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MINUTES

Members Present: Lara Collier, Kristin Eschenfelder, Michael Graham (left before first voting item), Yu Hen Hu (arrived after first voting item), William Karpus, Steffen Lempp, Lisa Martin, Christa Olson, Nicole Perna, John Pfotenhauer, Parmesh Ramanathan, Tracy Schroepfer, Steph Tai, Monica Turner, Kirstin Wolf

Members Absent: Caroline Alexander, Christopher Livanos, Earlise Ward

Guests: Constance Flanagan, Elizabeth Harris, Elaine Klein, Brian McNurlen, Jocelyn Milner, Scott Owczarek, Eric Wilcots

Staff: Judy Bauman, Marty Gustafson, Kelly Haslam, Elena Hsu, Peter Kinsley, Emily Reynolds

Dean William Karpus called the meeting to order.

The minutes of June 9, 2017, were approved as a matter of automatic consent.

Information Items:

1. Dean Karpus led introductions and described the GFEC overview and charge. New GFEC members beginning terms in the 2017-2018 academic year include Lara Collier, Steffen Lempp, Christopher Livanos, and Earlise Ward.

2. Vice Provost Jocelyn Milner and Registrar Scott Owczarek led a discussion on the new Guide publication schedule and its impact on governance actions.

3. Brian McNurlen and Elizabeth Harris led a discussion on a proposed data retention plan for retiring D2L and Moodle learning management systems on campus.

Approvals:

1. School of Human Ecology Associate Dean Constance Flanagan introduced the request to change the admitting status of the M.S. Human Ecology named options in Consumer Behavior & Family Economics and Human Development & Family Studies. The School desires that all students who wish to pursue a master’s enroll in the no-option M.S., leaving these options to Ph.D. students. The Ph.D. students may use the M.S. with named option to earn a Master’s degree, either on the way to the Ph.D. or when they choose to leave the Ph.D. program.
Motion: Moved and seconded to change the admitting status of the M.S. Human Ecology named options in Consumer Behavior & Family Economics and Human Development & Family Studies. The motion was passed unanimously.

Program Reviews and Updates:


- Art: They have had some success with a new recruitment committee’s efforts and note while their ten-year funding average is 58%, this has improved in the last four years to 85%. They have also addressed some of the safety issues in their building.
- Zoology: To address diversity issues, they have met with Graduate School Assistant Dean for Diversity, Inclusion, and Funding LaRuth McAfee. They have also taken the initiative to identify faculty interested in serving in leadership roles moving forward.
- Chemistry: While the program submitted a first draft of their new handbook, Dean Karpus notes the Graduate School has not seen a plan for a systematic approach to respond to the results of a department-wide climate survey last year.

2. GFEC member Steph Tai introduced the Institutional (10-Year) Supplemental Accreditation Review of selected graduate programs in Business, including Arts Administration M.A./MBA, Finance Investment and Banking M.S./MBA, Management and Human Resources M.S./MBA, Marketing M.S./MBA, Operations and Technology Management M.S./MBA, Real Estate and Urban Land Economics M.S./MBA, Risk Management and Insurance M.S./MBA, and Supply Chain Management M.S./MBA. Tai noted the strengths of the programs, which include increasing applications in recent years, most students finding jobs in areas/industries directly related to the programs in which they trained, exit surveys showing students rate faculty teaching and advising as excellent, and recent successes at retaining excellent faculty and general production of high-quality research. Tai also discussed review committee recommendations, which included publishing a graduate student handbook, conducting additional tracking of post-graduate outcomes to determine whether particular investments in training are delivering high returns, extending the Business Emerging Leaders program for undergraduates to the graduate programs, and conducting a comparison with peer institutions on diversity. The GFEC noted the number of project assistanships and fellowships awarded has also dropped recently, but is still notably higher than peer programs. The GFEC commends the programs on their strengths and recommends the department engage in efforts to address the review committee’s concerns.

Motion: Moved and seconded to accept the Institutional (10-Year) Supplemental Accreditation Review of selected graduate programs in Business. The motion was passed with 12 for, 1 abstention.

2. GFEC member John Pfotenhauer introduced the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the Computer Sciences M.S./Ph.D./Doctoral Minor. Pfotenhauer noted the strengths of the program, which include high rankings with a world-class reputation, excellent job placement, strong service courses for other majors, and good funding levels for research graduate students. Pfotenhauer also discussed challenges to the program, including a graduate program size that has doubled since 2007, with 75% of applicants being international, and difficulty replacing faculty due to a competitive job market in the same time period. There are also low numbers of women and domestic targeted minority students in the program. Pfotenhauer discussed review committee recommendations, including carrying out proposed program
assessment steps, accommodating emerging topics in the curriculum, incorporating new methods to improve graduate student communication skills, developing methods to mitigate their practice of course over-enrollment, and aggressively pursuing existing plans to increase diversity through efforts to hire and retain women and minority faculty. The GFEC also recommended the program review its admissions practices to consider if they are implicitly biased against women and domestic targeted minority applicants. The GFEC commends the programs on their strengths and recommends the department engage in efforts to address the review committee’s concerns.

Motion: Moved and seconded to accept the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the Computer Sciences M.S./Ph.D./Doctoral Minor. The motion was passed with 11 for, 2 abstentions.

Adjournment:

Motion: Moved and seconded to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University of Wisconsin–Madison Graduate School sets university-wide standards and policies for graduate education, serves a special advocacy and communication role, promotes diversity initiatives, and otherwise augments the margin of excellence. In 2016-2017 we fulfilled these roles in a number of exceptional ways.

Highlighted accomplishments of 2016-2017

SERVICE

Goal: Streamline graduate admissions
• Launched a new online application with improved navigation and a modern look and feel
• Adopted batch academic transcript collection

Goal: Deliver excellent academic services
• Piloted the Graduate Student Tracking System project
• Adopted the new campus Guide to replace the Graduate Catalog

Goal: Optimize program assessment
• Prepared in-depth comparative data reports for graduate program review committees
• Offered new program review, data analysis, and program assessment planning workshops

Goal: Encourage and support new program planning
• Strengthened partnership with the Division of Continuing Studies, focused on non-traditional programs

Goal: Increase student funding
• Allocated $15,000,000 in graduate student funding and $278,000 in travel awards
• Overhauled the divisional funding competitions
• Implemented changes to the assistantship appointment process

DIVERSITY

Goal: Promote diverse and inclusive experiences
• Supported student success through community-building opportunities
• Led efforts to foster an inclusive and positive climate, including diversity dialogues and bias-breaking workshops

ENGAGEMENT

Goal: Prepare students for career success
• Built DiscoverPD, a competencies framework, planning tool, and opportunities database
• Increased the number of opportunities promoted by the school and piloted new programs

Goal: Engage the campus community
• Onboarded new graduate students and communicated weekly with all graduate students
• Hosted Coffee with the Dean events to solicit input on graduate student experiences
• Offered trainings on a variety of graduate education topics for faculty and staff
• Met regularly with Directors of Graduate Study, Graduate Program Coordinators, and other disciplinary-specific groups
LEAD THE WAY in graduate education

Accomplishments of 2016-2017

The Graduate School advances its mission of fostering excellence in graduate education by partnering with faculty and staff, schools and colleges, as well as central administration to address a number of priority areas that include admissions, academic service, program assessment, and student support. These priorities derive from our core values of service, diversity, and engagement. The Graduate School advocates for graduate education and for graduate students. We work in collaboration with senior administration, schools, colleges, departments, and programs to provide resources and opportunities for success.

The Graduate School is committed to a learning and research environment that is free from harassment and intimidation. By engaging partners at University Health Services, the Graduate School launched programming that informs all graduate students about sexual harassment as well as resources for reporting and support. Similarly, diversity in all its forms is central to a robust educational and research environment and necessary for graduate student career development over the long term. To that end, the Graduate School partnered with faculty and staff who have expertise in recognizing and changing bias habits to deliver inclusivity resources to graduate students.

The Office of the Dean of the Graduate School supported two major projects designed to help graduate faculty, departments, and programs recruit and support the best possible graduate students. The first of these provides additional support to recruit Ph.D. applicants who have offers from peer institutions. This program is in its second year and had a 49% success rate, up from 43% in the previous year. Moreover, the number of students recruited away from prestigious peer institutions to UW–Madison doubled. The second project was the launch of the Collaborative Training Programs (CTP) in Arts & Humanities and Social Sciences. Modeled after the National Institutes of Health (NIH) T32 institutional training grant program, the CTP is a faculty-led effort designed to provide a cohort-based education experience for Ph.D. students in disciplines that have not historically provided such an opportunity. The Graduate School awarded one CTP titled “Interdisciplinary Research Methods Training for Scholars of Pre-Modern China” and a second titled “Youth Development, Social Media, and Assessment.”

UW–Madison has historical success in securing extramural funding for graduate student training. The university hosts 31 NIH T32 training grants that support students in the biomedical sciences. This funding mechanism exposes graduate students to a cohort training environment and allows graduate faculty in a large number of programs to compete nationally for the best graduate students. In partnership with the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education, the Graduate School committed tuition, stipend, and operational support for nine T32 training grant renewal applications.

In 2016-2017 the Graduate School continued its partnership with the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education in its support of the UW2020 program as well as the new Microbiome Initiative. In both funding competitions, the Graduate School committed a research assistantship to each funded project. Providing this additional support to the highly innovative research proposals serves two functions: to help faculty accelerate the pace of discovery and to expose graduate students to cutting edge research, which enhances their career development and subsequent opportunities.

The major challenge facing the Graduate School continues to be graduate student funding levels and the ability to help programs offer multi-year funding packages. The school has been fortunate to receive a strong and increasing commitment from the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF) in support of graduate students. The reinvestment of past research success into current graduate education allows UW–Madison to recruit the most talented graduate students who continue to change the course of the world through their creativity and innovation.
STREAMLINE graduate admissions

Accomplishments of 2016-2017

Specialized staff in the Graduate School Office of Admissions serve as essential resources for applicants and newly admitted graduate students, as well as for faculty and academic program staff throughout the admissions process. In 2016-2017 the Graduate School partnered with 156 master’s degree programs, four MFA, and 109 doctoral programs to process 19,385 applications.

UW–Madison attracts students from across the globe. The Office of Admissions provided service for 9,700 international applicants this past year. Certified staff in the office create I20 forms for international applicants, which are required by the Department of Homeland Security to obtain student visas.

In order to meet the needs of academic program staff who require specialized instructions on admission procedures and systems, the office hosted one-on-one training opportunities.

In January 2017 the Graduate School launched a new online application for admission. It features a modern look and feel, with differentiated sections that ease navigation. Application questions are dynamic and reorganized for better flow. For example, if an applicant indicates that he is applying as an international student, he is asked for visa type and dependents - improvements that make application easier for prospective graduate students and aid in improved data collection.

The new application connects to the residency smart application, maintained by the UW–Madison Office of the Registrar, to determine if an applicant would pay in-state or out-of-state tuition. The feature eliminates the need for the Graduate School to manually collect residency information and send electronic files to the residency office. Instead, information is transmitted directly and decisions about resident/non-resident tuition rates are made more quickly.

Batch receipt of electronic transcripts is an additional innovation put in place this year. By creating relationships with transcript vendors, the Office of Admissions was able to collect official transcripts electronically in batch, beginning in May 2017. This centralized collection eliminates the need for applicants to send transcripts to individual department offices, thus reducing confusion and increasing efficiency. Academic programs still receive unofficial transcripts through the online application and can make a recommendation using an unofficial transcript if desired.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATIONS</th>
<th>19,385</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Non-targeted</td>
<td>8,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Targeted</td>
<td>1,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>9,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMISSIONS</th>
<th>5,942</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Non-targeted</td>
<td>3,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Targeted</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1,899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>2,808</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Non-targeted</td>
<td>1,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Targeted</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Graduate School Office of Academic Services (OAS) is the academic dean’s office for all graduate students and serves as a campus resource to facilitate excellence in graduate education from matriculation through degree conferral. The office works with students, faculty, and graduate program staff to provide academic guidance and assistance, ensure satisfactory progress, manage academic portfolios, and grant master’s and doctoral degrees, including special committee degrees and joint degrees.

The office is responsible for ensuring that graduate students maintain satisfactory academic progress, monitoring and intervening as needed. While a student’s primary academic advising comes from the home program and faculty mentor, OAS staff ensure that students are meeting Graduate School timelines and expectations. The office is often a source of “neutral” counseling separate from the student’s faculty advisor and graduate program, interpreting policies and applying them to student situations.

The Graduate School is responsible for grievance procedures, typically in partnership with the Office of the Dean of Students. However, more commonly needed are confidential, impartial, and informal advice and guidance, which Academic Services staff provide on a daily basis.

