (and, it seemed, a lack of understanding of what the word ‘interdisciplinarity’ signals, i.e., a degree of confusion about the discipline/s itself/themselves). We would recommend that ITS faculty (both ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’) address together with graduate students possible (and within, ideal and attainable) definitions of the discipline or the ‘interdiscipline’ that emerges from the multiple disciplines that support the intellectual endeavor that is ITS. We anticipate that such conversations would be exploratory and would facilitate the emergence of answers rather than concern the transmission of pre-determined answers from faculty to graduate students. The format in which these conversations happen should reflect the emergent nature of the disciplinary definitions to be established. In that sense, a conference (or workshop) format – perhaps in the form of a graduate student conference – might be appropriate. In may also be useful to include in these conversations participants from outside ITS. These ‘outside’ participants could comprise non-ITS members (faculty and graduate students) of the housing department of English; representatives of departments that house ITS ‘core’ (and perhaps those that house ‘affiliate’) faculty; graduate students from other interdisciplinary fields on campus (such as Gender and Women’s Studies; or Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies; or the PhD Program in Second Language Acquisition); and representatives (especially, graduate students) from peer programs at other institutions. As members of the ITS community grapple with their specific notions of ‘interdisciplinarity’ at a concrete example (the definition of their own program), all participating parties will be able contribute to (and thereby deal with and learn from) a debate about interdisciplinary as well as inter-departmental collaboration in a nationwide academic climate that make such endeavors difficult and necessary at the same time. In other words, such a conference could accomplish multiple purposes: (a) It could help ITS tease out ideational
and practical dimensions of its identity; (b) it would raise the visibility of the program on campus and beyond and perhaps help build connections into the future; and (c) it could serve as a professionalization experience that is relevant for all participants but perhaps particularly enriching for its graduate students.

(1b) There also seemed to be a (perhaps, mis)perception among graduate students – to paraphrase one of them – that ‘the new ITS structure may be good for faculty but its advantages to graduate students are less apparent.’ It would seem useful to not only concentrate on building a communal identity among graduate students but also between ITS graduate students and ITS faculty. The current Program Director, Mary Trotter, is very actively engaged in community-building efforts and has implemented a weekly electronic newsletter in which community members at large are informed about happenings in the program. Whereas the use of electronic media – especially in a community that to-date lacks common physical space – is certainly of great relevance, the profuse use of such media also diminishes their significance, especially to recipients and particularly when ‘sender’ and ‘recipient’ roles are so clearly delineated (i.e., there is no real interactive dimension). The Program Director has also attempted to implement a series of colloquia, which were/are to address a range of professionalization and academic matters. As per reports from graduate students and the Program Director, this series has not yet come to full fruition. Of particular note to ITS students were, (a) a lack of student input into the specific content of these colloquia; and (b) faculty participation being limited to a small subset of the ITS faculty (perhaps because many of them were on leave).

In summary, it appears that future activities toward community building should (a) strengthen the sense of belonging and establish goals that are shared between faculty and students; (b) account for students’ perspectives and needs more explicitly; (c) expand beyond electronic media; (d) should not be driven solely by the Program Director and a small subset of faculty; and (e) should include interactive dimensions of exchange rather than only/mostly a unidirectional transmission of information.

Specific measures may include:

- ITS faculty (the Steering Committee) may consider the formation of sub-committees that are dedicated toward specific purposes, such as professionalization activities; academic interest groups; contact with alumni/ae or with professionals in the community (see also suggestions regarding the governance structure); and as appropriate, to include students on these committees so that students may participate in the determination of content of colloquia (or similar events) as well as take on well planned (rather than impromptu) roles in their organization and presentation. Similarly, it may be useful to include graduate students (or their representative/s) in designated and appropriate segments of faculty meetings.
• ITS may consider establishing routes of communication (such as blogs or Wikis; or social media; see also recommendations with regard to the ITS presence on-line) in which more and more diverse stakeholders can take on the role of ‘contributor’ rather than just ‘recipient’.

• One single person – even an extremely active and well-intended person – cannot carry a community forward, both for definitional reasons of what ‘community’ means and for reasons of sustainability and continuity. In other words, the Program Director alone cannot be responsible for shaping a community. Graduate students cannot carry the major burden of organizing community activities, either. In other words, ITS needs to devise ways in which a larger group of faculty – possibly not just ‘core’ but also ‘affiliate’ faculty – can take on leadership roles in community organizing. In addition to the formation of sub-committees (each dedicated to different specific purposes), ITS faculty may also consider hosting, on a rotating but regular (perhaps bi-weekly or monthly) basis – with one or two faculty leading the event – opportunities for students and faculty to interact socially (such as in a coffee or lunch-hour event) while also addressing specific professional, academic, or career-related matters. Topics could be determined in advance with input from faculty and students and a calendar could be prepared, with faculty signing up to host one or two events per semester. If appropriate, students from other programs (with related interests) could also be invited to join (and, perhaps reciprocate by inviting ITS students and faculty to some of their own events). If ‘affiliate’ ITS faculty could be enlisted for such an endeavor, with a total of 20-25 faculty, depending on the frequency of meetings, each faculty would be responsible for no more than 1 event per academic year. Faculty could use this opportunity, too, to talk about courses that they will be offered in the near and intermediate future; explain about their research (including methods); and perhaps connect with students who plan to submit proposals to conferences that they (the faculty) plan to attend or, in a similar vein, provide some chaperoning functions when ITS students (especially novice attendees) travel to the same conference.

(2) A communal identity is difficult to form or maintain when there is no physical space in which to give it expression. The committee realizes the serious shortage of space on campus. Nevertheless, an important step forward could be taken by ITS if an area could be identified in which ITS graduate students (and faculty) might give physical expression to their identities (such as by displaying ‘evidence of community’ that ranges from meeting agenda to recent publications by faculty and graduate students); make their presence known (such as via designated mailboxes); and come together (even if only at designated or reserved times).

To drive forward recommendation (2), these steps may be considered:

• Clarifications with regard to the use and allocation of physical space in the Department of English
(Helen C. White). Preliminary conversations with the chair of English, Russ Castronovo, indicated the possibility of (at least) assigning mail-boxes (and thereby, physical addresses at which to receive professional mail) to ITS students who do not hold work-for-pay positions (and benefit from facilities made available via these appointments). While such a step would constitute a significant improvement for some of the ITS students, it would not address the desire for shared space and/or a space in which to meet (even at pre-determined and limited times), that would be an important improvement over the current situation.

- The lack of shared (or, seen from another perspective, delineated) physical space also extends to the situation of graduate coordinator Brenda Weiss. The committee understands the advantages that follow from Ms. Weiss’s proximity to her colleagues with whom she shares work for the English department. However, if a shared/designated ITS space could be identified in which Ms. Weiss might hold, for example, designated ‘office hours’ for ITS faculty and students, we believe it would help members of the ITS community to a significant degree.

(3) Just as ITS needs to deepen its sense of communal identity, it would also be useful for ITS to broaden the synchronic and diachronic contexts in which ‘community’ can manifest. This is especially true for graduate students who, different from faculty, have no other ‘home’ but ITS, and which, in turn, for many of them lacks a physical and, by extension, distinct social and sometimes even distinct intellectual, dimensions. The ITS graduate students, it appears, already have taken measures of their own (such as weekly social meetings) to foster group cohesion. Nevertheless, ITS graduate students may benefit from a more explicit support structure in their current efforts as well in yet-to-be-made attempts to establish their ITS identity on and beyond campus.

Specific measures to broaden the *synchronous* context of the ITS community – in addition to the possible graduate student conference and the regular social-cum-professional meetings that also involve ‘affiliate’ faculty, as suggested above – could include:

- A meeting between all ITS faculty (not just ITS faculty housed in English) and (perhaps a particularly relevant subgroup of) faculty in (the rest of) English could be convened, with the objective to identify some overlap in research interests; to identify course offerings of mutual interest; and to discuss shared interests between the different groups of graduate students, with a view to planning opportunities for graduate students to connect.

- Similar meetings could be convened between ITS faculty (‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty) with their respective department chairs (including the chair of English) to determine whether/how specific needs of ITS can be met and what contributions ITS can/could make to the respective departments.
• ITS-relevant courses in foreign language departments may be a resource that has not been as fully utilized as it could be. Similarly, some of the graduate students in the foreign language departments may wish to develop their research interests in ITS more definitively. While foreign language departments may welcome the boost in enrollments as well as in intellectual outlook that ITS graduate students could provide, many foreign language departments will also feel obliged to continue in their long-standing practice of offering (certain) graduate courses in the target (foreign) language. In short, the cultivation of closer relationships between ITS and foreign language departments seems mutually desirable but at the same time, is limited when potential ITS students do not possess the necessary proficiency in the target language.

Several solutions might be explored: (a) In its advertising and recruitment of new graduate students, ITS may work in concert with foreign language faculty & departments and consider several routes: (a.1.) explore the possibility of joint degrees (which might also help with avoiding excessive demand on limited ITS faculty time for mentoring and advising doctoral students); (a.2.) allot an ITS recruitment contingent to applicants with proficiency in specific foreign languages; or (a.3.) consider the implementation of a PhD Minor in ITS, which students in the foreign languages may wish to pursue, thereby bringing their expertise (and possibly, that of their faculty advisors) into the ITS community; (b) come to an agreement with foreign language departments that certain ITS-relevant courses be offered in English, perhaps in alternation with the course being offered in the foreign language; or (c) devise a meets-with scheme in which the foreign-language version of the course would be accompanied by an English-language version/credit. For this scheme to function, there would need to be a designated ITS-prefixed subject listing. In another part of this report, we will recommend the exploration of an ITS-specific subject listing.

Specific measures to broaden the diachronic context of the ITS community could include:

• More explicit efforts to connect with and highlight the accomplishments of the program’s alumni/ae/alumnae could (a) increase the fund-raising potential of ITS (which would require more intense administrative support, at least temporarily, until proper channels have been established); (b) provide networking opportunities for current students; and (c) outline for current ITS students possible professional trajectories. In addition to involving alumni/ae in social media or forms of communication, such as newsletters, they may also be invited to participate in colloquia or the more informal (coffee or lunch-hour) meetings suggested above. Alumni/ae could participate in person; via Skype; other forms of on-line communication, such as blogging or chatting; or even ‘webinars/web panel discussions.’ Perhaps some alumni/ae would even be willing to take on an advanced ITS student as a mentee. In a similar vein, alumni/ae may be featured more prominently
on the program’s website (perhaps also in the form of video clips in which they talk about their experiences at Madison) and thereby serve not only current students but also speak to potential students and aid in recruiting.

- ITS students should also be connected more explicitly with professionals in the community and beyond, for several purposes: (a) For students to make contact with professionals who could employ them with a view to the satisfaction of practice-related degree requirements; (b) for students to develop a more concrete and practice-oriented understanding of their own professional interests and strengths and to broaden their understanding of possible career trajectories; (c) to raise the visibility of the program vis-à-vis practitioners (outside of academia); and (d) to enable the program to contribute to the local community and the state.

Such connections could be established in several ways: (a) Invite professionals to campus to participate in the context of their specific qualifications in a colloquium, graduate student conference, or social-cum-professional meeting; (b) advertise specific services that ITS students may render, such as via a database that lists students’ specific qualifications and is accessible to potential employers or via personal visits; and/or (c) collaborate with programs that have the necessary financial resources and may be interested in inviting professionals whose expertise is relevant to both them and ITS.

(b) The use of electronic media to promote & sustain community and the visibility of the program

Given the dispersed nature of the program (community); its relatively recent re/constitution as a program; and a degree of uncertainty about the program among its stakeholders, effective use of electronic media plays an essential role. However, we noted four specific issues with regard to the electronic presence of ITS: (1) Online information that was out of date or out of line with same-topic information that appeared elsewhere; (2) the web-presence (visibility) of the program; (3) the program name as a search term (and as a concept) as well as the lack of an ITS-specific subject listing; and (4) the underuse of electronic media to build and maintain community and share information among stakeholders.

The fact that on-line information presented by the program is out of date and/or incongruous when several outlets (program website; graduate school website/s; handbooks) are involved, has been discussed earlier in this document (in the description of the review process).

Apart from the fact that the ITS website contains information that is out of date, the ITS webpage is also not very easy to find online. This low degree of 'findability’ likely affects both current UW students who are looking for information (such as classes that may be taken toward degree) and prospective students who look for a potential PhD program in Theatre and Performance Studies (loosely defined). A link to the ITS website can be found on the Letters & Science page for the College’s departments and programs, but there is no comparable link on the University’s Academics tab.
Electronic course searches, too, are problematic. The lack of a designated ITS-specific subject listing, the overlap in subject matter with other academic units (most notably, the current Department of Theatre & Drama); the broad spectrum of courses offered by the housing Department of English; and perhaps not entirely self-evident cross-listings (such as English/TD 120 or TD/Slavic/C&I 360) all complicate matters. For example, in a recent exploration of the course search function, when we input ‘theatre’ as a keyword, about twenty courses from the Department of Theatre & Drama were the first things that came up. By the same token, when we input ‘English’ as a keyword, the first three courses that turned up were ITS courses. Since it is likely that the algorithm that directs the search also depends on the frequency with which search terms are used, having adequate descriptors is even more important.

The program name – that starts with an ‘I’ for ‘Interdisciplinary’ Theatre Studies – is prone to misdirecting searches that focus on key words, such as ‘Theatre’ (or ‘Drama’ or ‘Performance’). Perhaps more substantially, interviews suggested that there was some uncertainty amongst program faculty and students about what ‘interdisciplinary’ actually means. Although faculty frequently discussed it as a rubric for crossing disciplinary boundaries, students saw the term as referring to the blending of theory and practice. Furthermore, some committee members saw the term ‘interdisciplinary’ as a synonym for ‘interdepartmental.’

**Recommendations:**

Before we specify steps that might be taken toward the remediation of these issues, we would like to note that the execution of some of these steps (a) will require at least a temporary increase in administrative support that goes toward the program (e.g., toward the implementation of ITS-specific subject listings; improvement of the web presence; establishing accounts and templates in social media); (b) potentially, a small but permanent shifting in administrative resources (such as in the appointment percentages of ITS/English of program administrator Brenda Weiss) to a degree that is yet to be determined; and (c) collaboration between all ITS-interested departments and programs (such as to ascertain the most effective use of an ITS-specific subject listing, e.g., for cross-listings or meets-with arrangements), including, ideally, the current Department of Theatre & Drama. The maintenance of any innovations in the use of electronic resources cannot rest on the shoulders of the Program Director alone and may benefit from the leadership of a designated faculty sub-committee (see recommendations regarding the governance structure) and the involvement of graduate students as well as of UW resources yet to be identified.

(1) The Director and Steering Committee should work with the UW’s webmaster to make sure a link to the program’s website is added to the university’s tab for Academics, which lists departments and programs.
A concerted effort should be made at searching various websites with regard to the accuracy and congruency of the dissemination of ITS-specific information.

The ITS website should be updated and expanded/revised. For example, true to the academic mission of ITS, media besides the printed word should be utilized to showcase the accomplishments of ITS faculty, students, and alumni/ae. A more detailed and descriptive account of themes that that occupy the work of ITS faculty, students, and alumni/ae would also be useful (for example, the current list of alumni/ae in alphabetical order and by the names of their current employers is not really informative and also not quite inspiring).

ITS should consider the implementation of electronic platforms (Box folders; KBs; etc.) that facilitate the sharing of work & ideas across physical divisions and with some degree of continuity.

ITS may wish to consider improvements to the continuity and transparency in advising & mentoring of graduate students by creating an on-line student data base with uniform documents that can be accessed by all authorized faculty, such as to monitor the following student-related activities: advising agreements; the completion of course work toward degree work; the completion of non-course work degree requirements, such as obligatory practicums; the setting & completion of program milestones; and research accomplishments, such as presentations at conferences and publications.

The newsletter (or a similar publication) may be expanded (though, in that expanded format be reduced to an annual publication) to include – in content and audience - alumni/ae and others interested in the program.

ITS may consider targeted use of social media, such as a program Facebook site or twitter account to promote the program and communicate with stakeholders. The overarching goal would be for ITS to use media in a manner that does not relegate the majority of stakeholders to ‘recipient’ status but instead promotes greater participatory roles for all.

Both graduate students and their advisors would benefit from having a clearer overview (and have that overview sooner) of courses that they may count toward degree as well as, if possible, information about practice experiences. The latter might be accomplished if relevant stakeholders could advertise available positions at the ITS website or link already existing advertisements to the ITS website. The former might be achieved via the next recommendation (#9).
ITS would greatly benefit from program-specific subject listings for its classes. Multiple advantages can be expected: (a) A designated subject listing would make it much easier for students to find courses offered by the program. (b) It would be easier for the program to explain degree requirements, as captured in the types, number, and sequence of courses that need to be taken. (c) As explained earlier in the context of ITS-relevant courses offered in foreign language departments, an ITS-specific subject listing would facilitate meets-with or cross-listings between courses (or of course sections), i.e., those taught in the foreign language and those taught in English. (d) It would be easier to distinguish between courses that count toward the ITS major and any non-ITS PhD minors that ITS students would like to feature in their degree work. Indeed, an ITS-specific subject listing would help graduates profile their expertise on their Curricula Vitae. Conversely, should ITS implement a PhD Minor in ITS, an ITS-specific subject listing would help prospective ITS minors document their sub-specialization and also draw a clearer distinction in course work between ITS majors and minors. (5) If ITS courses were explicitly labeled, it may be easier for ITS to plan and monitor, together with the home departments of the ITS faculty members who teach these courses, the rotation of ITS-required and/or ITS-relevant courses and to add new courses into the rotation.

ITS should explore the prospect of changing the program’s name. The committee is keenly aware that the program’s current title was the product of much careful deliberation and negotiation. Moreover, we also acknowledge that the program may be reluctant to change the name after expending considerable effort to reestablish its identity, both on campus and within the preeminent professional organizations for theatre and performance studies. That being said, changing the program’s name to something that begins with ‘theatre’ would likely place webpage tabs and links in places where prospective students are more likely to look for it. Pertinent discussions may also yield new and useful insights into how the program delineates itself from and affiliates itself with the multiple academic traditions that are currently invoked in the inclusion of ‘interdisciplinarity’ in its name.

(c) Governance of the program

As noted earlier, the governance structure of ITS is not quite clear and likely not yet firmly established (which is understandable and, with a view to the need for flexibility in the early stages of ITS’s re/constitution, not necessarily a disadvantage). In the draft of the Provost’s letter of transmittal (from 2014), the College and ITS worked together to develop a small and efficient governing structure. According to this document, the governing structure was to consist of: (a) A Program Director; (b) a Steering Committee (made up of four elected members of the core and affiliate faculty); and (c) a/the Director of the Theatre for Youth Program. However, according to the self-study document (submitted on January 1, 2016; p. 3), ‘The ITS Program is
governed by a faculty-elected Program Chair and an executive committee. The executive committee is currently made up of members of the core faculty.

In fact, in conversations with the Program Director Mary Trotter, with ‘core’ faculty, and with some ‘affiliate’ faculty members, it emerged that the current governance structure rests on a model that combines features of the 2014 and the 2016 documents referenced above: A four-person committee (two ‘core’ faculty, including the Program Director; two ‘affiliate’ faculty members) currently governs the program but, according to a communication from the Program Director, the Director of the Theatre for Youth Program does not have a permanent seat on the Steering Committee (and does not, in fact, serve on the Steering Committee now). The Steering Committee is tasked with all the duties typically assigned to department executive committees. It is charged with oversight of program curriculum, with decisions about the program’s limited budget (such as monies that it receives for recruiting graduate students), with student assessment and student grievances, and with the vetting and selection of applicants for admission to the program. Yet the Steering Committee is somewhat small relative to the overall size (in faculty and graduate students) of the program.

It appears that the formative process of the governance structure has responded to the practical limitations that have presented themselves. ITS faculty have obligations, including often extensive administrative duties, to their housing departments and/or take leaves, such as sabbaticals. Another common theme throughout the committee’s review of ITS was a general sense that too much administrative responsibility falls to the Program Director. The Director is not only tasked with leading the Steering Committee, its ongoing colloquia for graduate students, its email communications with stakeholders, but also advises all first-year graduate students and chairs committees (or, constitutes in herself a ‘committee’) that concern various duties, such as maintaining the program’s web presence; obtaining grants for graduate students (such as the Graduate School Block grant); establishing & maintaining ties with alumni/ae; reaching out to persons and entities that can provide practice experiences to ITS students; communicate with ‘affiliate’ faculty and their home departments; interact with the Department of English, the Graduate School, and the College of Letters and Science on behalf of the program; and by and large, oversee graduate student recruitment (although the Director of the Theatre for Youth plays an active role in recruiting & vetting applicants with an interest in that particular area).

Furthermore, the relatively small number of core faculty has created certain challenges when it comes to planning curriculum and in performing student assessments. Since requests for leave are made and approved within faculty members’ home departments, the management of sabbatical rotations is outside of ITS’s control and prone to the specific needs and whims of other units. Yet, even in the best of circumstances, where only one core member is on leave at any given time, ITS operates most years with the expectation that its roster of ‘core’ faculty members will be reduced to less than five, who then – as a small group - need to carry on their shoulders the teaching of ITS courses as well as the administration of the program. As per self-study document (and as also explained above), only ‘core’ faculty appear to be entrusted with the advising of dissertations and only papers written in the courses taught by the ‘core’ faculty can be used toward the Prelim A exam portfolio. The relatively small number of ‘core’ faculty has had a knock-on effect for students
enrolled in the PhD program. Some doctoral candidates, for example, reported difficulties in preparing their PhD Prelim A exam portfolio, simply due to the dearth of courses offered by ‘core’ faculty that, in turn, resulted from sabbatical schedules that were made outside of ITS. Students were able to comply with the program’s requirements for Prelim A exams, but they nonetheless felt that the choices they had to make regarding which papers to submit for the Theatre History, Dramatic Literature, and Theatre and Performance Theory components of the exam were severely circumscribed.