This year a number of administrative efficiencies were achieved, including updating the program change form from paper to online, eliminating the required final review appointment, transitioning front desk staff from professional staff to a team of student employees, and implementing automatic phone call distribution.

The Graduate Student Tracking System project, which aims to allow students, faculty, and graduate program staff direct access to a detailed academic progress report directly in the Student Information System, met major milestones in 2016-2017. A pilot phase with two academic programs was completed, including an evaluation, summary report, and roll-out plans with budget estimations for a broad campus adoption.

With leadership from the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment, in June 2017 campus celebrated the launch of the Guide, a new academic catalog that combines graduate and undergraduate offerings. The Guide was created with a robust, specialized catalog builder that links courses generated by the Student Information System, applies workflow controls for governance, and provides an easy-to-use layout for enhanced navigation. The Guide includes material from the 2016-2018 Graduate Catalog and will go through an update cycle in 2017-2018.
Supporting UW–Madison’s commitment to timely and beneficial academic program review is an annual priority. In 2016-2017, the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) approved 25 program reviews (Figure 1), and the Graduate School provided in-depth comparative data reports on important student metrics for all review committees charged. These reports were shared with all programs under review so they could also reflect on the results and work on continuous improvement efforts.

New this year, the Graduate School Office of Academic Planning and Assessment (OAPA), worked together with the Office of the Provost to offer multiple new training opportunities for campus. This training included program review workshops offered each semester to programs charged with completing self-studies as well as to school/college representatives called upon to lead and monitor program reviews.

OAPA hosted campus data overview presentations explaining the use of data for learning outcomes assessment to all academic campus programs, as well as new GFEC member orientation and review committee training.

Working together with the Office of the Provost, the OAPA led quarterly workshops and graduate-level communications, supporting development of plans to assess Student Learning Outcomes. The first annual assessment report is due November 1, 2017.
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**Figure 1.** Program actions by the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (2012-2017)
The Graduate School provided approximately $15 million in graduate student funding during the 2016-2017 fiscal year. The primary source continues to be the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF), with additional support from donors including the State of Wisconsin Advanced Opportunity Program, the Office of the Chancellor, the Mellon Foundation, the Kohler Foundation, the Dickie Family, and the Kemper Knapp trust.

The Office of Diversity, Inclusion, and Funding (ODIF) oversees the Graduate School’s funding competitions, serves as the coordinating unit for multiple external fellowships, and provides assistance to graduate students, staff, and faculty on campus-wide funding issues.

Travel awards totaling $278,000 were provided to 365 students, using support from WARF, the Vilas Trust, and the UW Foundation’s Twin Cities Women’s Philanthropy Council.

A major initiative during the 2016-2017 year was an overhaul of the four divisional funding competitions. This effort sought to allow flexibility for programs to request the funding they need to be most competitive, provide consistency across the four divisions, and make the application process less onerous. This revision effort also sought to better align these funding competitions with the academic program review process.

In January 2017 the university approved a 3.5 percent increase in the TA-standard and PA stipends. Approximately 1,600 graduate students who hold teaching assistant-standard appointments and 600 with project assistantships benefited from the pay raise. Academic departments received a permanent supplement to budget allocations to cover the cost of the increase. This is part of an upward trend in graduate assistant stipends at UW-Madison, resulting in about a 14 percent rate increase over five years.

In addition to the rate increase, policy changes to the graduate assistantship appointment process went into effect, making it simpler for prospective graduate students to compare funding offers from different universities, and streamlining a department’s ability to set rates above the minimum rate. The Graduate School reviewed and approved all rates, noting trends in rates set at or above the minimum.

Going forward, each year the Graduate School will recommend to central administration the campus minimum stipend rates for TA, PA, and RA appointments and then will collect, review, and approve rates from all graduate programs.

The Graduate School updated its external fellowship supplementation policy in the summer of 2017. While the school has for many years supplemented a number of external fellowships, the new policy recognizes the fact that there are many other prestigious external fellowships earned by UW-Madison graduate students and provides an official process for programs to request funding to cover unmet educational costs. The new policy will further encourage students to identify and apply for such fellowships that will support their education and provide opportunities for them to connect with others in their disciplines.

Fellowship funding disbursed: $15,000,000
Travel grants awarded: $278,000
TAs and PAs receiving stipend increase: approx. 2,200
The Graduate School promotes access and success for all graduate students, especially those from underrepresented or marginalized backgrounds such as domestic targeted minority, low-income, or first generation college-going students. The Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Funding (ODIF) works to promote an inclusive climate for all graduate students through initiatives such as the McNair Scholars Program, the Summer Research Opportunities Program, and the Graduate Research Scholars communities.

In 2016-2017 ODIF supported students through a number of community-building opportunities, including events like the Multicultural Graduate Network welcome and a mixer/luncheon series to minimize the sense of isolation voiced by many students from racial/ethnic minority groups or the LGBTQ community. Recognizing the need to provide role models and engage the campus community, faculty, and administrators were invited to all mixers. This was a collaboration with the Division of Diversity, Equity, and Educational Achievement, with organizations such as the Black Graduate and Professional Student Association and the LGBT Campus Center.

To recognize the achievements of graduate students, ODIF is home to the UW–Madison chapter of the Edward Alexander Bouchet Graduate Honor Society. In the spring of 2017 UW–Madison inducted its seventh cohort of Bouchet Society members, which included five dissertators and one postdoctoral researcher, bringing the total number of UW–Madison inductees since the chapter’s inception in 2010 to 32. The Vice Provost and Chief Diversity Officer continued support by providing professional development awards to inductees.

In alignment with campus diversity initiatives, the Graduate School led efforts to help graduate students understand their roles in promoting positive campus climate and increase their capacity to enact diversity efforts. These efforts included diversity dialogues during Welcome Week, a discussion with graduate students based on the Fair Play video game developed at the Wisconsin Center for Education Research, and bias-breaking workshops led by psychology professor Patricia Devine’s research team. Approximately 250 students attended at least one of these activities, with an additional 100+ expressing interest.

To help build a pipeline of prospective graduate students from underrepresented groups, the Graduate School annually supports campus Summer Research Opportunities Programs. In SROP 2016, 110 undergraduate students participated through eight programs across campus. Additionally, the Graduate School partners with 15 predominantly minority-serving institutions and two consortia to promote UW–Madison summer and graduate program opportunities to their students.

The Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement Program, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education annually supports 31 undergraduate students from backgrounds underrepresented in Ph.D. programs. Fourteen students graduated this past year, 13 were accepted in graduate programs, and 12 will begin graduate school in fall of 2017. In the summer and fall of 2016 the Graduate School hosted graduate program visits for 102 McNair Scholars from eight other universities.
PREPARE students for career success

Accomplishments of 2016-2017

Drawing from research, national reports, peer practices, and input from graduate students, faculty, and staff, the Graduate School Office of Professional Development and Communications (OPDC) created a new model for graduate student professional development at UW–Madison. The resulting framework identifies universal competencies, skills, and attributes developed through graduate education. Paired with an Individual Development Plan, it provides students scaffolding on which to plan their time in graduate school, as well as a vocabulary to describe the skills that are central to graduate study. The framework is the basis for DiscoverPD, an online tool launched in October 2016.

DiscoverPD prompts graduate students to assess their confidence in each subarea of the framework, then generates a custom report that includes recommendations for improvement. The opportunities in the DiscoverPD database are searchable by keyword, modality, type, and time commitment.

The number of professional development events promoted through the Graduate School increased in 2016-2017. The events calendar, populated both by OPDC’s programming and collaborators’ events, contained 320 events, up from 280 last year. Beyond the Tenure Track, a series hosted by OPDC for the fourth consecutive year, included “The Graduate Student’s Guide to the Non-academic Job Search.” Over 230 people attended the three-hour event led by consultant Anne Krook, and it received a 93% satisfaction rating.

OPDC expanded its connections with academic programs. Together with the Office of Postdoctoral Studies, OPDC ran a pilot to grow capacity for programs to host non-academic career panels. A new grant program funneled funding requests from student organizations and departments into a single process, and awarded nine graduate student organizations and ten academic departments.

The new Higher Education Leadership Project Assistantship program offered exposure to university administration for Ph.D. students, while gaining practical experience in the functional areas of professional development and communication. PAs were appointed, maintained IDPs, and reflected positively on the skills and networks they developed.

The Graduate School remains the primary campus resource for Individual Development Plan support and information, and co-sponsored Mellon-Wisconsin Dissertation Writing Camps. Another new initiative was the Project Management Workshop hosted in collaboration with the Office of Quality Improvement.

To boost graduate students’ access to career advising expertise, the Career Development Summer Series and the Career Development Facilitator grant for graduate program coordinators were offered for the fourth year.

The Graduate School was selected to participate in the Council of Graduate Schools’ Understanding PhD Career Pathways for Program Improvement. This project will be led by the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment, and will seed career tracking and work toward various aspects of program improvement. The school also made plans to join the Coalition for Next Generation Life Sciences to advance career opportunities for graduate students and postdoctoral researchers.
ENGAGE the campus community

Accomplishments of 2016-2017

STUDENTS  New graduate students received a warm welcome to graduate school through a coordinated onboarding campaign that included email messages, Welcome Week activities, and the New Graduate Student Welcome, which was attended by over 450 students and 42 resource fair vendors. The Graduate School held the inaugural Degree Dash during Welcome Week, which brought together over 400 graduate students, faculty, staff, and family members who raced in the 5.7-mile Doctoral Derby or the 1.75-mile Master’s Mile.

The GradConnections Weekly newsletter was sent to over 9,200 students with approximately a 50 percent open rate. Twitter followers increased to over 1,500. The Graduate School started a Facebook group and developed a mobile version of Graduate Student Life.

The Graduate School Dean hosted eight coffee chats, including an online chat, one hosted jointly with the Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences, one hosted jointly with the Dean of the School of Medicine and Public Health, and two chats for targeted demographic groups. These chats gave students direct access to share their triumphs and challenges with the Graduate School Dean.

The Peer Mentor Awards recognized five graduate students for their exemplary mentoring qualities, with five additional students receiving honorable mention recognition, at the Center for Leadership and Involvement’s Bucky’s Awards. This is a tremendous opportunity for the Graduate School to partner with the Office of the Dean of Students to reinforce mentorship as a key form of leadership.

FACULTY AND STAFF  As the data infrastructure grows on campus, the Graduate School too has grown its involvement in the communities and governance bodies associated with it, including participation in the Campus Tableau Advisory Group, Tableau Developer Community, Business Intelligence Community of Experts, and the Teaching and Learning Advisory Group.

Through its work with faculty and staff across campus, the Graduate School participated in cross-unit projects to enhance engagement with directors of graduate studies and graduate program coordinators. It provided individual training for coordinators on policies and student systems. Workshops were available for coordinators each fall semester and on an as-needed basis throughout the year. One such workshop is Jump Start, which is a training held each fall for new coordinators. It provides an introduction to systems, policies, and procedures, as well as an opportunity to network with fellow graduate program coordinators and Graduate School staff.

WEBSITE  The Graduate School website received 1.95 million pageviews in 2016-2017, most focused on admissions pages at peak application times. The school launched a website redesign project, to be completed in the following academic year.

The number of alumni career profiles on the Graduate School website grew, now totaling 50 profiles. Twenty-one original stories were showcased on the homepage carousel. These stories featured Graduate School initiatives such as the GEM fellows, the Bouchet Graduate Honor Society, and the Robert Woods Johnson Foundation Health Policy Research Scholars.
PRIORITYs

for 2017-2018

ADMISSIONS

The Graduate School Office of Admissions looks forward to a successful launch of the application suite to replace GWIS and GWIS lite, which are the systems programs use to review applications, as well as OASIS, the student status check. The suite will include applicant review, applicant review admin, and the student status check. A related improvement will be the graduate admissions data mart to replace admission queries.

The Graduate School will begin initiating requests for final official transcripts from applicants, removing programs from the middle of this process and thus reducing confusion among applicants.

Parchment, an e-transcript vendor, intends to develop an automated search match process, which would be employed by the Graduate School in the next year.

The Office of Admissions will continue transitioning to paperless operations. This includes reviewing admission applications electronically, as well as mass assignment and removal of enrollment holds. These changes will alleviate the workload of the Graduate School admissions staff.

The office will prompt programs to rethink admission processes by introducing principles of holistic admission review with the goal of increasing student diversity.

Another innovation will be examining processes and systems to accommodate applicants to non-traditional programs, looking for consistencies and differences with traditional programs.

ACADEMIC SERVICES

The Office of Academic Services aims to secure funding, expand functionality, and begin rolling out the Graduate Student Tracking System to additional programs.

Staff will continue to develop the Graduate Student Portal, an integrated online student-facing system for Graduate School resources and systems.

The office will also review and update the existing workshop “Last Steps to Completing Your PhD” to expand participation and delivery of the relevant content to students.