Recommendations:

The small size of the Steering Committee relative to the tasks that it – and among them, especially the Program Director - needs to accomplish. raises issues of continuity (such as in instances of sabbatical leaves); sustainability (will there be enough faculty willing & available to carry out these tasks in the future); and effectiveness (can the Steering Committee accomplish all tasks that are necessary for an effective administration of the program).

We recommend that:

(1) the ITS Steering Committee should revisit the issue of what the responsibilities and privileges are reserved for ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty members, respectively. The Steering Committee should weigh the pros and cons of maintaining the current distinction, particularly as to whether it is the best way to incentivize the allocation of teaching effort to the program. As the program reexamines the expectations that is has of ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty, it may also consider (a) how to make it possible for ‘core’ faculty to assume, over time, greater and smaller duties, as their other obligations allow (for example, service on the Steering Committee may rotate); and (b) how to make service on the Steering Committee less onerous for individual members by dividing the labor over more people and into sub-committees (see Recommendation #2, just below).

Although some ITS faculty expressed a desire to eliminate the ‘core’/‘affiliate’ distinction altogether, that step may not do justice to the differential ability of ITS-interested faculty to serve the program. It seems more sensible to pursue the elimination of the ‘core’/‘affiliate’ distinction as a long-term, rather than short-term, goal. It may be more feasible to draw upon the pool of current ‘affiliate’ faculty to expand the size of the ‘core’ faculty. Adding an additional two or three people to the roster of ‘core’ faculty would help to (a) regularize the curriculum; (b) alleviate the challenges that students face in preparing their Prelim A exams; and (c) offer students a broader range of possible dissertation advisors even as individual ‘core’ faculty may perceive a lessened burden in terms of such advising responsibilities. The expansion of ‘core’ faculty would also add a safeguard in the event that someone was to retire or leave. Grass roots faculty energy and interest, rather than
standard budgetary requests to fill gaps and replace losses, will be vital to the program’s future sustainability.

(1) the number of Steering Committee members be expanded to (approximately) ten, i.e., the Director and (approximately) nine elected members of the ‘core’ or ‘affiliate’ faculty, including, possibly, ITS academic staff. This structure would enable the Steering Committee to form separate subcommittees charged with some of the tasks that currently fall to the Program Director. For example, one subcommittee might coordinate the program curriculum, another could reach out to alumni/ae and/or monitor the program’s web presence, and a third could perform initial vetting and contact of prospective admissions to the program. A slightly larger Steering Committee would (a) alleviate some of the burden that currently falls on the Director, which would contribute to the sustainability of the governance structure; (b) identify and mentor likely candidates for future leadership roles; (c) require broader buy-in from all faculty involved in ITS and, at the same time, help gauge the level of commitment that current (and future) ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ members can bring to the program – and ultimately guide a re-determination of the meaning and, potentially, feasibility of the division into ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty; (d) help the program achieve more or better, even as individual members need to contribute less; and (e) build a greater sense of community through the sharing of information, responsibilities, and achievements.

(2) a graduate student representative (elected by the graduate students) participate (perhaps as a non-voting member) in appropriate portions of Steering Committee meetings so as to present to faculty and, conversely, take back to the graduate students, concerns that are relevant to ITS graduate students. Graduate student representatives may also serve on appropriate sub-committees. The involvement of graduate students would enhance a sense of community between faculty and graduate students in a dispersed program; and would also help graduate students develop the ‘service’ dimension of their professionalization experiences in the program.

(3) the (new) Steering Committee, in consultation with all ITS faculty & graduate students and in observance of Faculty Policies and Procedures (FPPs) should draft a document that formalizes the governance structure of ITS. Given the discrepancies that exist between same-theme documents (such as the 2014 and 2016 documents that provide different descriptions of the program’s governance), it would be good to have the program’s governance clearly stated in a form that can be accessed by current and prospective ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty and can be used as a basis of communication with ITS faculty members’ housing departments, the Graduate School, and the College of Letters and Science.

(d) The situation of graduate students
We will first describe, in outline, (1) the overview of course of study for ITS graduate students; (2) the feedback that we received from past graduate students via the Graduate School Exit Survey and from current graduate students via personal interview; (3) feedback about aspects of the graduate program that we received from faculty and that had not been mentioned elsewhere in the report; and (4) data that capture the fundamentals of the graduate program.

d.1. Overview of course of study for ITS graduate students

Below is a chronological sketch of students' progress to MA/PhD:

1. Proseminar
   a. Proseminar in Theater Research (required) = ENGL 850 is taught every fall semester

2. Sequence of courses
   a. One of two courses in the graduate theater history sequence = ENGL/TD 731 & 732 is taught every year
   b. A seminar in theater and performance research is taught every semester
   c. The remainder of courses are selected from dramatic literature, theater history, theater/performance theory courses

3. Transition from MA to PhD:
   a. Students are required to apply to proceed to PhD from M.A. in their last semester of the M.A. program. The student sends a letter (email) to the Director, who consults with the Steering Committee. In the last 10 years, all applicants have succeeded in the transition to PhD
   b. PhD Minor requirement: students must complete a Minor from another program (e.g. GWS, English), or a distributed minor developed in consultation with their dissertation advisor

4. Prelim Exams: A & B

5. Dissertation Stage
   a. Students choose a dissertation advisor at the end of their 3rd semester of the PhD program

6. Learning Goals for PhD

- Demonstrate understanding of the theory, history, and practice of drama and theatre as collaborative cultural forms across historical periods.
- Master the methods and materials of theatre and performance research and writing in order to produce original scholarly projects that range in complexity from term papers to dissertations.
- Develop methods for theatre and performance practice and theory in order to test the reciprocal relations between research and practice through reflective participation in the production process.
- Identify and distinguish among the diverse global locations of theatre and the intercultural contact among
theatre traditions, especially as these multiply in the modern and contemporary periods.

d.2. **Feedback from ITS graduate students via the Graduate School Exit Survey (9 respondents) and personal interviews by the committee**

The graduate student body has clearly suffered with the split of ITS and T&D, and while they had noted the tensions prior to the reorganization, they remain unclear about the advantages of the current situation. In the Exit Surveys, ratings were lower than campus and divisional averages in quality of graduate curriculum, quality of graduate teaching, assistance in finding employment, sense of respect from faculty, and intellectual climate in program. Most reported a less than positive experience in the program and the university, and would not necessarily recommend others to attend. However, this was a small set of respondents (9) and the cumulative experiences that they referenced pre-date the split of ITS and T&D, with students included in the survey having entered between 2004-5 and 2010-11. In other words, respondents likely cued into the tensions that plagued the former doctoral program in Theatre & Drama, the predecessor of ITS. Nevertheless, it is possible that some of the concerns mentioned in the Graduate School Exit Survey carried over into the reconstituted ITS.

Students noted a variety of issues that have been either effected or exacerbated by the split (source: Interviews), particularly with regard to the following (please note that we are reporting on students’ comments, not our own opinion).

1. **Coursework:** Students commented on the unpredictability of course offerings because of dependence on other departments for course offerings and the allocation of sabbaticals. They also complained about the difficulty of finding and identifying degree-appropriate courses because of the lack of an ITS marker (subject listing).

2. **Advising:** Overall, students felt they were expected to take the initiative in obtaining feedback and guidance, rather than feeling fully supported intellectually. They perceived a lack of clarity about roles of ‘core’ vs. ‘affiliate’ faculty, especially their availability for courses, prelim papers, and dissertation advising. Dissertators in particular noted communication issues when faculty are overworked, unavailable, or away on sabbatical. They would prefer more advice in selecting a dissertation topic, directing research, and getting timely and/or helpful feedback for revisions. They also expressed an interest in receiving mentoring when they prepare for conferences and publications and on-site networking support at conferences when accompanied by faculty. Given that courses do not rotate across ‘core’ faculty and that a notable portion of the ‘core’ faculty (i.e., potential advisors) can be absent during a given semester, graduate students found it difficult to
encounter the full array of specializations by the time they are supposed to choose an advisor, i.e., by the end of the 3rd semester.

(3) Professionalization: Several students were concerned that the R-1 oriented faculty that constituted their teachers and mentors were not fully aware of the demands of non-R-1 faculty positions, specifically the need for faculty at non-R1 institution to teach a broad spectrum of courses (several of which are offered in the current Department of Theatre & Drama). Students would appreciate the opportunity to TA for a broader array of courses and also, practicums (see the next point. There was also a strong desire for individualized (not just in the form of generic colloquia) professionalization activities, including assistance with the preparation of job portfolios that acknowledge a broader spectrum of potential careers. Student also expressed a desire for an orientation to the faculty, courses, degree requirements, and the community at large upon arrival.

(4) Practicum Requirements: Students told the committee that it that after the separation between ITS and Theatre & Drama, they have found it more difficult to find required practicum opportunities, as they are not well supported in identifying relevant opportunities by the program or campus in general (students need to be involved in 3 production experiences during their program, through e.g., in the University Theater, in the Frederic March Play Circle, in the University Opera, or in plays put on as part of courses offered in foreign language departments).

(5) Community: Students desired a larger incoming cohort with a view to community building and long-term professional impact of the program even as they understood that limited resources may require so-called ‘right-sizing’ of the program. Overall, the students expressed a strong desire for a greater sense of community within ITS, especially in terms of broader and more intense faculty involvement. They wished for a designated space where students and faculty could mingle, network, and socialize informally. They also, in principle, supported the idea of colloquia but would like to see them better sustained and oriented toward students' objectives, especially, as outlets in which they (as well as faculty and invited speakers) could share their research, including in advance of conference presentation or on-campus visits as part of a job search.

(6) TA Opportunities: For graduate students, TA appointments are part of their professionalization experience (see Point #3, above). They are grateful for the opportunity to earn a small salary, health insurance, and tuition remission via teaching the two courses that seem best geared toward supporting ITS students (i.e., English 120: Introduction to Theater and Drama, ca. 350 undergrads enrolled, employs 7 ITS students as TAs; TD/Slavic/C&I 360 typically offers 3 TA positions). However, students explained that serving as TA for these two courses alone does not help build the teaching portfolio that they believe is required for success in a very competitive job market.
Job Placement: Students realize that the academic job market in their field is limited although some said they had not been made aware just how dire the situation appears to be when they first applied to the program. In addition to these general worries that apply to many academic fields, students were specifically concerned about the impact that the split of ITS and T&D had on the resources available to them (course offerings; mentorship; work experience); the reputation of the program; and the professional identity that they would attain (several students expressed the belief that in their future careers they likely would need to draw on skills taught in ITS as well as T&D). They were also confused about the label ‘interdisciplinary’ in the title ITS and some feared that their own lack of understanding might be shared by potential employers who would then fail to identify ITS students as qualified. This worry was compounded by the lack of ITS-specific subject listings, which yielded transcripts full of non-ITS-marked courses.