ACADEMIC PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT

Using new data dissemination tools, the Graduate School Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will redesign the graduate program profiles, offering data visualizations that meet the distinct needs of prospective students and faculty/staff. Using Tableau™ software, the redesigned profiles will include a data explorer that gives internal audiences greater access to detail, and a simple dashboard for prospective students with information relevant to selecting a program. The visualizations will be launched in the new Graduate School’s website in 2017-2018.

Staff will lead the update process of the first edition of the new Graduate Guide, which replaces the Graduate Catalog with a visual, easy-to-navigate interface for degree and program information.

The office will continue working together with the Office of the Provost to streamline the program review process for graduate, professional, and capstone certificates.

The Graduate School will play an active role in campus planning, led by the Division of Continuing Studies, to increase the number of students in non-traditional programs, and continue to support the campus 2019 HLC accreditation project.

Staff will implement current student and alumni surveys of the Understanding PhD Career Pathways for Program Improvement project.
DIVERSITY, INCLUSION, AND FUNDING

While there has been growth in measurable diversity within the graduate student population, new strategies are necessary to make the campus climate more welcoming to all students.

The office will expand mixer/luncheon series to support students underrepresented in various demographic dimensions, including race/ethnicity, LGBTQ identity, low income, and first generation college-going, among others.

ODIF will implement a Bouchet Society seminar series and professional development events to promote the organization and provide special opportunities to members.

Another goal is to expand diversity workshops offered through the Graduate School and support academic programs’ efforts to improve campus climate.

The McNair program will implement intensified workshops to aid scholars’ ability to prepare competitive applications for graduate funding opportunities. SROP will expand to include more humanities, arts, and social science disciplines, and opportunities in academic programs that do not have formal summer research programs.

ODIF will continue refining application fee coupons to encourage students to apply to UW–Madison. This will include a review of recent changes to identify ways to continue to make fee grants visible yet targeted. The Graduate School will pilot holistic admissions practices; this effort will include examining successful programs at other universities, such as the Fisk-Vanderbilt Bridge Program.

The Graduate School will transition divisional and Graduate Research Scholars (GRS) fellowship allocations to a new competition process and structure and initiate a review process of all GRS programs. Efforts to streamline funding processes will be implemented to allow the school to better support students and academic programs.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Among OPDC’s top priorities are promotion of DiscoverPD and graduate student professional development broadly, as well as integrating the new framework into professional development programming.

The Graduate School will grow student attendance and leadership presence at the New Graduate Student Welcome, establish a grant to foster professional development programming at the disciplinary level, build on the success of the Higher Education Leadership Project Assistantship, and evaluate impact of dissertation camp on student success and time to degree.

Finally, the Graduate School website will be redesigned in 2017-2018, a project that includes examining the KnowledgeBase and Graduate Student Portal.
The above organizational chart is current as of June 2017. To view an updated chart, please visit grad.wisc.edu/about.
February 20, 2017

Sarah C. Mangelsdorf, Ph.D.  William Karpus, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  Dean of the Graduate School
Sent electronically

Re:  Review of the Capstone, Graduate and Professional Certificates in Clinical and Community Outcomes Research

Dear Provost Mangelsdorf and Dean Karpus:

On behalf of the School of Medicine and Public Health, I endorse the five-year review of the Capstone, Graduate and Professional Certificates in Clinical and Community Outcomes Research.

After discussion at the February 15, 2017 meeting of the SMPH Academic Planning Council, APC members unanimously approved the report of the review committee, the recommendations of the committee for implementation, and the response of program leadership to the review committee’s report. Those reports are attached. Also attached is a rationale to continue the capstone certificate program despite its low award status.

Program Strengths: The review committee and APC are highly laudatory of the certificate programs. The certificate programs meet a need for the university and research communities with regard to translational research. The programs focus on community-based research with a mixed methods approach. The programs have a high impact, as most students who participate in the program publish their research. The programs are highly interdisciplinary, promote interactions among faculty and students, attract a diverse student body and have requirements that are clear to students. Program Director Barb Bowers and Program Coordinator Sharon Schumacher provide outstanding leadership and support.

Recommendations: The review committee made many recommendations, with the following being the most salient. The APC supports these recommendations and commends the program for already having taken action.

1) Recommendation: The programs have low enrollment and thus a low number of certificates awarded. The review committee recommends that the program increase its marketing to increase enrollment.
Program response: The program has revised its website, developed a new brochure and increased direct marketing across campus. As a result, students from a wider variety of disciplines are enrolled (e.g., business, engineering, kinesiology). Due to the following limitations, enrollment in CCOR certificate programs will remain relatively low:
  - Enrollment limitations in the core/intro course, POP HLTH 709
  - A key element of the program is having a staff member to advise students on conducting translational research. Funding is only available for a 0.5 FTE.
Dean’s response: The SMPH will provide funding to expand POP HLTH 709. The APC supports this decision.

2) Recommendation: The review committee recommends that the program establish student grievance procedures and create a student handbook.
   Program response: The program has created a handbook and established grievance procedures, which are posted online.

Both the SMPH Academic Planning Council and I concur with the review committee’s recommendation to continue the Capstone, Graduate and Professional Certificates in Clinical and Community Outcomes Research. We recommend that the next review occur in ten years.

Thank you for your consideration. If you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Andrea Poehling.

Sincerely,

Robert N. Golden, M.D.
Robert Turell Professor in Medical Leadership
Dean, School of Medicine and Public Health
Vice Chancellor for Medical Affairs
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Copies to:
Barbara Bowers, Ph.D., RN, FAAN, Clinical and Community Outcomes Research Certificate Programs
Sharon Schumacher, Clinical and Community Outcomes Research Certificate Programs
Rob Lemanske, M.D. Institute for Clinical and Translational Research
Marc Drezner, M.D. Institute for Clinical and Translational Research
Richard L. Moss, Ph.D., School of Medicine and Public Health
Andrea Poehling, M.S., School of Medicine and Public Health
Marty Gustafson, M.S., Graduate School
Emily Reynolds, M.A., Graduate School
Jocelyn Milner, Ph.D., Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Sarah Kuba, Ph.D., Academic Planning and Institutional Research

Attachments:
1) Review committee report
2) Program response
3) Implementation forms
4) Rationale to continue capstone certificate program
Clinical and Community Outcomes Research Certificate (Capstone, Graduate, and Professional)

Program Review December 7, 2015

The CCOR program was reviewed in fall, 2015, by Jane Mahoney, MD, Department of Medicine (committee chair); Susan Thibeault, Ph.D, Department of Surgery (Graduate Faculty Executive Committee representative); and Elizabeth Cox, M.D., Ph.D., Department of Pediatrics. The committee reviewed the following:

• original proposal for the Certificate in Type 2 Translational Research, dated February 27, 2009. The certificate program was later renamed to Clinical and Community Outcomes Research
• the Self-Study by Program Director Barb Bowers, RN, PhD, dated October 2014
• data on enrollment and completion of students from 2009 to 2015
• review sheets for grants received by students during and shortly after completion of the program,
• webpage materials (Capstone through Division of Continuing Studies, and Capstone, Graduate and Professional through ICTR, and program material available on a google webpage)

On September 14, 2015, the committee conducted a site visit, meeting with the program director, Barb Bowers, the program administrator, Sharon Schumacher, faculty advisors Maureen Smith and Betty Chewning, and three current students (2 capstone, 1 professional) and 3 alumni (1 capstone, 2 graduate)

The Capstone, Graduate, and Professional certificates have identical application processes, student services, requirements and curricula. Therefore, the review and report focus on all certificates. There are a few differences across the certificate programs, in particular with regard to student enrollments and dropouts. We highlight these at the end of the report.

PROGRAM STRENGTHS:

• This is a unique program on campus and fills an important niche. It aligns with a number of the UW-Madison strategic priorities, particularly those related to translational research. It is essential to ICTR’s success in community engagement and training. It is important for career development of graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, and junior faculty, who may enroll in the program preparatory to, or as part of, a K-award. Graduates of the program are well positioned to build scholarship around community engagement. Students and graduates of the program have been successful in obtaining peer-reviewed intramural and extramural funding. The committee reviewed “pink slips” for career development awards received by 4 of the CCOR students/graduates. All peer-reviews praised the training that the CCOR certificate provides.
• The program is highly interdisciplinary, both in students and faculty. Students are matched with an advisor from outside their discipline in order to broaden perspectives. It is innovative in its emphasis on community engagement. Very few students in health sciences have a sense of organizations in the community. This program provides them with an organizational and community perspective. Students are required to take a course in community engagement in research, and must include community stakeholders in their project. For many of the students, it also provides their first training in qualitative methods, which are increasingly necessary for translational research.
• The diversity of students in the program is remarkable (7 of 12 alumni are non-white).
• Students were highly complimentary about the program. They agreed that the certificate was different from, but synergistic with a masters or PhD. They stated they learned the importance
of and how to engage stakeholders, and learned to apply research methods in clinical and community outcomes research. The required course, Pop Health 709, Translational and Outcomes Research in Health and Health Care, was universally appreciated by students. They stated they wouldn’t have been able to find all the courses without the structure of the program. They appreciated the extensive set of electives from which to choose, and valued the flexibility of the program in selecting electives. They felt they had adequate guidance in selecting electives. They appreciated having the opportunity to do a community-engaged project, and found it helpful to have structured templates to initiate and complete the project. Students found advisors to be accessible and helpful. They appreciated receiving feedback from a faculty advisor through all phases of the project, from conception to completion.

- The program administrator is friendly, highly engaged, committed to the program and responsive to students’ needs.
- For most students, project completion resulted in one or more publications.
- The requirements for the certificate are in order and are clear to students.
- Learning outcomes are articulated clearly on the websites, and are assessed using grades for required and elective courses. The project is reviewed by the student and advisor together prior to starting it. Clear instructions are given to the students on how to write a project plan incorporating the learning outcomes that the student wants to achieve. After the project, students complete a rubric for self-evaluation and then review it with their advisor.
- Certificate graduates have been surveyed yearly, with the types of questions changed from year to year. Questions have addressed: what they learned, how the certificate advanced their professional goals, opportunities open to them as a result of the certificate program, advice they would give to current and future students, whether courses were useful, and suggestions for recruitment. The program administrator also called students who withdrew to find out the reason why.

WEAKNESSES:

- The primary weakness is that enrollment is low. Since its inception in 2009, 14 students have completed the certificate (10 graduate, 2 professional, 2 capstone), and 8 are enrolled (3 graduate, 1 professional, 4 capstone). The enrollment goal for all 3 programs combined is 10 to 15 new students per year, per the 2009 certificate program proposal. Certificate awards for all three programs combined have been increasing over time (one in 2010, two in 2012, three in 2013, six in 2014), but numbers remain below that specified in the program proposal. There is not a systematic approach to recruitment. Given the program’s worth to campus and ICTR, it is not visible enough across campus. For example, programs that could serve as feeders for CCOR, such as ICTR’s KL2, Masters, and PhD in Clinical Investigation don’t have links to CCOR from their websites.
- There is not a specific handbook that is provided to students. Students are provided a link to a Google App website where there is information similar to what would be in a handout (e.g. the requirements of the certificate, student learning outcomes, curricula, etc). There is no information about grievances procedures and policies.
- The CCOR Capstone website through the Division of Continuing Studies (https://advanceyourcareer.wisc.edu/capstone-certificates/clinical-community-outcomes-research) is visually appealing but lacks detail. ICTR, as the administrative home, has a website for CCOR (https://ictr.wisc.edu/T2TRCertificate), which has more detail, but the program administrator cannot update it to meet program needs. Neither have a student handbook. The ICTR CCOR webpage doesn’t link with the Division of Continuing Studies CCOR webpage.
An opportunity exists to create a sense of community among program participants and students expressed a willingness for this and saw potential benefits. They suggested a forum for all students to share their research with each other. Students have one annual meeting that highlights their research and are together for 1 course (Pop Health 709), but could benefit from additional opportunities to convene.

There is no access to Cooper Hall for meetings before or after regular hours.

Students do not have access to a manuscript-writing group as part of the program.

Policies and procedures appear to vary across faculty advisors. Students may have only annual communication with their advisors. The google webpage has information for advisors but it is not clear how systematically it is accessed by them. The number of advisors is small, and there has not been a systematic plan to recruit or train more. There is no regular structure for CCOR faculty advisors to meet.

Community stakeholder involvement with students’ projects can vary, which at times can result in under-engagement, or engagement that begins too late in the project’s course.

Similar to other capstones, it can be difficult for students to get all the coursework in, if getting it as part of an MPH or PhD, in particular, if they don’t begin the certificate early in the course of their graduate degree.

The program administratively is under ICTR’s REC (Research Education and Career Development) core, but there is not a strong communication link with REC, making it hard to take advantage of ICTR programs as feeders for recruitment and as opportunities for students enrolled in CCOR.

CCOR’s administrator is the person the students seek out when they have questions. There is no trained back-up for the administrator when she is gone or should unanticipated absence occur.

Five students withdrew from the certificate program in 2012. Many of these were community members. To decrease dropouts, in 2013, the program quit recruiting community members. Since then, there has been 1 dropout in 2013, and 1 in 2014. While dropouts have decreased it remains a concern when number are small to begin with.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM:

The program needs to increase its numbers to those specified in the original application (10-15 new students enrolled each academic year). To accommodate growth, the program needs to systematize procedures. The committee felt the program is very valuable and ultimately has potential to grow beyond the numbers projected in the initial application. Most of the recommendations below have to do with marketing to increase growth, and systematizing procedures to accommodate the increase in size.

The leadership should focus on marketing the program across campus to increase number of students. The certificate program should appeal to junior faculty seeking K awards, to people on training grants, or in fellowships or post-doctoral positions, and to master’s and PhD students. We would recommend increased marketing to department chairs in relevant schools and colleges (eg SMPH, Nursing, Pharmacy, Business, Education, Engineering), and to Directors of the MPH, related PhD programs, and T32’s. Directors of masters and PhD programs should be advised to encourage students to enroll in CCOR early on during their masters or PhD, to ensure they can get all the CCOR coursework in.

Grievance procedures need to be established.

A formal handbook should be created that follows Graduate School’s requirements (https://kb.wisc.edu/gsadminkb/page.php?id=34123). Hard copies should be distributed to all
faculty and to incoming students, in addition to being available online. It should be on the CCOR website(s).

• The program should work to foster an increased sense of community among students. This could be through “community of scholars” meetings several times per year, where students share and get feedback on their projects, with attendance by faculty advisors and possibly community stakeholders as well. As an alternative, an additional seminar could be established, to feature students’ projects and provide a forum for discussion and development of relationships, with the same stakeholders attending.

• The program should consider other ways to increase community stakeholder involvement.

• CCOR’s webpage should be linked to other programs that may serve as recruitment sources (e.g., ICTR’s MS and PhD in Clinical Investigation, other Departments across campus).

• The google website materials should be on the ICTR CCOR website.

• The program should continue to monitor drop-outs and formally document the reason for each; if they persist, they should develop a plan to decrease drop-outs.

• Program leaders should develop a 5-year plan. It should include plans to increase enrollment.

• Advisors should meet with students at least twice yearly. The student experience across faculty advisors should be standardized with respect to faculty’s use of templates to help guide students, guidelines for initiation and completion of student projects, standards around meeting frequency/content, etc. There should be formal policy and procedures for recruiting new advisors, and formal training for onboarding new advisors. The advisor manual should be shared with and vetted by all advisors. The program should incorporate the potential for co-mentoring by more than one advisor, and provide guidance to students and faculty about this. Faculty should meet to discuss governance, structure, and needed changes at least twice yearly.

• The program should include plans to grow diversity as part of program growth. Current diversity is commendable. This program offers a natural niche to increase diversity.

• Standards should be established regarding community stakeholder involvement (when community engagement should begin, what involvement should constitute at a minimum, etc). It would be ideal to have a stipend for community stakeholders.

• Guidelines should be in place for advisors to work with students with a clinical background who lack formal (masters or PhD level) research training. If such students are seeking an academic career, they need early advice to get a masters in a research area, as the Capstone alone will not be sufficient for career success.

• The program needs a back-up for the administrator if she is gone for a period of time.

• We would recommend regular, better integration with ICTR’s REC core. The masters and PhD Clinical Investigator programs may be a feeder for enrollment, and better linkage may help in advising students of opportunities through ICTR.

• The program should ensure that manuscript and grant writing groups for both quantitative and qualitative methods are available to students.

• The director should track outcomes of, and survey former students to demonstrate the importance of the certificate to future careers, and identify strengths and weaknesses.

• Program alumni may be engaged more systematically, particularly alumni who remain on campus. They could join a re-union/welcome day event with new students, could participate as part of a seminar, could help advise students, etc.

• Students should receive access to the building after hours.

• To ensure timely progress, advisors should encourage students to being writing their manuscript as soon as they have finished writing their research protocol.
• The program may want to consider adding Computer science 769 (natural language processing) as a relevant elective course.
• Consider allowing 2 students to work collaboratively on 1 project.
• Encourage and model inclusion of IT as an often essential stakeholder in clinical and community outcomes research.
• In response to students’ feedback, to help students who are applying for training grants, they are creating lists of courses that are compatible with both training grant needs and Certificate requirements. We recommend this information be made available on the CCOR webpage.
• Students have reported difficulty finding qualitative methods courses. One option is to develop a qualitative methods course specifically for the Certificate program. We would encourage the program leaders to explore all alternatives that may be available on campus through other departments (sociology, etc).
• Create a directory of CCOR students and alumni with information about their projects and contact information when available.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SMPH AND THE UNIVERSITY

• CCOR needs to increase enrollment as per initial program prospectus. Increased enrollment will require additional financial support, towards the goals of increasing director’s time, number of core faculty, and numbers of students. Additional funding could also provide stipends for community stakeholders, support a new seminar as described above, and potentially help support research staff to take advantage of the Capstone certificate. This could help research staff obtain promotions and even work toward PI status, ultimately expanding UW’s research capacity and ability to attract external funding.
• ICTR, and REC in particular, should work with CCOR team members to make the ICTR CCOR website easier to find and to give the program the ability to update the website with information necessary to meet the program’s needs.
• ICTR should create links from the K-program, and the Masters and PhD programs in Clinical Investigation to the CCOR webpage, to make it easier for potential students to learn about the program.

Summary:
Although enrollment has been low, both certificate programs (Capstone and Graduate/Professional) are innovative and of high importance to the mission of ICTR and SMPH. The committee believes there is potential to increase the number of students. The review committee has outlined a number of steps that can be taken to increase enrollment and the Director has identified others in the self-study.

Comments on the Capstone Certificate: Initially, the majority of dropouts were from the Capstone program. The program Director rectified this problem by more carefully selecting students for the program. Recently, junior faculty and postdoctoral fellows have enrolled in and are completing the Capstone as part of their training grants or fellowships. For junior faculty and postdoctoral fellows from SMPH, Pharmacy, Nursing, Industrial and Systems Engineering, Kinesiology, and other departments across campus, the Capstone serves a very important role, allowing them to extend their skill in clinical and community outcomes research.

The committee’s recommendation is to continue the Capstone and Graduate/Professional certificates. We recommend the next review occur in 10 years.
A. The Certificate Faculty Advisory Committee met on 2/3/16 to address issues raised in the Review Committee's report. Following is a summary of their resolutions.

1. **Low enrollment.** Although enrollment has increased gradually over time it is still below the number projected in the original certificate program proposal. We acknowledge this but support maintaining total enrollment at the current level (five to ten) as the level is consistent with both campus need and program capacity.
   
a. **Campus Need.** Although there may be limited demand for the certificate across campus, the certificate serves an important purpose for people in the field. Specifically, the program meets an otherwise unmet need of graduate students and junior scholars with career development awards in the health sciences. In particular, K scholars and postdoctoral fellows have been including the certificate in their proposal professional development plans. This group has been increasing in the past few years, with four of the last 6 enrollees being K scholars.
   
b. **Target enrollees.** The program continues to send recruitment messages to graduate program coordinators across campus. However, since the program inception, there has been a shift in enrollment, from a distribution across professional, graduate and capstone (community based) students, to a predominance of capstone students (K scholars and postdoctoral fellows). The greatest increase has been in students already in their professions (mostly MDs) with career development awards (K awards from NIH and fellowships). The certificate has frequently been included as an integral part of K proposal training plans. Eliminating the certificate would negatively influence the success of this group in competing for K awards. Our recent marketing efforts have primarily targeted this group. (See a sample K scholar proposal training plan in Appendix 1.) One obstacle to enrollment for K scholars has been the recent increase in cost of enrolling in courses. However, we are seeking additional funding from the CTSA to support the cost of these courses for junior investigators with K awards.
   
c. **Program Capacity.** A required course in the certificate program is POP HLTH 709—offered each fall semester. This course fills and has a wait list every time it is offered. Because of this, increasing certificate program numbers would exceed the capacity to accommodate additional certificate students. There are no resources for program advisors or to support faculty teaching. The program has been designed to take advantage of courses across campus along with program faculty advisors’ expertise in translational research. Given the lack of resources for program faculty, there is no untapped capacity.
d. **Time to Completion:** The time to completion for this certificate ranges from 1–5 years, with most completing the certificate program in 1–2 years (9 of the 14). Completion of the program is dependent on 1) successfully completing the one required course, 2) completing additional course requirements from electives, and 3) completing a formal project. (See certificate checklist in Appendix 2.) This requires at least a full year, and for many students, will take longer as the course completion must be aligned with other responsibilities and most K scholars and postdoctoral fellows take only one course at a time. As well, many students require a full year, sometimes longer, to complete the project. The advisory committee considers this time frame to be quite reasonable, and does not see a need to reduce the time required for completion of the certificate or the project.

e. **Attrition of certificate enrollees:** Of the 30 people who’ve been admitted to the certificate program since it began in 2009, eight withdrew without finishing the requirements. Five of these withdrew in 2012 for a variety of reasons. (See below.) Five of the eight withdrawals were Capstone students. From this we learned that we needed to provide more information to off-campus students before they apply for enrollment, i.e., that most or all courses are offered only on campus and during weekdays and that none of the courses are offered online. We continue to watch for opportunities to convert courses to a distance education format. However a distance education option for some courses, e.g., the core course POP HLTH 709, wouldn’t necessarily increase course capacity because of the amount of support and interaction required from the course instructor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>By Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Withdrawals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Grad/Prof or Capstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAPSTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CAPSTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CAPSTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CAPSTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CAPSTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Forming a sense of community among students.** The Certificate Faculty Advisory Committee agreed that additional strategies to create a community would benefit the certificate students and strengthen the program. The committee decided to create a forum for students, meeting at least once each semester, in addition to the annual spring gathering. One or two advisers will meet with certificate students in a seminar-style gathering once or twice each semester. The primary purposes will be to foster a sense of community and provide a forum to discuss ongoing projects.

3. **Consistency in advisement procedures.** The Certificate Faculty Advisory Committee will add to the existing “Checklist for Completing the Certificate” (Appendix 2) that students should meet with their adviser at least once per semester. In the discussion about this, the committee emphasized that the program was intentionally designed to be flexible in order to accommodate a variety of student career goals and projects. Standardizing project initiation and completion times or project content would be at odds with this goal and might not be sufficiently flexible to address the unique circumstances of each student.

4. The Certificate Faculty Advisory Committee will continue to meet to determine how to operationalize committee recommendations about recruiting and training new advisers, mentoring students with clinical backgrounds, increasing community stakeholder involvement, developing a five-year plan and vetting the adviser manual.

B. **In addition, the program plans to adopt the following review recommendations**

1. A *printed handbook*. The program will collect evidence from students and advisers about the format that would be most useful and accessible to them, e.g., printed, online, online with printable PDFs, etc. There are many printable program handouts provided to students and advisers, most frequently sent as attachments to e-mails but also available online: checklist, curriculum plan worksheet, approved electives, and several others.

2. Add a grievance procedure to the handbook along with other information suggested in the Graduate School’s handbook template.

3. We will request that the ICTR web page for CCOR include a link to the online handbook <https://sites.google.com/a/wisc.edu/t2trcertificate/home>.

4. We will request that ICTR web pages for the KL2 program and graduate programs include a link to the CCOR web page.

5. Add Computer Science 769 – Advanced Natural Language Processing to approved electives.

6. **Back up administrator.** The current administrator works with the administrator of the ICTR Certificate in the Fundamentals of Clinical Investigation (Sally Wedde) on certificate-related matters. Sally is familiar with this certificate program. There is a detailed guide for certificate coordinators in the online handbook that will be useful if the current administrator is ever unavailable.

7. **Manuscript and grant writing groups.** The program will collect evidence of need from enrolled students. Many students are in such groups through other majors.
C. Committee recommendations that were already being practiced by the program

1. Include lists of courses that are compatible with both training grant needs and Certificate requirements with CCOR online information.

2. The program tracks outcomes and surveys former students to demonstrate the importance of the certificate to future careers and to identify strengths and weaknesses. The program uses this information for program development and in marketing materials. We’ll put effort into disseminating these materials more effectively. Certificate alums are invited to—and participate in—the Annual Certificate Meeting of Students, Alums and Faculty. Some Certificate alums mentor current students and serve as project advisers. We will explore additional ways to increase involvement of alums.

3. There’s no policy preventing two students from working collaboratively on one project. It would be encouraged. We’ll add this to the “Examples of Project Options” page in the online handbook.