Despite their concerns, students also expressed a strong sense of gratitude toward the faculty, who – students realized – (a) are struggling not only with the typical multiplicity of demands of a faculty career but (b) who also have worked hard for the program to transition into the present ITS and, (c) who, as a result of the split, need to accommodate competing demands from ITS and their (new) home departments. All the students indicated satisfaction with the availability and clarity of the written set of expectations about requirements and satisfactory progress (source: Exit Survey). Students also recognized the benefit of the program in Theater in Education/ Theater for Youth program, as UW-Madison is one of only 3 such programs nationwide. In addition, students reported a very positive sense of collegiality among peers. Indeed, perhaps realizing the constraints under which the faculty have been laboring, students have been working hard themselves to create a coherent community within ITS (source: Interviews). The Student organization (TDGSO) organizes weekly social meetings and puts on a graduate conference annually.

d.3. Feedback from faculty as it concerns graduate students

Faculty noted some of the same issues that were also identified by students. They mentioned needing to divide their already tightly-budgeted time between ITS and their home department; insufficient funding for student recruitment as well as for students in the program. Some faculty – particularly those housed in departments with endowments, where they realized the stark differential in resources between ITS and other programs – regretted ITS’s comparative lack of ability to provide, fellowships, and summer and research (including travel) support. Faculty also noted a drop in applications that started in 2011. It is unclear whether this drop reflects a national trend (especially in the Humanities) and/or is linked to a variety of situation-specific factors (such as the failed expectation of the establishment of a College of the Arts; or the then-impending process of re/constitution). In light of the current job market and the program’s resources, all ITS
faculty were in favor of a lower target admissions although preferences ranged between two and four new students per year.

d.4. Data that capture fundamentals of the graduate program

In reviewing ITS-relevant data we examined four aspects of the graduate program: (1) Demographics; (2) funding; (3) time to degree; and (4) the range of career outcomes.

(1) Demographics:

In terms of diversity, while ITS has a good record of admitting Domestic Targeted Minorities, very few enroll. From 2006/07-2015/16, there were 16 Applicants, 7 Admits and 2 Enrollments of Domestic Targeted Minorities. Most current ITS students are US citizens, although the program receives a number of international applications annually. ITS has a low but steady international enrollment number. From 2006 to 2015, ITS’s gender balance has held steady at ca. 60-65% female and 35-40% male. The most recent data (for 2015/16) show 22 Applicants (15 Domestic Non-Targeted, 7 International); 10 Admits (8 DNT, 2 I); and 4 New Enrollments (4 DNT, 0 I).

(2) Funding:

Most funding is through TAships, in ENGL/TD 120 (usually 7 spots) and TD/SLAV/C&I 362 (usually 3 slots); other TAships are occasionally available in English, Comm Arts, ILS, the DesignLab, and other programs. The percentage of Full-Time PhD Students with 1st 4 years funded by University is 74%; the percentage of Full-Time M.A. Students with 1st 2 years funded by University is 35%.

(3) Time to degree:

The 10-Year Doctoral Completion Rate for a cohort of 21 is ca. 6.3 years; 86% completed the PhD vs. 71% of all AAUs.

(4) The range of career outcomes:
It is unusual for ITS students with PhDs to achieve a tenure-track appointment immediately out of graduate school. In the last 10 years, 38\(^2\) scholars have graduated from the program. Of these: 23 are in tenure-track positions; 5 are in academic staff or adjunct position; 2 are in higher education administrative positions; 1 is in state-level educational administration; 1 is teaching theatre in a primary school; 2 are working in/with professional and/or community arts organizations; and 4 are working in other fields.

Recommendations:

We believe that the recommendations for community building; revision to the program’s governance structure; and better/more intense use of electronic media will address many of the issues raised by graduate students (and by faculty about the situation of graduate students). As a matter of fact, many of the recommendations that we presented in these sections were strongly influenced by what we heard about the concerns of (as reported by graduate students in interviews and as shown in the Graduate School documents that we referenced) and about (as reported to us by ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty in interviews) graduate students in ITS. As ITS weighs the implementation of these recommendations, we ask that it pay special attention to the desire of graduate students for greater guidance in their professionalization, especially with regard to (a) mentoring in research activities (writing a dissertation; presenting at conferences; preparing and a professional dossier, among other issues); (b) allowing for the possibility to tailor the academic and practice components of the program to specific student career objectives; (c) better communication with regard to the full array of employment opportunities after graduation; (d) greater involvement of students in shaping & maintaining the program (including in aspects of governance); (e) the conveyance of a realistic assessment of the resources that ITS can offer – under the best possible circumstances – to its students; and (f) the setting of program requirements & goals as well as admission criteria & targets that match the program’s abilities to provide well for each of its stakeholders (students, faculty, and administrators).

(e) Outlook

In this section, we address some of the possibilities that ITS may consider beyond the immediate scope of this report. We recognize that each of these suggestions (we do not consider them true recommendations) has a different type of impact on different stakeholder groups and may not be welcome by all. It is for ITS, together with its current stakeholders, to decide whether/how to move forward.

---

\(^2\) Again, please note the discrepancy between two reportings of graduates in the last ten years, i.e. 38 and 40, respectively. It appears that the difference can be attributing to whether graduates of May 2005 are included in the count.
e.1. A comprehensive community-identifying/-building exercise

One of the faculty members that we spoke with suggested a retreat for ITS; we were inspired by the idea but, based on other conversations, are concerned that a retreat at this point in the program’s constitution may put stressors on this emerging community that it is (not yet) equipped to meet. We were wondering, however, whether a meeting of interested parties (including, possibly, select representatives from the Department of Theatre & Drama – especially those who are still listed as ITS ‘affiliates’) around a specific (and rather neutral) topic might serve a conduit to the determination of (1) who would be willing and able to be part of the endeavor that is ITS; (b) what roles individual members are willing and able to play in the program; and (c) how these individual roles could be constituted into a coherent plan of action. We thought that at a meeting on the topic of graduate student professionalization opportunities (via course work; practice experiences, teaching assistantships, and mentoring on the broader scale) might be suitable. It would further help ITS to appear not only as a receiver but also a provider of services and ideas (see also, (e.2.).

e.2. The establishment of a PhD Minor in ITS

Mentioned by several of the ITS faculty members that we talked to, the PhD Minor in ITS does not seem to be a new idea of ours. Indeed, a PhD Minor in ITS could address several of the concerns presented in this report. It could help broaden the connections of ITS across campus; permit a closer collaboration between ITS and ITS-relevant programs that out of practical considerations cannot share ITS’ objectives fully (e.g., foreign language departments); provide a larger cohort of similarly-interested students to students in ITS without imposing on ITS the need to take on cohorts that are larger than what ITS can manage comfortably; and, in some instances, may enable ITS graduate students to participate in events, etc. that are organized by the home departments of ITS PhD Minor students. We do recognize that the introduction of a PhD Minor would impose an additional burden on ITS faculty and, possibly, the graduate program administrator, as requirements will need to be designed and their observance monitored; the new minor will need to be advertised; advising will need to be offered to new students as well as students who are interested in the program; and communication with the home departments of the new PhD Minor students as well as with various university agencies will need to be initiated and maintained.

e.3. A certificate program for undergraduates

Although ITS grants degrees only to graduate students, its curriculum also serves a substantial number of undergraduate students. Given the unpredictably of ITS’s course offerings from semester to semester and from year to year, the program is likely to see a certain amount of volatility in its undergraduate enrollment totals. This could pose some challenges as the College moves toward a system that emphasizes teaching
metrics. Because ITS quite wisely seeks to keep its incoming graduate cohorts small, the program could find itself disadvantaged in measures focused on the total number of credit hours taught. We understand the concern about the proliferation of certificates across the UW campus. Nevertheless, we also believe that there is a potential untapped market for ITS courses, both within the College and in some of the professional schools. Moreover, ITS’s Steering Committee might also develop strategic plans focused on increasing undergraduate enrollments. Such plans would enhance the program’s teaching metrics (and, quite bluntly, its standing or collateral within the Department of English) and might broaden opportunities for teaching assistantships and other professionalization activities for ITS students.

e.4. A meeting to dissect and discuss this report and determine a concrete agenda for action

Just like the idea of the PhD Minor in ITS, the idea of a meeting to dissect and discuss this report and determine a concrete agenda for action is really not ours. It was presented to us by Program Director Mary Trotter as already in the planning stages. We only wanted to express our strong support for this proposal and we hope that this report will be a useful basis for the discussion of ITS members. We would also like to recommend that graduate students as well as the graduate program administrator be included in these deliberations as much as is feasible.
December 15, 2016

Elaine M. Klein
Associate Dean for Academic Planning, College of Letters and Science
307 E South Hall
Bascom Mall
UW-Madison
Madison, WI 53706

RE: Errata in ITS Review Committee Report

Dear Elaine,

Thank you for forwarding the ITS Review Committee Report to me earlier this month. The ITS Steering Committee and faculty are already discussing the committee’s extremely thorough and thoughtful work. I do list in the document, however, some corrections and clarifications around (inevitable) errors of fact discovered in the report.

We are grateful for the review committee’s hard work, and look forward to the APC’s response to the report as well.

Yours sincerely,

Mary Trotter
Director, Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies Program
Associate Professor, English and Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies
Affiliate Faculty, Celtic Studies and CES
Immediate Past President, American Conference for Irish Studies
Pages 1-2
Reviewers’ Report
“The doctoral program in Theatre & Drama (now, ITS) in the last 10 years has lost two faculty members (Barbara Clayton; Robert Skloot) and one academic staff member (Kristin Hunt) and now is constituted of five ‘core’ faculty members (a term that will be explained below).”

Correction/Clarification
The doctoral program has lost one faculty member (Robert Skloot) and two academic staff members (Barbara Clayton and Kristin Hunt)

Page 2
Reviewers’ Report
“Similarly, the three other ITS ‘core’ faculty members also have 50% of their teaching effort dedicated to ITS even as they hold their full-time appointments in other departments, i.e., Associate Professor Michael Peterson in the (new) Department of Theatre & Drama; Professor Mike Vanden Heuvel in the Department of Classics and Near Eastern Studies; and Professor Manon van de Water in the Department of German, Nordic, and Slavic.”

Correction/Clarification
Since in the fall of 2016, Michael Peterson’s tenure home moved to the Art Department. He is now an Associate Professor of Art with a .50 FTE teaching effort dedicated to ITS. At the time of the writing of the self-study, Peterson was still in the Department of Theatre and Drama

Page 2
Reviewers’ Report
“Similarly, another course that is taught by an ITS ‘core’ faculty member (Manon van de Water) and provides TA positions for graduate students in ITS is TD/Slavic/C&I 360.”

Correction/Clarification
The course in question is not TD/Slavic/C&I 360 but TD/Slavic/C&I 362.

Pages 2-3
Reviewers’ Report
“The same self-study also described the program’s governance structure and the Executive Committee’s responsibilities as follows ‘[…] governed by a faculty-elected Program Chair and an executive committee. The executive committee is currently made up of members of the core faculty. The executive committee’s responsibilities include new student recruitment, course scheduling, budgetary decisions and contributing to assessments of student progress.’ However, the current practice is for a Steering Committee to govern the program and for that
Steering Committee to be composed of two ‘core’ faculty members (the program’s Director, Professor Trotter, and Associate Professor Michael Peterson) and two ‘affiliate’ faculty members (Associate Professor Paola Hernandez, Spanish and Portuguese and Professor Christine Garlough, Gender and Women’s Studies).”

Correction/Clarification
I regret that that the self-study did not make more clear our plans for our governing structure. The program shifted to the Steering Committee structure outlined in our request to relocate and rename the program from 2014. When we wrote the self-study in 2015 we were still transitioning into a program fully independent administratively of Theatre and Drama (ITS and Theatre and Drama shared budgetary administrations until June 30th, 2015), and we continued with a version of the model of governance we employed as part of Theatre and Drama, relying exclusively on core faculty to govern the program. In our self-study we signaled the plan to move into a structure similar to that outlined in our 2014 proposal, writing, “we plan to include the option for the executive committee to be made up of selected core and affiliate faculty when the program becomes more established” on page 3 of the self-study. The study should have been more clear by using the new term “steering committee” instead of “executive committee.”

Page 3
Reviewers’ Report
“However, the current practice is for a Steering Committee to govern the program and for that Steering Committee to be composed of two ‘core’ faculty members (the program’s Director, Professor Trotter, and Associate Professor Michael Peterson) and two ‘affiliate’ faculty members (Associate Professor Paola Hernandez, Spanish and Portuguese and Professor Christine Garlough, Gender and Women’s Studies).”

Correction/Clarification
The current steering committee members were elected by ballot by all faculty and affiliates serving in the program in spring semester of 2016. We plan to have members of the steering committee serve three-year appointments, with faculty rotating on and off the committee. This plan may change if we choose to have a significantly larger steering committee. We are grateful to affiliate faculty Professors Paola Hernandez and Christine Garlough for volunteering their efforts toward moving ITS forward. Both Hernandez and Garlough bring superb insights into teaching and research of theatre and performance studies, and their time is in high demand in their own departments and in the profession.

Hernandez and Garlough’s efforts are not only essential due to their intellectual contribution to the program, but also due to the fact that their involvement allows core faculty the opportunity to pursue research or serve L&S and UW in other ways. Core faculty member Manon van de Water requested not to serve on the Steering Committee for the next three years while she continues to serve as ITS’s Director of the Theatre for Youth Program and takes on the Chairship of the newly formed German/Nordic/Scandinavian Department. Core faculty member Mike Vanden Heuvel is on sabbatical after stepping down as Chair of the Integrated Liberal Studies
Program. And core faculty member Aparna Dharwadker received a spring semester 2017 fellowship from the Institute for Research in the Humanities and will be unavailable for service that semester. This situation left only two core faculty members available to serve on the steering committee. Thus, to continue with core faculty governance was not only counter to our proposed governance structure but logistically untenable.

Page 3
Correction/Clarification
Christine Garlough is Associate Professor of Gender and Women’s Studies

Page 3
Reviewers’ Report
“According to a self-study report submitted to the College of Letters and Science on January 1, 2016, between May 2005 and May 2015 (the program’s last academic semester as the doctoral program in Theatre & Drama), the program – specifically its current five ‘core’ faculty members – guided 40 students to the PhD degree and had another 11 students working toward degree completion, many of whom have since finished.”

Correction/Clarification
The committee is correct that the I (Trotter) provided them a breakdown of 38 rather than 40 graduates in the last ten years as part of a lengthy document the reviewers requested covering a large range of topics. In my haste to get the requested information to the committee as quickly as possible I overlooked two of our forty graduates between 2005 and 2015. Allow me to offer the correct numbers here:

- PhD alumni from 2005-2015 currently work in the following positions.
  - Tenure-track/tenured higher education 23
  - Non-tenure track higher education 5
  - Primary/secondary education 2
  - Higher education administration 2
  - State-level educational administration 1
  - Arts/creative activity 3
  - Positions outside education or arts 4

I sent the review committee members this data in response to their concern that our graduates do not usually move into academic positions immediately after graduation. This data reflects our high levels of placement in a highly competitive field, where very few students move immediately from graduation into an academic position.
Page 5
Reviewers’ Report
“The Graduate School’s description of the program states that the ‘minimum course requirement’ for the PhD is 51 credits but the program handbook stipulates that students need 69 credits to graduate.”

Correction/Clarification
The minimum course requirement number in the graduate school description is the minimum number of courses beyond transfer credits. The handbook stipulates the total number of courses required for completing the program, including transfer credits. Students who matriculate into the PhD program with an MA may transfer up to 18 credits, then take 51 credits of coursework at UW, totaling 69 credits.

Page 6
Reviewers’ Report
“[The ITS Program] is essentially in a diaspora i.e., a community that needs to establish itself as such via a concerted effort rather than the more typical organic means that arise from the benefits of a shared space, time together, and accountability to/within the same hierarchical structures.”

Correction/Clarification
While we appreciate the reviewers’ observation that having faculty and curriculum dispersed across several departments requires a concerted effort to a higher degree than a program within a single department, we believe that the use of the term diaspora is problematic. Diaspora implies that the theatre and performance MA and PhD on campus is in a state of exile and displacement. However, our relocation to English (our very hospitable new administrative home) has in fact allowed us to stay in our “ancestral home” of the College of Letters and Science, while the Theatre and Drama Department decided to move from the College of Letters and Science to the School of Education. Also, the MA and PhD relied on affiliate faculty across campus to support its mission while still in Theatre and Drama. In other words, we appreciate and acknowledge the reviewers’ astute and well considered observations of the very real difficulties of a program with faculty distributed across departments, but we made this change to the program in order to maintain core program values and practices, best cultivated by maintaining our home in L&S.

Page 8
All ITS students now have access to mailboxes from the English Department

Page 9
Reviewers’ Report:
“the housing department serves as tenure & budgetary home for some but all ITS faculty members”

Correction/Clarification
This sentence should read, “some but not all ITS faculty members”

Pages 18-19
Reviewers’ Report
“According to the (2014 program proposal) document, the governing structure [of ITS] was to consist of: (a) A Program Director; (b) a Steering Committee (made up of four elected members of the core and affiliate faculty); and (c) a/the Director of the Theatre for Youth Program. However, according to the self-study document...(2015)...The ITS Program is governed by a faculty-elected Program Chair and the executive committee. The executive committee is currently made up of members of core faculty”

Correction/Clarification
Please see note regarding pages 2-3

Page 19
Reviewers’ Report
The Director of the Theatre for Youth Program does not have a permanent seat on the steering committee (and does not, in fact, serve on the steering committee now).

Correction/Clarification
The Director of the Theatre for Youth Program took on the position of Chair of the newly formed German/Nordic/Slavic Studies Department this fall, and currently serves on the executive board of an international TFY organization that requires a significant amount of trouble. Thus, she has asked not to be included on the Steering Committee while she serves as GNS Chair.

Page 19
Reviewers’ Report
“Only ‘core’ faculty appear to be entrusted with the advising of dissertations and only papers written in the courses by the ‘core’ faculty can be used toward the Prelim A exam portfolio.”

Correction/Clarification
Papers written in courses taught by ITS affiliate faculty may indeed be used in Prelim A exams. The report is correct that, at this time, only core faculty sit on Prelim A exam defenses.

Page 24
Reviewers’ Report
“Student[sic?] also expressed a desire for an orientation to the faculty, courses, degree requirements and the community at large upon arrival.”

Correction/Clarification
While this expression was one or more students’ opinion, we are concerned that student/s did not think they received an orientation. During welcome week, all new students participate in a one-hour new student orientation which covers faculty, courses and degree requirements as
outlined in the program handbook, followed by individual course advising from the program director. They also are invited to an all-program meeting and social during welcome week or the first week of classes. We hope that, with the help of our newly elected student representative to the ITS Steering Committee, we can redress this issue.

Page 24-25
Reviewers’ Report
“RE: student concerns that Theatre and Drama courses, production experiences and TA positions are no longer available to them since ITS’s relocation and renaming.”

Correction/Clarification
ITS students have the same number of opportunities to take Theatre and Drama courses and participate in University Theatre productions as they did before the split. Indeed, ITS students have continued to work as actors and dramaturgs for University Theatre productions and have taken Theatre and Drama courses every semester since ITS’s relocation in Fall of 2015. As for TA positions, ITS students were not offered TA positions in acting or design by the Theatre and Drama department before the split, so there has not actually been a loss of teaching opportunities with ITS’s relocation in English. Indeed, our students continue to teach TA positions in Integrated Liberal Studies and Communication Arts, and several ITS students are enjoying working in the writing center or teaching composition in the English Department this year. This clarification does not dismiss, however, the students’ desire for more curricular, practice and teaching opportunities. Rather, we wish to correct the assumption that curricular teaching and production opportunities were lost with the renaming and relocation of the program. We will clarify this matter with our students while also striving to create more opportunities for them.
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19 February 2018

TO: Sarah Mangelsdorf, Provost
    Bill Karpus, Dean of the Graduate School

FROM: Sarah Pfatteicher, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, CALS

CC: Dominique Brossard, Chair, Department of Life Sciences Communication
    Jocelyn Milner, Director, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
    Sarah Kuba, Associate Academic Planner, APIR
    Kate VandenBosch, Dean, CALS
    Nikki Bollig, Assistant Dean for Academic Policies and Planning

RE: Program Review of Life Sciences Communication BS, MS, & Doctoral Minor

We are pleased to report that the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences has completed the first stages of the program review for the Life Sciences Communication bachelor’s and master’s of science degrees and doctoral minor (program code ALS 054). The self-study prepared by the program and the report of the review committee are attached to this memorandum, along with the departmental response to the review, which corrects several errors of fact in the review committee report. Readers may find it helpful to review the departmental response alongside the review committee report to obtain the most accurate reflection of the program. The assessment of our Academic Planning Council, by unanimous vote, is that the LSC programs are strong and should continue.

The CALS APC met on December 5th to hear from Prof. Beth Olson, who chaired the review committee, and again on January 16th to hear from Prof. Dominique Brossard, the chair of the Life Sciences Communication Department. The review was unanimously accepted by APC on January 16th as complete, with comments and recommendations to ensure the future strength and resilience of the program, as outlined below.