4. Information about CCOR students and alums who agreed to be listed is available in the online handbook, indexed under “Students and Alums.” It includes quotes and information about their careers, research interests, projects, what they learned, how they applied what they learned, published works, and advice for current and future students. We will disseminate this information more effectively.

5. The program lists among approved electives nine qualitative methods courses from across campus. The courses were selected from among the departments of Anthropology, Counseling Psychology, Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, Medical History, Nursing, Sociology and Social Work. They were approved as meeting the following elective criteria.

   Course learning objectives and content must be relevant to research in communities or organizations. Ideally, the course might also address research methodologies that take account of community and organizational culture and values, that are responsive to community partners’ priorities, or that have a direct benefit to the partner.

D. How the program would prioritize recommendations that require additional funding

1. Salary support for developing core course POP HLTH 709 into a distance education course (We are watching for external funding opportunities for this.)

2. A new seminar for Certificate students, faculty and community stakeholders

3. Stipend for community stakeholder involvement

4. Tuition support for UW-Madison research staff to pursue the Certificate

5. Funds to develop incentives for recruiting and/or buying the time of new advisers

6. Funds to print handbooks if there is evidence of need

7. A back-up Certificate administrator

Summary

The Review Committee provided many valuable ideas for improving the Certificate program. We plan to adopt almost all of the ideas and/or use them to take a second look at our practices.

Appendices

1. Sample K scholar proposal training plan
2. Checklist for completing the certificate
3. Enrollment update 3/31/16
4. Letter of support from ICTR
I. Career Development and Training Plan

Urinary and/or bowel incontinence affect more than 60% of community-dwelling US women aged 65 and older, and will become even more prevalent as our population continues to age. Incontinence is associated with significant negative impact on quality of life and substantial health care costs, but the majority of people with this condition do not seek care. Interventions to reduce symptoms and increase care-seeking for both urinary and bowel incontinence among older women in the US are urgently needed to minimize unnecessary suffering, prevent institutionalization, and decrease healthcare costs. My long-term research career goal is to become an academic urogynecologist leading a federally-funded translational research program to develop, implement, and disseminate innovative programs to reduce symptoms and increase care-seeking for urinary and bowel incontinence. This research has a high likelihood to positively impact continence and improve quality of life, prevent institutionalization, and decrease healthcare costs for over 14 million Americans.

The research and training plan proposed in this application will supplement my existing epidemiologic and clinical research skills with additional skills in adaptation and intervention development, community-based research, and dissemination and implementation research. These skills are necessary for me to continue my research trajectory through adaptation and pilot-testing of a community-based urinary and bowel continence promotion program. The findings of the research that will be conducted during the course of this career development award will provide preliminary data for an R01 application to evaluate the effectiveness of the adapted intervention and subsequently to conduct related dissemination and implementation research.

Through the use of structured mentoring and formal coursework, my objectives are to:

1) Acquire a foundation in community-based research
2) Develop skills in implementation science and dissemination research
3) Develop collaborative partnerships with communities and other stakeholders
4) Advance my leadership and mentorship skills

Research Knowledge and Skills

I have a strong foundation in quantitative methods and have published several manuscripts of preliminary data upon which the proposed work builds. This work was supported by my former training in an Applied Epidemiology Fellowship and a Masters of Advanced Studies in Clinical Research. My career development and training plan (Table 1) incorporates additional training in the following key areas critical to the proposed research and my professional development: community-based research and implementation science, development of collaborative partnerships, and leadership and mentoring skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Training Plan and Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Knowledge &amp; Skills:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Research,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Partnerships,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Mentoring Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Conduct of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wisconsin Multidisciplinary K12 Urologic Research Career Development Application:

To obtain Objective 1, attaining a foundation in community-based research, I will complete a Capstone Certificate in Clinical and Community Outcomes Research through the Institute for Clinical and Translational Research (ICTR) at UW. This certificate focuses on examining factors that facilitate or impede implementation of evidence-based practices in real-life communities and specifically provides training in building stakeholder engagement. Mandatory coursework includes electives in working with communities, quantitative methods, and qualitative methods. The curriculum for this certificate includes five courses and one project totaling 15 credit hours, which I will plan to complete over the three years of the mentored career development award. Table 1 provides the list of courses and their timing within the context of the K12 Program. During the first year of the award, when I have 50% protected time for research, I will complete one course in the fall semester. This course, CURRIC 719: Introduction to Qualitative Research, meets each Tuesday from 9:30-12:00, and my Department Chair has supported the redesign of my clinical schedule to accommodate attendance. I will complete the remaining coursework during the second and third years when I have additional protected time (75%) for research. The award of this grant is essential to provide me with the necessary time to devote to my research development. Without it, I will not be able to find the time to be released from my clinical duties to achieve my goal to become an independent investigator in implementation and community based interventions.

To complete Objective 2, development of skills in implementation science and dissemination research, I will work closely with mentor Dr. Jane Mahoney, who has extensive expertise in intervention adaptation and dissemination and implementation research. In addition to a short course in Dissemination and Implementation Research I attended in October 2013 at UW, I will attend the Annual Conference on the Science of Dissemination and Implementation held in Bethesda, MD in December each year.

To attain Objective 3, development of collaborative partnerships with communities and other stakeholders, I will continue to work closely with mentors Dr. Jane Mahoney and Dr. Maureen Smith, both of whom are leaders in community-academic partnership. I have already secured a partnership commitment from the Director of the Fitchburg Senior Center for the proposed work, after an introduction by way of the Community Academic Aging Research Network (CAARN) and Dr. Mahoney. At Dr. Mahoney’s suggestion, I have assembled an Advisory Board of stakeholders to ensure their voices are heard and appreciated through the duration of the proposed work and beyond. I will be closely mentored by Dr. Mahoney and Dr. Paul Moberg, both of whom have experience working with community centers to evaluate health promotion programs, to continue building collaborative partnerships with relevant stakeholders.

To achieve Objective 4, advancing leadership and mentorship skills, I will attend an 8 hour workshop on mentoring offered through ICTR during my final year on the mentored career development award. I will continue to volunteer with my national and international professional organizations and will continue to serve as a peer reviewer to develop a national academic reputation. I will submit abstracts to present my work at both national and international urogynecologic research meetings annually. I will continue to serve on the Healthcare Advisory Board for the Healthy Mature Living Foundation, as well as a contributing editor for www.ABLinfo.org, to promote national recognition of the importance of bowel incontinence as a mature health issue. Most importantly, I will be mentored by four outstanding mentors, who will lead by example and serve as role models so that I am able to mentor residents, medical students, and fellows in their research endeavors in the future. Because our institution does not have a funded investigator in Female Pelvic Medicine and Reconstructive Surgery, I have secured the mentorship of Dr. Rogers, at the University of New Mexico. She has extensive experience in qualitative research and is a leader in questionnaire development. She has collaborated extensively in the submission of this application and has experience with successful distance mentoring, with three of her recent mentees achieving research independence.

Responsible Conduct of Research
I will take a one-credit seminar in the Responsible Conduct of Research during the spring semester of the first year of my career development award, which will address all 9 core instructional areas in the responsible conduct of research. To address issues with publication practices and responsible authorship, I have already taken a two day short course on grant writing, and will continue to attend two writing groups through ICTR and the Health Innovation Program. I will also continue to serve on the International Urogynecological Association’s Publication Committee. To continue to gain experience with ethical issues of peer review, I will continue to serve as a peer reviewer for the International Urogynecology Journal, the British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, and the Journal of Urology. The mentorship seminar during my third year of the career
Wisconsin Multidisciplinary K12 Urologic Research Career Development Application: development award will address mentor/trainee responsibilities. I will continue to participate in CITI training modules to address the remaining ethical issues in: data acquisition, management, sharing and ownership; collaborative science; human subjects research; research involving animals; research misconduct; and conflict of interest and commitment.

**Career Goals**

The training and professional development plan outlined above will allow me to move beyond my early studies describing the prevalence of urinary and bowel incontinence, associated risk factors, and poor rates of care-seeking, towards adaptation of targeted interventions to improve symptoms and increase care-seeking for these conditions. Table 2 displays the anticipated research career trajectory through which I will pursue independent R01 funding for subsequent intervention dissemination and implementation research, which has the potential to impact quality of life, independence, and healthcare costs for over 14 million Americans. Further, this platform of community-based research in urogynecology aligns with priorities of the Departments of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Urology and will provide the research mentoring skills I need to support our Female Pelvic Medicine and Reconstructive Surgery fellows when our fellowship training program is established in the next 5-7 years. With the skills and training offered by the Wisconsin Multidisciplinary K12 Urologic Research Career Development Program, I will not only advance my own research agenda, but will also become a mentor for future young scholars pursuing similar research and clinical careers.
# Checklist

## For completing the Certificate in Clinical and Community Outcomes Research

Use this checklist to make sure you follow all the procedures required to complete the Certificate.

### Apply for enrollment

- See admission policies and procedures at [https://sites.google.com/a/wisc.edu/t2trcertificate/home](https://sites.google.com/a/wisc.edu/t2trcertificate/home).
- Non-degree-seeking students, follow the procedures for a Capstone Certificate application.
- There’s no deadline. Applications are reviewed and admissions are decided on a rolling basis.
- Don't hesitate to contact Sharon Schumacher with any questions, scschumache2@wisc.edu, (608) 262-1415.

### Receive your notification of admission and adviser assignment

If you have completed all the application procedures, you will receive notification of the admission decision within three weeks. If you have any questions about the status of your application, feel free to contact Sharon Schumacher scschumache2@wisc.edu, (608) 262-1415.

- **Your adviser:** After you have been admitted, the Certificate Advisory Committee will review your stated research interests and recommend a Certificate adviser for you. (Your Certificate adviser will not be the same as the adviser for your degree program.) An objective is to match each student with a Certificate adviser from a discipline other than their own in order to expose students to a variety of perspectives. Sharon Schumacher will e-mail you the name and contact information of your Certificate adviser.

- **Certificate declaration form:** If you are a graduate or professional student, Sharon Schumacher will ask you to complete and sign a certificate declaration form. This tells the UW Registrar to enter your Certificate program enrollment into the Integrated Student Information System (ISIS). (Capstone Certificate students do not need to do this.)

### Schedule a meeting with your Certificate adviser to discuss your curriculum plan

- To get ready for your first advisement meeting, take a look at the Learn@UW site for the Certificate [https://learnuw.wisc.edu/](https://learnuw.wisc.edu/). (Look under your ‘Student’ tab.) It contains information about course and project requirements and options, enrollment procedures, forms, support resources, etc.
- Use the ‘Curriculum-Plan-and-Tracking Form’ to start planning your courses (linked on the ‘Forms’ page of the Learn@UW site for the Certificate).
- Use the list of approved electives (linked on the ‘Curriculum’ page) to identify elective courses you would like to take. You can propose qualifying courses that are not on this list to fulfill elective areas.
- Think about which of the two seminar options would be best for you.
- While meeting with your adviser, discuss your research and career interests.
- Complete the ‘Curriculum-Plan-and-Tracking Form’. Even if you are not sure about all the courses you would like to take, please go ahead and complete as much of the form as you can and send a copy to Sharon Schumacher (address on the form). You can always update the form as you learn more about your plans.
- Meet with your advisor at least once a semester.

## Course work

### POP HLTH 709—Translational and Outcomes Research in Health and Health Care

(3 credits. Fall only.)

- It is recommended that you have taken at least one or two courses in research design and/or analysis before taking this course.
- To enroll in POP HLTH 709, e-mail Professor Smith at maureensmith@wisc.edu. Enrollment limit is twelve students. This course is only offered in the fall.
- Your project experience will be enhanced by taking this course before or during your project experience.
- A description of this course is linked to the ‘Curriculum’ page on the Learn@UW site [https://learnuw.wisc.edu/](https://learnuw.wisc.edu/).
Three elective areas: Complete one approved course in each area.

- At least 50 percent of your certificate credits must be taken while enrolled at UW-Madison.
- If you are a graduate or professional student, at least one of the elective courses must be from outside your major.
- You may propose to your Certificate Adviser a pertinent course for consideration as elective credit that is not listed among approved electives, including a course that fulfills a requirement for your degree program. The criteria for a course to be considered as fulfilling a Certificate elective requirement are on the list of approved electives.
- INSTRUCTIONS for proposing an alternative: Complete the form ‘Proposal of an Alternative Course to Fulfill an Elective Requirement’. (This form is linked on the ‘Forms’ page at the Learn@UW site for the Certificate [https://learnuw.wisc.edu/].) Send the completed proposal with the course syllabus to your adviser for approval. Once approved, send a copy with the course syllabus to Sharon Schumacher. Keep a copy for yourself. (These instructions also appear on the form.)

Elective area: Working with Communities (2–3 credits) See list of approved electives.

Elective area: Quantitative Methods Relevant to Translational and Outcomes Research (3 credits) See list of approved electives.

Elective area: Qualitative Methods Relevant to Translational and Outcomes Research (3 credits) See list of approved electives.

Seminar (To fulfill the seminar requirement choose one seminar from the following two options. Follow the procedures for enrolling and earning course credit.)

Option 1

AQORN (Access, Quality, and Outcomes Research Network) Seminar (POP HLTH 990-092)

AQORN is an informal lunchtime seminar that is open to University of Wisconsin faculty, staff, and students interested in health services research. AQORN meets for 90 minutes, sometimes as frequently as twice a month. At each meeting, someone who has a research project in progress presents information about their project. Then the group discusses and exchanges information and ideas relevant to the project. Information about past AQORN topics is at [http://www.aqorn.org/].

SEMINAR REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATE STUDENTS: To receive the one hour of seminar credit required for earning the Certificate, students must do the following.
- Register for AQORN credit.
- Give a presentation about your research at an AQORN meeting.
- Attend ten AQORN sessions (counting your own presentation). There will not always be ten AQORN sessions in a single semester, so you should be prepared to attend additional AQORNs outside the semester in order to complete the credit.*
- Make sure your attendance is recorded the AQORN staff person during the session.
- Participate in the discussions.
- Complete a guided summary of each of the ten sessions you attend (see guided-summary template linked to the ‘Curriculum’ page of the Learn@UW site for the Certificate).
- After you have completed ten sessions and guided summaries, send your guided summaries to Sharon Schumacher (address on the template).

* NOTE: There will not always be ten AQORN sessions in a single semester. So you should be prepared to attend additional AQORNs outside the semester in order to complete the credit. In this case an ‘Incomplete’ will be recorded as your grade until you are able to fulfill all requirements listed above.

Option 2

The Patient Safety Research Seminar (ISyE 961)

Since ISyE 961 is not offered on a regular basis, the alternative is for a student to sign up for one credit of independent study with Professor Pascale Carayon (carayon@ie.engr.wisc.edu). In this option, the student will be required to:
1. Watch all the videos of seminars in the Community Academic Partnership (CAP) Patient Safety series.* There are currently eleven videos, each approximately one hour long.
2. Write two one-page summaries of two seminars that are due on the last day of class.

Complete your project (2 credits)

- For helpful details, steps and suggestions for completing your project, follow the ‘Project’ link on the ‘Curriculum’ page of the Learn@UW site.
- Schedule a meeting with your certificate adviser to discuss your project ideas(s).
- Obtain approval signature from your certificate adviser on: 1) your project plan and 2) your rubric for evaluating your project. Send a copy of each to Sharon Schumacher.
- Complete your project.
- Evaluate your project using your rubric.
- Give a presentation about your project at an AQORN seminar and/or at an annual spring get together of Certificate students and faculty.
- Ask your adviser to review your project and complete the project review form. Send a copy of your approved project plan, signed project review form, completed rubric for evaluating your project, and other project material to Sharon Schumacher; scschumache2@wisc.edu; 701 Highland Ave., Madison, WI 53705; phone 608 262-1415.

Final step

- Notify Sharon Schumacher that you have completed all of the Certificate requirements.
  Let her know the address to send your certificate to.

Please contact Sharon Schumacher with any questions.

sschumache2@wisc.edu
(608) 262-1415
701 Highland Ave., Room 5137
Madison, WI 53705
## Enrollment

**Certificate in Clinical and Community Outcomes Research**

### Enrollment activity by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Academic Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>Year Admitted</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Grad/Prof or Capstone Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Krupp</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Dattalo</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Meghan</td>
<td>Brennan</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Amaziah</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Roll</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Wasley</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Frasier</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Students awarded the Certificate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>Year Awarded</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Grad/Prof or Capstone Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>Utecht</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Paj Ntaub</td>
<td>Vang</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Jia</td>
<td>Pu</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Stacy</td>
<td>Walz</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Kristen</td>
<td>Pecanac</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Shadeeqqa</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Maichou</td>
<td>Lor</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Anping</td>
<td>Xie</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Gilmore</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tolu</td>
<td>Oyesanya</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 28, 2016

To: Richard L. Moss  
Senior Associate Dean for Basic Research, Biotechnology and Graduate Studies  
UW School of Medicine and Public Health  
UW SMPH 2015–2016 Academic Planning Council

From: Marc K. Drezner  
Senior Associate Dean for Clinical and Translational Research  
UW School of Medicine and Public Health  
Executive Director  
Institute for Clinical and Translational Research

Subject: Letter of Support for the Certificate in Clinical and Community Outcomes Research

I am writing to express my enthusiastic support to continue offering the Certificate in Clinical and Community Outcomes Research (CCOR). This certificate program, established in 2009, provides important research training and skill development opportunities for scholars pursuing careers in health services research, and is central to the workforce development objectives of the University of Wisconsin Clinical and Translational Science Award (CTSA) from the National Institutes of Health.

The NIH/National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences supports a national consortium of more than 60 medical research institutions—including the UW Institute for Clinical and Translational Research (UW ICTR). The goals include to accelerate the process of translating laboratory discoveries into treatments for patients, train a new generation of clinical and translational researchers, and engage communities in clinical research efforts.

Moving toward these goals requires translational research that engages a diverse array of stakeholders, including community members and organizations, clinicians and researchers, as partners in the research process. This type of research requires a distinct set of skills, dedicated in large part to understanding the multiple factors that interact to influence a community or organization to: 1) participate in research; 2) implement change in practice habits; and 3) form and manage sustainable partnerships across disciplines and the workforce sector, among other things. The CCOR focuses on the development of these and other skills, enabling successful engagement in translational and community health outcomes research.
Strategically, the UW ICTR has developed two separate but complementary certificate programs to meet the needs of a diverse health research workforce. The Certificate in the Fundamentals of Clinical Research supports the training of “bench to bedside” investigators, previously referred to as Type I translational researchers. The CCOR focuses on skills needed to translate research findings from controlled clinical environments to natural community settings. Taken together, these two certificate programs facilitate the development of a workforce prepared to create, test, and disseminate new technologies and health improvement strategies.

Most certificate enrollees have no prior training in collaborating with community organizations or in research methods appropriate for community based clinical research when entering the certificate program. The flexibility of this certificate program allows students from many disciplines to tailor courses and projects to their specific needs, while ensuring that they gain knowledge and skills needed to conduct community based clinical research. In accord, the curriculum for the program is highly flexible with approved electives from more than 20 academic discipline, allowing a high level of individual tailoring of courses and experiences to accommodate the requirements of different departments and programs.

To date, there are 14 CCOR certificate graduates and 8 current students from medicine and population health, nursing, pharmacy and industrial and systems engineering. Recruitment efforts have targeted these health disciplines, as well as disciplines not commonly associated with the provision of health care, such as education, public policy, anthropology, sociology, social work, and business.

Early-stage scholars have been including this certificate program in their training plan proposals for career development awards (such as K awards from the National Institutes of Health, as well as young investigator awards from other national programs). NIH reviewers have been particularly positive about the CCOR certificate. Since the certificate program began in 2009, the number of certificate students with professional development awards has increased—from one in 2010 to four at present. Over time, we hope that these scholars will become the faculty mentors for the next generation of clinical and translational researchers.

Please feel free to contact me directly if you would like to discuss further.
Implementation Form – Capstone Certificates

This form must accompany a capstone certificate proposal. An updated form should be submitted when changes to the certificate are made and when a certificate is reviewed. It is used by administrative offices to better assist departments and programs with implementation. Questions in this form reflect guidelines in the Full Guidelines for For-Credit Certificates, [http://apir.wisc.edu/certificates.htm](http://apir.wisc.edu/certificates.htm).

Document Date: 8/15/16
Name of Capstone Certificate: Certificate in Clinical and Community Health Outcomes Research
Faculty Program Director: Barbara Bowers
Primary Faculty/Staff Contact: Sharon Schumacher
Home Department/Academic Unit (Name/UDDS): Institute for Clinical and Translational Research/532940
Approval Date: 2/18/2009
School/College: School of Medicine and Public Health
Approval Date: 2/18/2009
GFEC Approval Date: 4/23/2009
UAPC Approval Date: 4/23/2009
Implementation Term (typically the fall term after UAPC approval): Fall 2009
Year that first program review is scheduled (usually 5 years after implementation): 2014–15

Information to be completed by RO and APIR:
Plan Code (assigned by the Registrar’s Office):
CIP Code (assigned by Academic Planning and Institutional Research):
Primary Divisional Disciplinary Assignment (assigned by APIR for analysis purposes only):

Curriculum (9-12cr) - List of required and elective courses and any other program requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Cr. Hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POP HLTH 709 Translational and Outcomes Research in Health and Health Care</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose from elective area: Working with Communities.</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose from elective area: Quantitative Methods Relevant to Translational and Outcomes Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose from elective area: Qualitative Methods Relevant to Translational and Outcomes Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CREDIT HOURS</strong></td>
<td><strong>14-15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Goals:
List 1 to 5 certificate learning goals:

The student will demonstrate through the required certificate project an understanding of the following clinical and community outcomes research principles and methods.
1. Develop a research question about a health concern of an actual community.
2. Select an evidence-based approach to addressing the health concern.
3. Involve investigators from two or more disciplines and/or stakeholders from two or more sectors as partners in the project.
4. Demonstrate an understanding of collaboration skills for sustainable partnerships, e.g., benefits to the community partner(s) are built into the project; evidence of partner input to project design.
5. Employ data gathering and analysis methods that respect community partners' organizational culture, values, staffing, and work flow.

Projections for annual enrollment: 2–5 new admits

Specify overlap provisions – name degree/major, minor or certificate programs that a student may have previously earned that disqualify them from being admitted to the capstone certificate program.

None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please answer the following:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that the capstone certificate is open to only non-degree seeking University Special</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students who hold a bachelor’s degree.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that all credits are required to be earned in residence at UW-Madison.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will there be limits on number of students who can enroll?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes, please explain: No more than 10-to-15 students is the best fit in relation to teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity of the intro course (POP HLTH 709) and supervision of projects by faculty advisers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that all core/required courses are approved through the school/college curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that courses in curriculum are offered on a regular basis and have space for students</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in this program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that required courses in the curriculum are numbered 300 or above.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that courses taken as Pass/Fail or Audit are not included in the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are courses taken Credit/No Credit allowed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, specify limits:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that special topics courses are only used if all instances count for the certificate.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that, at a minimum, C grades must be earned on all course work attempted for the</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capstone certificate program. (Only graduate-level work from the capstone that is earned with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a grade of B or better is eligible for subsequent application to a UW-Madison graduate degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other requirements, please specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will exceptions to the course core requirements be allowed?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, specify limits and process:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that the program/department has a process in place to monitor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student progress and to notify the Registrar’s Office when students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete the certificate requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment plan – confirm that the proposal includes a plan that</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>describes how the program faculty will regularly evaluate student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that the program/department understands that international</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students who must request a UW-Madison-issued I-20 (for the F-1 student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visa needed for legal study in the US) will only be eligible to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate in the program if it is offered full-time and if the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program has been approved by the US government to receive such</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international students. If the program is offered entirely online or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the international student is here legally on another visa (such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the JS, H, etc.) and an I-20 from UW-Madison is not needed, then this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provision does not apply.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will this capstone certificate be implemented as a Fund 131 tuition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, has a budget been developed with the Division of Continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies and the sponsoring school/college dean’s office?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is the appropriate school/college contact for questions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Clinical and Translational Research/School of Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Form – Graduate/Professional Certificates

This form must accompany a graduate/professional certificate proposal. An updated form should be submitted when changes to the certificate are made and when a certificate is reviewed. It is used by administrative offices to better assist departments and programs with implementation. Questions in this form reflect guidelines in the Full Guidelines for For-Credit Certificates, http://apir.wisc.edu/certificates.htm.