As noted by the review committee and echoed by the APC, the academic programs in LSC are strong and the department exhibited skill at recognizing their own strengths and weaknesses. The programs benefit from the collegiality of the faculty, impressive facilities, and strong alumni support, and are characterized by strong placement rates for graduates, a flexible undergraduate curriculum that facilitates use of LSC as a second major, and a commitment to fully fund master’s students.
The program review notes three particular areas to watch and improve in the LSC programs. First, the challenge of covering all the courses in the undergraduate curriculum with current faculty resources was noted. A faculty search is currently underway and is expected to provide some relief in this area. Second, the acceptance rate for minority applicants to the master’s degree is lower than the department would prefer. The department is exploring approaches to this challenge, and is encouraged to connect with resources in the college and on campus to continue to address this challenge. Third, undergraduate advising has had several staff turnovers in recent years. Students report the quality of the advising has remained strong despite the changes and that they welcome stability and consistency in this position. Given their current staffing for advising, this has likely already improved significantly.

In addition to these program-specific comments, the review noted the need for improvement in the Graduate Handbook, a suggestion that has been made to virtually all graduate programs undergoing review in recent years, and the department has indicated its plans to undertake this project.

We applaud the department’s interest in continuous improvement and their engagement in efforts to develop and enhance revenue streams, within the constraints that exist in human and financial resources.

We look forward to working with campus leadership, GFEC, and the UAPC on the next stage of this review.
Life Sciences Communication Department Review Summary and Recommendations

**Review Committee:** Laura Jull, Beth Olson (chair), Christa Olson (GFEC representative), Randy Stoecker.

**Background:** The Life Sciences Communication (LSC) program is located at Hiram Smith Hall on Observatory Dr. on the UW-Madison campus. There are currently 18 faculty in the department representing professional instructional staff and tenure-track faculty. The general stature and status of the department is very high. Cornell University has a comparable status to LSC.

LSC prepares students for careers as professional communicators in scientific and technical fields or for graduate school. Scientific areas of expertise include the environment and natural resources, health and nutrition, agriculture, new technologies such as biotechnology, and social sciences.

Graduates of the program are highly sought after by employers across scientific and communication industries. Key to the education that LSC students receive is a combination of theoretical grounding and state-of-the-art practical applications in rapidly changing media environments. Their instructors are a mix of world-class researchers and real-world practitioners of regional, national and international profiles.

The mission of LSC programs fits well within their home department. In 1908, LSC became the first department of what was then termed Agricultural Journalism in the world, and has retained its leadership position in science communication ever since. All case studies and examples used in teaching fall within CALS key strategic areas (health, food, bioenergy, climate change, community development). LSC undergraduate and graduate courses are central to the land grant mission of CALS and the University mission. They preparing professionals ready to join a cutting-edge workforce at the intersection of science, media and society.

**Review Process:** The committee was charged by CALS Senior Associate Dean Richard Straub to review the Academic Programs of Life Sciences Communications (LSC) as follows:

- Life Sciences Communication, BS (10-year review)
- Life Sciences Communication, MS (10-year review)
- Life Sciences Communication, Doctoral Minor (10-year review)

The committee received and reviewed the LSC self-study, as well as documents from the Graduate School which included data on admission, enrollment and other metrics for the LSC MS degree, demographics and a campus peer comparison for the MS, and data on use of the doctoral minors over the past 10 years. The committee also requested and received from LSC
their new handbook for the MS degree and recent metrics on their undergraduate program assessment. The committee requested the 2007 self-study and review from CALS to better understand the response to that review included in the 2017 self-study.

The committee met on September 6 to review the materials, September 27th to finalize guiding questions for in-person discussions with LSC faculty, instructors, staff and graduate and undergraduate students, and October 11th to discuss and complete their report.

Schedule for In-Person Meeting with LSC

October 4, 2017
9:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m.
Room 225 Hiram Smith Hall

Review Committee: Beth Olson (chair), Randy Stoecker, Christa Olson, Laura Jull

9:00-10:00 a.m.  LSC Faculty
Dominique Brossard, Dietram Scheufele, Bret Shaw, Larry Meiller, Shiela Reaves, Neil Stenhouse

10:00-11:00 a.m.  LSC Instructors
Mike Flaherty, Gunther Nelson, Ron Seely, Don Stanley

11:00-11:45 a.m.  LSC Student Services Coordinator, Tera Holtz

11:45-12:00 p.m.  Break

12:00-1:00 p.m.  LSC Undergrads

1:00-1:45 p.m.  LSC MS Students
The review committee met with nine graduate students. Eight are currently enrolled in the MS and one had completed the MS and was enrolled in the joint doctorate in LSC / Mass Communication. Of the nine, six were following the thesis track, two the professional track, and one was undecided.

1:45-2:30 p.m.  Meeting with LSC Director of Graduate Studies
Dietram Scheufele (past), Bret Shaw (current)

2:30-2:45 p.m.  Break

2:45-3:30 p.m.  Meeting with LSC Director of Undergraduate Studies, Shiela Reaves

3:30-4:00 p.m.  Meeting & Facility Tour with Chair, Dominique Brossard

Overall Summary and Recommendations

Areas of Strength

The department has a strong national and international reputation. The department talks about their visibility in relation to competing programs in places such as Cornell, as well as the professional prominence of their practice instructors in their respective fields.
The department is successful in placing its graduates at both the Bachelor's and Master's levels into professional employment and graduate school. The department also carefully tracks and maintains contact with their alumni. The successful placement of their graduates, and tracking them, also means they can bring them back to campus to talk to current students and provide network links to help their improvement prospects.

They have a mix of strong research and theory faculty and strong practice instructors. The department has developed a strategy of building a strong faculty in theory and research, and a strong cadre of practice instructors who continue their work in the field. This allows them to provide a balance of student education in theory and practice.

There is a strong sense of community. The small size of the department makes it easier for everyone to know each other. Undergrad and grad students felt like they recognized and knew each other, and knew the faculty and academic staff. Among the instructional staff, there is also a strong sense of collegiality, even between faculty and academic staff. Perhaps because both faculty and academic staff are prominent in their respective fields, there are strong relationships between them, and engagement of the academic staff in department decision-making.

The department's internal teaching facilities are strong, including professional studio rooms and classrooms that facilitate active learning. They also seem to have the visual and audio hardware that they require. The department uses a variety of specialized visual, audio, and other software that they seem satisfied with. They have achieved these resources through their own fundraising.

The department is able to fund all of its Master's students. Sometimes this involves a combination of funding with RA and PA positions. The RA funding also helps the department organize a grad student research group.

The undergraduate program has a lot of flexibility, allowing students to choose courses from other departments. The students very much appreciate this flexibility as it allows them to customize the major to meet their individual interests. But it does come with a flip side we will discuss below.

Areas of Concern

The department expresses that they have some difficulty covering all the courses in the undergraduate major with their current faculty resources. Students have mentioned that there are courses they would like to take but are not offered when they need them. The department is currently hiring and that may provide some relief.

The acceptance rate of minority applicants for the Master's degree is lower than the department would wish. The statistics on this issue are influenced by the small numbers involved, and the department's recruitment strategies that emphasize attracting minority applications. They are also working hard to explore ways they might support minority students whose educational records make difficult to admit.

Undergraduate advising was a challenge because of turnover among department staff. Some students report having had three different advisors over the course of their time in the major. But the students have only positive comments about the current undergraduate advisor.
While there is, from our perspective, a strong sense of community across the students and faculty in the department, the graduate students express a desire for a stronger sense of community. The department is already addressing this desire by organizing more social events and a research group.

The flexibility of the undergraduate curriculum, while highly valued by students for its support of individual interests (see areas of strength above), can also make it difficult for some undergraduates to develop a sense of community through their classes.

Recommendations

Our recommendations mainly support the department's self-recommendations.

The department sees strong growth potential for their PhD minor. They also see realizing at least some of this potential without requiring a lot of extra faculty resources.

Likewise, the department sees strong growth potential for their online offerings. This too may be possible without requiring a lot of extra resources.

The department is noticing an increase in the number of students who are double majoring with them, and is thinking about ways to support increasing the number of students who may choose LSC for their second major.

As social media communication expands in importance, the department is thinking about ways to further develop their curriculum to better serve students interested in the field.

The department is currently revising its graduate student handbook to include grievance and disciplinary policies.

The department is continuing to strategize ways to increase the diversity of their admitted Master's students. We applaud and encourage the department to continue exploring strategies, engaging with the available campus resources, collaborating in joint recruitment with other departments, and looking at how to further develop the climate to support diverse students.

The retirement of one faculty member and a new hire will provide the department with the opportunity to review its current course offerings. In the interim, they need to maximize lines of communication with the undergraduate advisor and with undergraduates to know what courses will most likely, and least likely, be offered in the next couple of years.

In times of austerity, everyone is short staffed. That is also true of LSC. The department explored, and then shelved, a strategy to have faculty do advising because the number of majors would completely overwhelm the faculty's availability. More faculty would also allow the department to offer more courses in-house, helping to build a greater sense of community among the undergraduates.

Graduate Education

Curriculum: Course offerings and faculty availability; strengths and gaps

At the graduate level, Life Sciences Communication (LSC) offers a Master of Science degree and a doctoral minor. This review did not include LSC's joint Ph.D. program in Mass Communication. The
Master’s program is active, successful, and the LSC faculty are strongly committed to it. The doctoral minor had fallen into disuse but the program is invested in revitalizing it and has already begun doing so. They have a clear target audience for the doctoral minor and are seeing increasing enrollments.

The MS degree offers two tracks, one with a thesis (24 credits + thesis) and one without (30 credits). Students in the two tracks are treated equally in terms of funding, mentoring, and access to faculty. The faculty expressed strong support for both tracks and students indicated that both were valued and had sufficient courses and support. The size of the MS program has declined since 2008 due to intentional planning on LSC’s part. The goals of that reduction were to provide full funding for all incoming students, improve the quality of the program overall, and allow better mentoring. Faculty feel that the program is now the right size and that the move to full funding, especially, has been beneficial for program climate. Knowing that demand for graduate opportunities in science communication continues to be high, the former Director of Graduate Studies identified creating an online Master’s in science communication aimed at working professionals as a possible future direction for the LSC graduate program. At this time, however, the department does not have the FTE to pursue that idea.

The small size of the LSC faculty effects course availability within Life Sciences Communication, but the department has organized the Master’s requirements to allow students to complete the degree using a combination of coursework inside and outside of LSC. The graduate students we met explained that they generally took one course each semester with an LSC faculty member and another 1-2 outside the department. Students in the professional track are able to take more courses with LSC faculty because they take more classes and are able to enroll in mixed undergraduate / graduate courses.

LSC faculty offer a reasonable range of graduate courses and a sufficient number of courses to allow for timely completion of Master’s degree. The faculty are invested in mentoring Master’s students and the students report that they receive excellent support. Program graduates are successful in finding relevant employment and gaining admission to doctoral programs. Any weaknesses in the program are related to the number of faculty available, but those weaknesses are consistently off-set by flexibility in coursework and proactive mentoring. At the time of the review, the new graduate handbook for the Master’s degree did not include grievance and disciplinary policies, but the department was in the process of adding them.