Document Date: 8/15/16
Name of Graduate/Professional Certificate: Certificate in Clinical and Community Outcomes Research
Faculty Program Director: Barbara Bowers
Primary Faculty/Staff Contact: Sharon Schumacher
Home Department/Academic Unit (Name/UDDS): Institute for Clinical and Translational Research/532940
Approval Date: 2/18/2009
School/College: School of Medicine and Public Health
Approval Date: 2/18/2009
GFEC Approval Date: 4/23/2009
UAPC Approval Date: 4/23/2009; rename approved 4/17/2014
Implementation Term (typically the fall term after UAPC approval): Fall 2009
Year that first program review is scheduled (usually 5 years after implementation): 2014–15

Information to be completed by RO and APIR:
Plan Code (assigned by the Registrar’s Office):
CIP Code (assigned by Academic Planning and Institutional Research):
Primary Divisional Disciplinary Assignment (assigned by APIR for analysis purposes only):

Curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Cr. Hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POP HLTH 709 Translational and Outcomes Research in Health and Health Care</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose from elective area: Working with Communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose from elective area: Quantitative Methods Relevant to Translational and Outcomes Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose from elective area: Qualitative Methods Relevant to Translational and Outcomes Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CREDIT HOURS</strong></td>
<td><strong>14-15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projections for annual enrollment: 2–5 new admits
Learning Goals:
List 1 to 5 certificate learning goals:

The student will demonstrate through the required certificate project an understanding of the following clinical and community outcomes research principles and methods.
1. Develop a research question about a health concern of an actual community.
2. Select an evidence-based approach to addressing the health concern.
3. Involve investigators from two or more disciplines and/or stakeholders from two or more sectors as partners in your project.
4. Demonstrate an understanding of collaboration skills for sustainable partnerships, e.g., benefits to the community partner(s) are built into the project; evidence of partner input to project design.
5. Employ data gathering and analysis methods that respect community partners’ organizational culture, values, staffing, and work flow.

Please answer the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will there be limits on enrollment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes, please explain: No more than 10-to-15 students is the best fit in relation to teaching capacity of the intro course (POP HLTH 709) and supervision of projects by faculty advisers.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that all core/required courses are approved through the school/college curriculum committee.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that courses in curriculum are offered on a regular basis and have space for students in this program.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that all courses numbered 300 or above.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that courses taken as Pass/Fail or Audit are not allowed.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are courses taken Credit/No Credit allowed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, specify limits:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that special topics courses are only used if all instances count for the certificate.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the certificate use the typical minimum GPA requirement of 3.0 for all course work for the certificate?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, specify other requirements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will exceptions to the course core requirements be allowed?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, specify limits and process:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that at least 50%/half of the credits must be earned “in residence” at UW-Madison (in residence includes distance/online courses and Study Away/Abroad on UW-Madison courses.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that the program/department has a process in place to report certificate enrollment to the Registrar’s Office.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that the program/department has a process in place to monitor student progress and to notify the Registrar’s Office when students complete the certificate requirements.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confirm that the program faculty and staff understand that a student’s graduation should not be delayed to complete the certificate.  

Assessment plan – confirm that the proposal includes a plan that describes how the faculty will regularly evaluate student learning.

Specify overlap provisions – name degree/major, doctoral minors or certificate programs that may not be earned along with the certificate. Note that majors take priority over certificates. (Students may not earn a graduate certificate if they are also earning a post-baccalaureate major/degree or doctoral minor with the same name.)

None

What provisions have you made in the admissions process to gain consent from students’ degree/major program(s) to participate in the certificate program?

Require signature of the student’s degree program adviser on the Certificate Declaration form
Graduate Program in Clinical Investigation

DATE: Dec. 21, 2016
FROM: Faculty Executive Committee, Graduate Program in Clinical Investigation (GPCI)
       GPCI Training Director Robert F. Lemanske, Jr., MD
TO: School of Medicine and Public Health Academic Planning Council
     Care of Andrea Poehling
SUBJECT: Rationale for Continuing the Clinical and Community Outcomes Research Capstone and the Fundamentals of Clinical Research Capstone and Fundamentals of Clinical Research Graduate/Professional as Separate Certificate Programs

Dear Academic Planning Council Members:

The Executive Committee members of the Graduate Program in Clinical Investigation (GPCI) are the faculty governing body for the following academic programs housed in the Institute for Clinical and Translational Research (ICTR): (1) PhD and MS in Clinical Investigation; (2) PhD minor with a clinical and translational science (CTS) research focus, which we call PhD^{CTS}; (3) Capstone, Graduate and Professional Certificates in the Fundamentals of Clinical Research (FCR); and (4) Capstone, Graduate and Professional Certificates in Clinical and Community Outcomes Research (CCOR). ICTR represents five academic partners: The College of Engineering and the Schools of Medicine and Public Health, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Veterinary Medicine.

Under the University Academic Planning Council definition adopted June 16, 2016, three types of ICTR certificates were identified as being in a low award producing status: graduate/professional and Capstone completers in the FCR and Capstone completers in the CCOR programs. We are writing on behalf of both the FCR and CCOR programs to address this issue as follows. First, we will provide information that supports the unique educational value and career opportunities these programs provide to the university community and the rationale for maintaining both the FCR and CCOR programs as separate entities. Second, we will provide information that addresses why these programs have low enrollment status currently, and our planned corrective measures.

Do the programs fulfill specific academic niches unique to UW-Madison?

- The rationale for continuing both the FCR and CCOR certificate programs as separate entities includes the following. First, the programs fulfill unique academic niches within UW-Madison; second, the demonstrated student need; third, the program’s stable home, faculty commitment, and effort; fourth, the role of the certificate in graduate student recruitment, and fifth, the fact that the Certificate programs are essential to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Clinical and Translational Science Award (CTSA)-mandated biomedical workforce development programs in ICTR.

- All four Certificate programs – FCR and CCOR Capstone, and Graduate/Professional -- are critical components of the continuum of clinical and translational research training. The Certificates were created in response to a national need for clinicians to be trained to acquire the skills to conduct research on new clinical treatments and health interventions, and to successfully translate these research findings to improvements in patient care.

- The objective of the original FCR Capstone Certificate program, and its subsequent expansion to include professional and graduate students, is to provide formalized training for health care professionals in clinical research methodologies, designs, and statistical analyses.

- In contrast, the CCOR programs are designed to train researchers at early career stages from a variety of disciplines to focus on dissemination and implementation of health and biomedical research findings and solutions to diverse patient populations and communities.

- The Capstone programs reach health professionals who otherwise would have no student relationship with the University.
• The Graduate and Professional programs reach graduate and professional students who apply clinical and translational science to their field of study; that is, the conduct of research that is designed from the start with an eye toward the patient populations that eventually would benefit.

**Do the programs address student needs?**

• Currently the Graduate Program in Clinical Investigation (GPCI) has 21 graduate students, 26 Certificates students, and 10 PhD<sup>CTS</sup> students (see table below). The educational programs within ICTR, both for credit and non-credit, provide a purposeful array of options for a variety of students interested in advancing their education in various aspects of the clinical and translational continuum. The Certificate programs play a critical role in contributing to this continuum and their loss would introduce a gap that cannot be filled through other courses. Indeed, the curriculum of the FCR certificate program constitutes the didactic foundation required of all students enrolled through the NIH CTSA-funded TL1 predoctoral (existing) and postdoctoral (new and projected to begin in July 2017) programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical and Translational Research Students (Nov. 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEGREE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD&lt;sup&gt;CTS&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCR Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCOR Certificate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Based on new initiatives created in the recent CTSA renewal request for applications (RFA), we feel confident that the low enrollment status of the Graduate/Professional FCR program will be corrected. Importantly, NIH funding of ICTR for the five-year renewal starting in mid-2017 hinges on providing the didactic foundation (the FCR Certificate) for TL1 program predoctoral (PhD CI and PhD<sup>CTS</sup>) and postdoctoral trainees. The newly created postdoctoral training program will increase the pool of students who will complete the FCR Certificate 13-15 credit requirement by approximately 3-4 students/year.

• For the Capstone FCR program we are addressing the low enrollment status in three ways. First, through personal and widespread (six ICTR academic partners) faculty recruitment of potential scholars among Wisconsin working health professionals, with future funding allowing expansion to out of state. Second, by increasing visibility on our recently revised and updated ICTR website. Third, through direct marketing in person and promotional materials to fellowship programs in academic partner schools and colleges.

• Regarding low enrollment status in the Capstone CCOR program, we are working on a number of factors that we consider relevant to this problem. Most Capstone students are engaged in clinical practices that make it difficult for them to attend timetable courses. To make it easier for this group to enroll in the methods courses required for the certificate, we’re exploring the feasibility of packaging online lectures, readings, and assignments into asynchronous, online, credit-bearing courses on 1) qualitative research methods for health services research and 2) dissemination and implementation research methods. This alternative course access approach is in response to feedback from current and past Capstone certificate enrollees.

• The certificates are crucial for recruitment of Clinical Investigation Program graduate students. Among all alumni and current students, 62% of MS students and 24% of PhD students in Clinical Investigation started as Certificate students. When students move from the certificate to the graduate program, they become “non-completers.” The ability of the Certificate Programs to serve as an initial step towards the subsequent pursuit of advanced graduate degrees should be considered as one of their assets and not as criteria for their discontinuation.
• We did not realize at the inception of the GPCI how valuable the Certificates would become for graduate program recruitment. Indeed, clinical Investigation MS and PhD students tend to begin the GPCI as potential Capstone Certificate earners. Prospective students know they are interested in more training about clinical research, but they do not yet know whether they will pursue formal or even further training. Since many of our scholars are working health professionals and/or junior faculty, they are unsure of the practicality of coursework with other responsibilities. These students are not required to notify the program to enroll in a course as a Special Student, and they can complete these courses before declaring either Certificate.

• In addition, in order to allow health professionals time to see whether taking a course fits into their professional and personal lives, the bar for admission to a Certificate program is lower than that for Graduate Schools; the online application is shorter, and there are fewer letters of recommendation. This ability to explore the courses is eminently helpful for working health professionals for whom the programs are designed.

• Certificate students go on to earn other graduate degrees at UW-Madison. Among students who are counted as Certificate non-completers, three went on to earn other degrees: the MPH, MS in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, and Kinesiology. An FCR non-completer is pursing the PharmD; another completed the FCR and went on to earn an MS in Population Health Sciences.

• All of these factors indicate that the certificate programs can serve multiple purposes for workforce development along the clinical and translational spectrum and graduate education in general. As such, they should be given more time to flourish.

What is the program’s academic home and faculty commitment?

• The ICTR is committed to hosting the Certificate programs. Faculty from the ICTR partner schools and college are committed to the students, as demonstrated by their active service as primary mentors, degree committee members, program governing committee members, and lead course faculty and/or lecturers in required courses. Some 142 faculty members were involved in these varied activities from 2009 through 2014 (source: Executive Committee review of GPCI faculty)

• Leaders of many fellowship training programs now recommend certificate level training at a minimum, for health care professional fellows and trainees.

• Capstone Certificate program participants include junior and mid-level faculty, fellows, research assistants and research program managers, and scientists. The range of interest among graduate students in the certificate and graduate programs indicates a growing awareness of the value of clinical research training.

What costs are incurred by the program?

As detailed in the five-year self-reviews, the estimated annual dollar cost for the four Certificate programs is $87,143, as follows:

• The FCR Certificates budget includes $23,542 for salary and fringe benefits for administration and student services, and $41,383 for instructor and TA salaries and fringe benefits. These TA costs are not exclusively directed to the Certificates. The courses form the didactic foundation for the MS, PhD in Clinical Investigation, PhDCTS, and the future postdoctoral training program and therefore serve a larger constituency. Certificate student enrollment in the courses is a small part of total enrollment.

• The CCOR Certificates budget is $11,218 for administration, and approximately $11,000 for TA costs for one course that also is open to all UW-Madison graduate students with instructor consent.

• In addition, the GPCI recognizes that the certificate programs also incur costs for the School of Medicine and Public Health, the Registrar’s Office, the Graduate School, the Office of the Provost, and others.
Why is merger or discontinuation not productive options?

- The FCR program started in the Biostatistics Department and moved to ICTR in 2007 as a Capstone program. The programs were approved for enrollment of graduate and professional students as well in 2011. Providing a quantitative-based didactic foundation, the FCR program is the predecessor to the whole GPCI (see five-year self-review report, Capstone Certificate in the Fundamentals of Clinical Investigation).

- Meanwhile, the CCOR program started in 2009 for Capstone, graduate, and professional students. Its genesis was a joint venture of several departments focused on qualitative research including health equity research. (see five-year self-review report, Clinical and Community Outcomes Research).

- Merger of the FCR and CCOR certificate programs would be inappropriate, given the differing research needs of the students of the FCR and CCOR programs and the curriculum content of each that addresses different aspects of clinical and translational research and community engagement. Even though the students are engaged in some aspect of the translational research spectrum, the didactic foundations they acquire by completing the certificates are unique and provide them with distinct career opportunities.

- Despite low numbers for Capstone and Graduate/Professional student completers of the FCR and Capstone completers of the CCOR, outcomes for participating students are quite positive, including 197 publications and $5.5 million in external and internal awards.

- Multiple schools and colleges benefit from the FCR and CCOR Certificate programs (source: 2015 report to NIH External Advisory Committee) as demonstrated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCOR Student Academic Homes</th>
<th>FCR Student Academic Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMPH</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SON</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SON</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L &amp; S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As summarized in our response to the five-year review, we are committed to promoting the Certificate programs for all types of students as a key part of marketing training opportunities within the GPCI and ICTR. Our current priorities are:

- Personal and widespread (six ICTR academic partners) faculty recruitment of potential scholars among Wisconsin working health professionals, with future funding allowing expansion to out of state

- Increased visibility on ICTR revised website

- Direct marketing in person and promotional materials to fellowship programs in academic partner schools and colleges.