The Doctoral Minor requires ten credits, including participation in the credit-bearing LSC Colloquium and either LSC 720 (Introduction to Communication Theory and Research), LSC 902 (Public Opinion of Life Science Issues), or LSC 860 (Science and Environment Communication). Students in the Doctoral Minor then choose an additional six credits from an array of fifteen approved electives. LSC has recently worked to raise the profile of the Minor among students in the bench sciences, promoting it as a useful, communication-focused counterpart to their scientific training. The LSC Student Services Coordinator estimates that there are currently 18 students working toward the Minor along with approximately 100 graduate students from other departments who have taken an LSC or LSC cross-listed course since fall 2016. The department is actively recruiting students to the Minor and has added a graduate attribute to some of the advanced professional skills courses offered by the department (e.g. LSC 532 Web Design for the Sciences, LSC 560 Scientific Writing, and LSC 432 Social Media for the Life Sciences) to ensure that graduate students can access that professional training.

Graduate Students: Recruitment, funding, advising, expectations, learning goals and career opportunities
Overview: LSC Master's students were uniformly positive in their view of the program. They identified its collaborative spirit and top-notch faculty as particular strengths. Though they raised possible areas for improvement, those suggestions were offered as ways to make a strong program even stronger. The most consistently raised "weakness" was the program's flexibility, but students simultaneously described flexibility as a program strength. Because of the program's interdisciplinary nature and small faculty, Master's students take many graduate courses outside of LSC. This dispersion allows graduate students to tailor their degrees to their specific interests. However, some find the range of options overwhelming even with the excellent mentorship they receive from LSC faculty. Students also noted that being spread across campus makes it difficult to form community. For most, teaching positions in the department were the main source of connections with colleagues. Others cited the Research Group as a productive community space, though not all Master's students participate in the group.

Funding: LSC guarantees full funding (at 40%) for all Master's students throughout their career and offers opportunities for additional support. Most Teaching Assistantships in LSC are in LSC 100 (which fulfills the Communications A requirement) but there are also Teaching Assistants in some upper-division undergraduate courses. The students felt the funding available to them was fair and that the processes for awarding Teaching Assistant and Project Assistant positions was transparent. Because available Teaching Assistant appointments are announced early in the process, students feel they have sufficient time to plan and apply. Students noted that availability for Project Assistant positions was less transparent but only because those positions depended on faculty receiving outside funding. They appreciated faculty commitment to identifying Teaching Assistant and Project Assistant positions that would be of particular use to students based on their career trajectory and then connecting them to those opportunities.

Mentoring: LSC has a robust and carefully designed mentoring and advising system for Master's students. Incoming Master's students are assigned a temporary "Orientation" Advisor on admission. The program stresses that students can change advisors at any time but assign this first advisor to ensure access to program information. Orientation advisors are assigned based on student interest and with attention to faculty mentoring load. A few graduate students described some initial confusion about the "orientation" aspect of the advisor but said advisors were helpful in clarifying their role. Students clearly understood that they were free to change advisors as desired. Though a few students made passing comments about the challenge of having advisors on leave, all nine students expressed appreciation for and comfort with mentoring in the department.

Assessment: In addition to working with their advisors, LSC graduate students receive an annual formal assessment from the graduate committee. Each student submits a portfolio including a report form and CV listing professional and academic activities. The LSC graduate committee compiles these reports, reviews them, and provides students with written feedback each year. The current and former Directors of Graduate Studies noted that this process ensures that students stay on track and receive the support they need to be successful. Students felt that expectations, learning goals, and assessment mechanisms were clear across the program, highlighting the value of the annual progress reports.

Recruitment: While noting that they have maintained high-quality graduate student cohorts who have seen significant success after graduation, the current and former Directors of Graduate Study identified recruiting the best students from outside the University of Wisconsin as a persistent challenge. LSC often uses a "grow your own star" approach, encouraging their best undergraduate students to apply
for the Master's degree and using the Thesis Master's to support the joint doctoral program in Mass Communication. Because competitor programs are investing in recruitment, it is becoming increasingly difficult to attract strong students from outside of UW-Madison simply by being a top-ranked program. While both Directors of Graduate Study and other faculty expressed strong commitment to the Master's degree as a stand-alone master's program (rather than a direct path to the doctorate), they recognized that competitor programs recruit directly to the Ph.D, making them more desirable for some students.

The Master's program has had some difficulty recruiting, admitting, and enrolling graduate students who are members of targeted domestic minority groups. The ten-year average rate of admission for targeted domestic minority applicants is nearly thirty points lower than for white applicants. The committee recognized that a portion of that percentage difference could be attributable to the low numbers of applicants involved. The Directors of Graduate Study also indicated that in previous years LSC outreach programs had generated significant enthusiasm among students but those students hadn't always been prepared for graduate work. Even after an additional review by the admissions committee taking a holistic view of candidates' qualifications, a lower percentage of those applicants were ultimately admitted. Recent efforts at recruitment have been more targeted and the department is hopeful that they will show results. The newly hired Student Services Coordinator has experience with helping graduate programs increase diversity and has begun work on that front for LSC. In the last six months she has attended recruiting events focused on attracting under-represented minorities to graduate programs. Those events include SACNAS (the Society for the Advancement of Chicano and Native American Students), the Bioscience Preview Weekend (a diversity preview event where she represented the doctoral minor), and the UW-Madison Graduate School Fair focused on prospective graduate students from under-represented minority groups. In addition, because the graduate program frequently draws applicants from LSC's pool of undergraduate students, it seems plausible that the program's successful attention to increasing diversity at the undergraduate level could result in a more diverse pool of applicants well-prepared for the Master's.

Undergraduate Education

Curriculum: Background, facilities, courses, capstone, internships strengths and gaps

Background Information:

In 2012, the LSC department revamped its undergraduate major and added a vision statement for the major, based on suggestions from the 2007 LSC department review. The major was evaluated, streamlined and reorganized based on the vision statement and input from students, faculty, staff, and other stakeholders, including professionals in the industry. Courses were reorganized, learning outcomes were produced with the necessary assessment of these learning goals outlined, course titles and numbers were changed and organized into a systematic format. Redundant and obsolete courses were eliminated and new, required courses were created to meet content needs of the discipline and changing employment opportunities.

All faculty teach three courses a year. Undergraduate students feel the teaching staff are excellent in what they do and genuinely care about students’ progress and success. There is a nice balance between instructional faculty who are field based and those that are more academic based, both offering a
diverse skill set. Courses taught by professionals in the field bring in real-world experiences into the classroom. Many classes are project based, and may involve a community partner who subsequently uses the communication—an example of a real-world experience. Tenure-track academic faculty research is discussed in the classroom. Top notch lecturers, including former alumni, are often brought into classes for as a guest lecturer. LSC undergraduates are a major source of recruits for the LSC Master’s program.

Faculty and undergraduate students feel there are good lines of communication and a strong sense of community between them. The LSC program is better organized since the last departmental review in 2007 with a detailed protocol for undergraduate procedures. With a newly renovated, intimate building and smaller faculty size, students and faculty feel they enjoy a collegial, positive and welcoming environment. Social events with faculty and undergraduate students is well received, including the banquet for scholarship recipients where students meet the scholarship donors.

**Facilities:**

Teaching facilities within the building include one regular classroom, two computer labs, three radio labs, and a video editing lab (some of these facilities were made possible by alumni donations). The goal of the undergraduate population in LSC is to house 200-225 majors. Currently, there are 140 majors in the department, up from 40 in 2007. Enrollment has increased significantly for double majors whose first major is outside of LSC. However, the faculty feel this increased demand for current and new LSC courses is not sustainable as the amount of teaching FTE and teaching assistant support is inadequate to meet the demands of larger class sizes. New faculty hires would significantly help address this issue and keep the enrollment in the major high.

Teaching facilities inside the department are considered adequate for small enrollment courses (< 31), however, larger enrollment LSC courses must be taught outside of Hiram Smith Hall. Many faculty and students have stated the teaching facilities in external, larger classrooms on campus are inferior and inadequate in physical equipment (cameras, lights, video recorders) and software with no technical support available.

**Courses:**

LSC undergraduate courses focus on writing, editing, producing messages, planning, designing and evaluating effective communication programs. Students report on science, health, agriculture or the environment and internships are strongly recommended. There are many LSC courses listed in the course catalog (38 from 100-699 level), but several of them are no longer offered or offered infrequently. This was mentioned in the previous 2007 LSC departmental review and is addressed again in this review.

Students are required to take 24 credits in the major, up from a previous requirement of 18 credits, starting with an introductory science writing course (LSC 111 or 212, both 3 credits) before taking more advanced courses in the major. Following this foundation course, students are required to take 12 credits of core courses including LSC 250, LSC 251 (both 3 credits) and 6 credits from LSC 270, 314, 320, 332, 350, or 360. A capstone course, either LSC 515 or 640, both 3 credits, is required for the major. Students are then required to take 6 credits in one of two concentrations. The first concentration is Communication Strategy that focuses on skills and theory to effectively communicate with audiences in
life sciences, while satisfying the long-term strategic goals of an organization. This concentration includes courses in advertising, social marketing, and risk communication. The second concentration is Communication Skills and Technologies. It focuses on the skills required to translate organized information into informative and persuasive messages for a variety of media. This concentration includes courses in news writing, documentary photography, publications editing, web design, and video production.

Some undergraduate students voiced a desire for a required course that teaches AP style. This need has been addressed by the faculty with the development of a new course, LSC 430, Communicating Science with Narrative within the Communication Skills and Technologies concentration (though the course is not required). Some students expressed concern that many LSC courses are focused primarily on agriculture issues and would like to see more courses covering life sciences, health, environment and nanotechnology.

Communication Strategy concentration courses LSC 440, 444, 616, and 660 and Communication Skills and Technologies concentration courses LSC 450 and 505 are not offered or offered irregularly due to either lack of faculty to teach the course/retirements. However, these courses still appear on the LSC B.S. degree curriculum sheet. The undergraduate students who spoke to the review committee mentioned some frustration with course availability, noting especially a desire to take LSC 450, Documentary Photography for the Sciences. Since many students join the major late in their career and have limited time remaining at UW-Madison, they miss out on courses that are offered irregularly. LSC 617, Health Communication in the Information Age, is currently taught by the Journalism and Mass Communications program and is difficult for students to register as the course is offered irregularly. The review committee recommends that LSC review irregularly offered courses and determine whether they should be kept in the curriculum. There will be a new faculty hire soon who will be assigned to teach LSC 270 and 435.

Based on student interest, the LSC department is working to revive its honors program to allow undergraduates interested in research to work with a faculty advisor on a project leading to development of a research honors thesis.

**Capstone, Internships and Career Opportunities:**

The LSC faculty and advisors strongly encourage students to take an internship during their degree enrollment.

On average, 5-10 internship and job opportunity announcements are shared weekly with students from the Student Services Coordinator and the two instructors who work closely with employers to develop student internship opportunities.

Students may also elect to take a Capstone course, with two options available.

**Undergraduate Students: Orientation, recruitment, advising, learning goals and assessment**

**Orientation and recruitment of new students:**

There is an orientation for in-coming undergraduate students that includes a tour of the Hiram Smith building and classroom facilities, introductions of faculty and staff and advisors. Students are informed of all campus welcome events through email and on the department's social media platforms such as
Facebook, Twitter and Instagram. Other important departmental information is advertised heavily through social media, list-serves and emails.

Approximately 30% of new LSC majors come from students who take LSC 100, Science and Storytelling, a non-major course that fulfills the Communications A requirement. This course addresses sustainability and climate change issues, particularly important for professional track students. The Student Services Coordinator has implemented new strategies for attracting students to the LSC major. Her presence across campus to discuss the major and double majoring in LSC has received positive feedback. Various brochures, public service announcements and social media outreach resulted in increasing undergraduate LSC majors. Recent undergraduates and graduate students post on social media what they are doing now with their LSC careers in hopes of recruiting future LSC majors.

**Advising:**

The average time to degree for LSC undergraduate majors was 4.18 years for 2015-2016. This is within UW-Madison campus goals in terms of degree performance and completion rates. Of these undergraduate students in the major, 64% of LSC seniors planned to work full time in the industry following graduation and 29% were planning on going directly to graduate school, either at UW-Madison or at other institutions.

First year students can declare their major when they attend SOAR. For current students who want to declare LSC as their major, they need to meet with the Student Services Coordinator. Once a student achieves senior status (above 86 credits), they cannot declare a LSC major. LSC places advisor holds on all declared majors every semester prior to enrollment for the following semester until students meet with their advisor.

There was discussion about switching to a faculty advising model, however, there is not enough faculty in the department to advise the goal of 200 students. Faculty would need training on how to advise students and the necessary academic requirements, therefore, this faculty advising model is not being implemented in the near future. The high quality of student advising is provided by the Student Services Coordinator and Advisor, Tara Holtz, who advises 90% of the declared majors, with the remaining 10% advised by two faculty members, Shiela Reaves, Professor and Director of Undergraduate Studies, and Larry Meiller, Professor Emeritus and Senior Lecturer. The students who met with the review committee expressed some concern about turnover in the Advisor position but were pleased with the current Advisor. Faculty advisors help students with internships, jobs post-graduation and applying to graduate school. A performance review of the Student Services Coordinator is conducted annually with feedback from the faculty to ensure continued excellence in student advising.

For LSC undergraduates, a 4-year degree plan, list of courses on the curriculum sheet, and a fillable degree and course planning worksheet are available online. Further information about course availability and schedule would help students plan their major. Other information for undergraduates is available on the website but may benefit from more organization, perhaps in a similar format to the graduate handbook.

**Learning Goals and Assessment:**

The LSC major has established 6 undergraduate student learning goals: 1) Science Communication Theory and Practice, 2) Critical Thinking, 3) Media and Audience, 4) Global Science and Society, 5)
Teamwork, Policy and Democracy, and 6) Ethics and Diverse Views. Each year, the department will address two learning goals in specific courses.

In Spring 2017 semester, assessment of two learning goals was conducted in the department. Learning goal two, Critical Thinking, was evaluated in the final project, oral presentation of LSC’s two capstone courses, LSC 515 and 640 (only one is required). Learning goal four, Global Science and Society, was evaluated in a written assignment in LSC 251, Science, Media and Society, which is a required course for LSC majors. This assessment will be presented in Fall 2017 to the LSC Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the LSC Executive Committee. Learning goals one, three, five and six will be addressed in the future in LSC courses, but we are not sure which courses will address these goals. Students feel some of the new learning goals/objectives are met in their current courses, while other courses, the learning goals/objectives are unclear. This could easily be addressed in the course syllabus and specific courses listed under each learning goal; similar to learning goals two and four above.
November 21, 2017

TO: Nikki Bollig
    CALS Assistant Dean for Academic Programs and Policies
    116a Agricultural Hall

FR: Dominique Brossard, Chair, Department of Life Sciences Communication

RE: LSC Program Review Report

The LSC faculty and staff thank the review committee for their thorough review of our B.S., Masters and Ph.D. minor programs. After review of the LSC program review report, we have found the following errors of fact that need to be corrected.

1) On page 1, the report says that we have 18 faculty members. In reality, we have 7 tenure track faculty members, 2 faculty associates, 6 lecturers, and 3 affiliate tenure track faculty members.

2) On page 6, it is stated “LSC guarantees full funding (at 40%) for all Master’s students throughout their career and offers opportunities for additional support.” This is incorrect. We do need guarantee full funding. We strive to fund all the students (and do so on a regular basis), this is linked to available resources.

3) On page 7, it reads ‘All faculty teach three courses a year.’ This is technically correct, but is adjusted to each faculty percentage appointment (Bret Shaw teaches one course a year due to his 80% Extension appointment).

4) On page 8, it is stated, regarding courses, that “several of them are no longer offered.” This is incorrect, the course catalog has been updated and the only courses listed are the ones that will be offered in the future, even they are not right now.

5) On page 9, it is stated that “Some students expressed concern that many LSC courses are focused primarily on agriculture issues and would like to see more courses covering life sciences, health, environment and nanotechnology.” This is incorrect and was puzzling to the faculty, since no LSC course focuses primarily on agriculture issues. We would like to know what courses the students were referring to since it is unlikely they are LSC courses.

6) On page 10, the second paragraph refers to LSC 100 and states “This course addresses sustainability and climate change issues, particularly important for professional track students.” This is inaccurate. LSC 100 is a Comm A course for undergraduate students, no graduate student takes it.
It does not address climate change and sustainability particularly. An accurate description of the course is “LSC 100 addresses the importance of storytelling in explaining science and uses a text that explores race, gender and poverty issues in science in the bestselling book, "The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks" by Rebecca Skloot”.

7) On page 10, fifth paragraph, LSC Student Services Coordinator, Tera Holtz’s first name is misspelled.

8) On page 11, the schedule of learning goal assessment for the undergraduate major is inaccurate. Corrections are inserted below in red.

   a. In 2016-2017, assessment of two learning goals was conducted in the department. Learning goal two, Critical Thinking, was evaluated in the final project, oral presentation of LSC’s two capstone courses, LSC 515 and 640 (students are only required to take one capstone course). Learning goal four, Global Science and Society, was evaluated in a written assignment in LSC 251, Science, Media and Society, which is a required course for LSC majors. This assessment will be presented in Fall 2017 to the LSC Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the LSC Executive Committee. In 2017-2018, learning goal one, Science Communication Theory and Practice and learning goal five, Teamwork, Policy, Democracy will be assessed in capstone courses LSC 515 and 640 (only one is required). In 2018-2019, learning goal three, Media and Audience and learning goal six, Ethics and Diverse Views, will be evaluated in capstone courses LSC 515 and 640 (only one is required). Students feel some of the new learning goals/objectives are met in their current courses, while other courses, the learning goals/objectives are unclear. This could easily be addressed in the course syllabus and specific courses listed under each learning goal; similar to learning goals two and four above.
Enrollment in Graduate School Programs

Select Term:
- Fall Term

Select Student Category:
- Female/Male

Degree Level:
- All

Disciplinary Division:
- All

Academic Plan:
- Life Sciences Communication MS

Named Option:
- All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2007</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2009</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2017</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This visualization was created by the UW-Madison Graduate School Office of Academic Planning and Assessment. Questions should be directed to Peter Kinsley, peter.kinsley@wisc.edu.
This visualization was created by the UW-Madison Graduate School Office of Academic Planning and Assessment. Questions should be directed to Peter Kinsley, peter.kinsley@wisc.edu.
Graduate School Time to Degree: 2008-2017

- 1+ to 2 years: 39.0%
- 2+ to 3 years: 33.9%
- One year or less: 8.5%
- 3+ to 4 years: 8.5%
- More than 4 years: 10.2%

This visualization was created by the UW-Madison Graduate School Office of Academic Planning and Assessment. Questions should be directed to Peter Kinsley, peter.kinsley@wisc.edu.
Proposal for
Annual Assessment and Feedback (AAF) on Progress Towards Degree to
Doctoral Students

Premise. Every doctoral student should get an annual feedback of his/her progress towards degree beginning in the third year.

Graduate School presently does not have a policy to assure that every doctoral student is assessed annually and given a written feedback on his/her academic and research progress. Many of our peer institutions such as Duke University, University of Arizona, University of California-Berkeley, Columbia University, and University of Florida have such policies. Despite, the lack of such a policy at UW-Madison, many of our graduate programs conduct such a formal assessment, at least bi-annually, if not annually. The goal of the proposed Annual Assessment Feedback (AAF) policy is to provide all doctoral students with an annual written assessment of their academic progress towards degree completion.

Why Annual Assessment and Feedback (AAF)?

- Provides each student a clarity of expectations
  - Clarity of expectations is a basic right
- Establishes clear goals which in turn, keep students motivated
  - Reduces attrition
  - Reduces time to degree
- Helps alleviate problem situations
  - Early identification and intervention in problem situations
- A means to check whether a student is in good academic standing
  - For compliance with certain fellowship conditions
- A means for graduate students to discuss professional goals with program faculty
  - By including aspects beyond research, students are better prepared for “life” after graduation
- Aggregate information of students’ activities can inform program decisions

UW-Madison Graduate School AAF Policy

By end of Spring 2019 semester, all graduate programs must develop procedure for providing (approximately) annual assessment and feedback (AAF) to doctoral students on their progress towards degree. Effective Fall 2019, all programs must implement their procedures. Although each program may develop a procedure that works for them, the basic requirements are as follows.

1. Doctoral students must start receiving written feedback progress towards degree around the start of the third year in the program and must continue to receive AAF on a regular basis (approximately annually) until they graduate. Qualifying examinations, preliminary examinations, thesis committee meetings etc. may be included in the annual assessments as long as they include written feedback on progress towards degree. Regular research discussions with advisors do not qualify as assessments unless they include assessment and feedback on progress towards degree.
2. The feedback must be in written form so that they can be tracked and archived. Graduate School will develop a software tool to facilitate archival and tracking. The use of this software tool is optional.

3. The AAF must include input from at least two program faculty or staff and where at least one is not the students’ advisor or co-advisor. The second person may be a member of the student’s dissertation committee, may be faculty director of graduate study, another faculty member in the graduate program, or a graduate coordinator. It is understood that a program faculty or staff who is not an advisor or co-advisor of the student may not be able to fully assess the quality of the work being done by the student. Their role is to alleviate a common graduate student concern that the advisors tend to keep their productive students longer than necessary.

4. In addition, to the curricular and research milestones, the assessment and feedback may include guidance on the professional and career development training for the student. For instance, students may be encouraged to maintain Individual Development Plans (IDPs) and share parts of their IDP with their advisor or other program faculty involved in AAF in order to get guidance on their professional and career development training.