In summary, program faculty and staff are committed to Certificate students in the continuum of training; the programs are proving to be an invaluable pipeline to graduate program recruitment; and the programs increasingly attract students who otherwise would have no other training program available. The certificate programs in totality are a critical part of ICTR’s requirements for successful and continued funding via the NCATS Clinical and Translational Services Award.

Do not hesitate to contact us if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Lemanske, Jr., MD, Training Director, and
Executive Committee Members of the Graduate Program in Clinical Investigation:

Barbara J. Bowers, PhD, RN, Associate Dean, Professor
Nursing SON

KyungMann Kim, PhD (Chair)
Professor, Biostatistics and Medical Informatics SMPH

Robert Thorne, PhD (Vice-Chair)
Assistant Professor, Pharmaceutical Sciences SOP

Christopher L. Brace, PhD
Associate Professor, Biomedical Engineering COE and Radiology SMPH

Murray H. Brilliant, PhD
Director, Human Genetics Center, Marshfield Clinic Research Foundation

Ronald Gangnon, PhD
Professor, Population Health Sciences SMPH

Karen E. Hansen, MD, MS
Associate Professor, Medicine-Rheumatology SMPH

Eneida Mendonça, MD, PhD
Associate Professor, Biostatistics and Medical Informatics SMPH

David Rabago, PhD
Associate Professor, Family Medicine and Community Health SMPH

Marulasidappa Suresh, DVM, PhD (Invited)
Professor, Pathobiological Sciences SVM
May 24, 2017

Tejumola Olaniyan, Ph.D.
Louise Durham Mead Professor Professor and Chair
Department of African Cultural Studies
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Sent Electronically

Dear Professor Olaniyan,

Thank you for your letter of March 30, 2017, responding to my February 21, 2017, letter summarizing the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee’s discussion of the ten-year review of the Department of African Cultural Studies graduate programs.

On May 12, 2017, the GFEC had an extended discussion of your letter. The committee was appreciative of the goals you provided for the areas of concern raised by the GFEC; however, there are still remaining questions about several matters from the program review.

Specifically, at a time when many of our language programs are experiencing decreasing applications and increased funding package competition from peers, the GFEC is interested in learning what has changed in your new admissions process that you believe will better align it with your cultural studies orientation and desire for full five-year funding support. Given limited funding resources, the GFEC is also concerned with low rates of degree completion, and as such would like to understand your program’s plan for improving this important measure for all students, with particular focus on those from underrepresented groups.

The GFEC requests you attend the committee’s first fall meeting on September 8, 2017, to discuss these matters. Assistant Dean Marty Gustafson will contact you to reserve a place on the agenda. We again encourage you to meet with LaRuth McAfee (laruth.macafee@wisc.edu), Assistant Dean for Diversity, Inclusion and Funding, prior to the September GFEC meeting for additional resources and strategies to improve your retention efforts. The GFEC also recommends that the program use the new campus Diversity Inventory Program to learn more about practices here at UW-Madison related to diversity, inclusion and climate that may directly benefit its recruiting and retention efforts. The GFEC is looking to see specific plans that the program will pursue to address each of these areas of concern.
Thank you for your attention to these issues and to the quality of the student experience for those in your program.

Sincerely,

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

Cc: J. Karl Scholz, College of Letters and Science
    Susan Zaeske, College of Letters and Science
    Elaine Klein, College of Letters and Science
    Katrina Thompson, Department of African Cultural Studies
    Toni Landis, Department of African Cultural Studies
    Jocelyn Milner, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
    Sarah Kuba, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
    Parmesh Ramanathan, Graduate School
    Marty Gustafson, Graduate School
    LaRuth McAfee, Graduate School
    Emily Reynolds, Graduate School
March 30, 2017

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

Dear Dean Karpus,

I am writing in response to your letter of February 21, 2017 regarding the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) review of the Department of African Cultural Studies (ACS).

On Title VI cutbacks, language teaching, and graduate funding. The GFEC Program Review came precisely at the time the department began a comprehensive revision and reorientation—change of department name and program names and requirements, and change of the curriculum. All these changes were planned in part to prepare us for the inevitable negative impacts Title VI cuts will have on our language teaching, and in part to create solid programs that will thrive well into the future. The programmatic changes also entailed purposefully refashioning our admissions process in line with our new cultural studies orientation, and the institution of better support for those already in the pipeline toward timely graduation. Our desired goal is a full five-year support guarantee and we are sure the actions we have taken have set us on a sure and short path toward that goal.

On AOF-eligible students. We recognize our key task here, which is to work on recruitment even prior to the application stage. Our program has historically attracted very few domestic students, and domestic minorities more so. This year we had no AOF-eligible applicants, despite advertising at some Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and through personal emails to colleagues asking them to encourage minority students to apply. We only have one current domestic minority student, who enrolled last year. We gave her an AOF and continue to make every possible effort to ensure her experience in the department is a positive one. With the change of program name and orientation, we are hopeful that over time we will be able to attract more domestic minority students.

The Doctoral Minor. We like to continue this award and will take steps to advertise it. We will also appreciate any promotion assistance the Graduate School can give.

Department of African Cultural Studies
1410 Van Hise Hall, 1220 Linden Drive, Madison, WI 53706
608-262-2487; 262-8168; Fax: 608-265-4151 http://african.wisc.edu
Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tejumola Olaniyan  
Chair

Cc:  
J. Karl Scholz, College of Letters and Science  
Susan Zaeske, College of Letters and Science  
Elaine Klein, College of Letters and Science  
Katrina Thompson, Department of African Cultural Studies  
Toni Landis, Department of African Cultural Studies  
Jocelyn Milner, Academic Planning and Institutional Research  
Sarah Kuba, Academic Planning and Institutional Research  
Marty Gustafson, Graduate School  
Emily Reynolds, Graduate School
February 21, 2017

Tejumola Olaniyan, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Department of African Cultural Studies
University of Wisconsin-Madison
*Sent Electronically*

Dear Professor Olaniyan,

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

The GFEC learned of the many strengths of the program, including innovations with your M.A. track in pedagogy, development of new large undergraduate classes, a commitment to improvement of student funding, a good climate and good Ph.D. career placement with faculty open to options beyond academia. In addition to the noted strengths, the program review revealed areas of concern:

- The program is experiencing cutbacks in Title VI support that provide for language teaching, leading to fewer teaching assistantships for graduate students. The GFEC encourages the program to continue its purposeful admissions practices that will move it toward a path that guarantees full five-year funding support for students.

- The GFEC learned the program has few enrolled domestic targeted minority students, and that retention of these students is lower than desired. The committee requests that the program clarify its admissions practices regarding students eligible for Advanced Opportunity Funding and how its new admissions decision criteria will improve retention.

- The GFEC noted that the program’s Doctoral Minor has very few awards. If you would like to continue offering the minor, the department should consider its promotion to likely interested students. The Graduate School can also assist you in discontinuation.
The GFEC commends the program on its strengths and thanks you for your commitment to graduate education. We encourage the program to consider the recommendations in the review committee report, and we look forward to hearing back from the program regarding its admissions practices and plans for improving underrepresented student degree completion by April 30, 2017.

Sincerely,

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

Cc: J. Karl Scholz, College of Letters and Science
Susan Zaeske, College of Letters and Science
Elaine Klein, College of Letters and Science
Katrina Thompson, Department of African Cultural Studies
Toni Landis, Department of African Cultural Studies
Jocelyn Milner, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Sarah Kuba, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Marty Gustafson, Graduate School
Emily Reynolds, Graduate School
24 July 2017

TO: Thomas DuBois, Chair, Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies (Fall 2016)
    Mary Layoun, Chair, Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies (Spring/Summer 2017)
    Ernesto Livorni, Incoming Chair, Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies (2017-18)

FROM: John Karl Scholz, Dean

RE: Review of Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies programs, including:

- Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science – Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies
- Master of Arts – Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies, with named options in “Comparative Literature” and in “Folklore Studies”
- Doctor of Philosophy – Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies, with named options in “Comparative Literature” and in “Folklore Studies”
- Undergraduate Certificate in Folklore

XC: Marty Gustafson, Assistant Dean, Graduate School
Elaine M. Klein, Associate Dean for Academic Planning, L&S
Sarah Kuba, Academic Planner, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Lisa Martin, Associate Dean, Graduate School
Jocelyn Milner, Associate Provost and Director, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean for Arts and Humanities, L&S

On May 2, 2017, the L&S Academic Planning Council considered the review of academic programs overseen by the Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies. Associate Dean Susan Zaeske led discussion of the department’s self-study, the review committee report, and of the corrections and comments offered about the committee report. This review of the programs was conducted for several reasons, most of which relate to the timing of prior reviews: the last “regular, ten-year” review of the Comparative Literature Department was completed in 1999, a specially convened departmental review was completed in 2002-03, and the certificate programs in Folklore have never before been reviewed. In addition, it has been four years since the department was restructured to become the Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies, and it is important for the college and faculty to evaluate carefully academic programs in departments that have been restructured, so we may consider program function and purpose and whether and how faculty reconfigurations serve our students.

Before summarizing the L&S Academic Planning Council’s discussion of the program review and its recommendations, I want to assure you that we understand that the review process is time-consuming as well as intellectually and emotionally challenging. Our hope is that the
process adds value to the work you and your colleagues do and provides an opportunity to think carefully about how to configure academic programs to best serve our students.

Dean Zaeske’s presentation began with the observation that Comparative Literature will be celebrating its 100th anniversary in the coming year. This celebration comes on the heels of several years of significant change, including the merger of Comparative Literature with Folklore, a number of faculty retirements, and a notable number of new faculty hires. We appreciate the effort you and your colleagues have invested in the review process, as well as the work invested for the past several years, working on the new departmental entity. We also greatly appreciate the efforts of the review committee to offer thoughtful, though challenging, recommendations about the future.

The L&S APC had a wide ranging discussion on the self-study and review committee reports. Members were particularly struck by the review committee’s observations that “almost everyone in CLFS agrees that Folklore Studies faculty have not been fully integrated into the merged department,” and that there are substantial disagreements between the faculty in areas ranging from instruction, graduate training and TA allocation, to governance. The review committee expressed concern about disagreements regarding Graduate program requirements, as well as the difficulty the faculty has had to articulate a common undergraduate program of study (within the constraints of the L&S baccalaureate degree requirements) that integrates both Comparative Literature and Folklore. More seriously, the committee offered comment on the department’s capacity to offer the nominally integrated programs for which it is responsible, with serious concern expressed about whether there are sufficient Folklore faculty to offer courses at levels to serve that array of programs (certificate, undergraduate major, graduate minor and degrees). The report suggests that program development and renovation that was anticipated at the time of merger has failed to come to fruition, and that in addition to the Folklore Program not being well integrated into the Comparative Literature program, Folklore retirements and departures have eroded the ability of CLFS to offer an integrated curriculum.

The evaluation of the committee suggests, and the L&S APC concurs, that the attempt to merge these academic areas has failed. To remediate the situation, the council has asked the department to consider reconceptualizing the merger of these programs, with the following recommended sequence of actions:

- By the end of Fall 2017, CLFS should submit a request to restructure.
- By the end of Fall 2017, CLFS should submit a request to suspend admission to CLFS program(s) during reconceptualization. Suspension of program admissions beginning in Fall 2018 will afford the faculty time to plan for the future. CLFS programs include:
  - Undergraduate major (Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science) – Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies
  - Master of Arts – Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies, with named options in “Comparative Literature” and in “Folklore Studies”
  - Doctor of Philosophy – Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies, with named options in “Comparative Literature” and in “Folklore Studies”
  - Undergraduate Certificate in Folklore
  - Doctoral Minor in Comparative Literature
o Doctoral Minor in Folklore

- By end of Spring 2018, Folklore faculty (expanded to include folklorists beyond the department) should submit a proposal to relocate the existing Folklore Certificate.
- By end of Fall 2017, the Comparative Literature faculty and interested affiliates should submit a plan for engaging in efforts to reconceptualize the programs (perhaps convening a “Future of CL Task Force,” similar to the “Future of Asian Studies” task force)? Our hope is to see a broadly configured committee that will be able to engage in discussion of the future of CL as highly connected, interdisciplinary program with comparative literary (and other) study at its core.
- By end of Fall 2018, CLFS should ask to revise the CLFS program names, update program requirements (and, if necessary, discontinue the named options), and request permission to reopen admissions.

Finally, with respect to the programs as they currently exist, the APC also spent some time considering CLFS’ assessment strategy, and how this process can be used to inform discussions of student learning and program design. Members noted that while it is useful to have a sense of student satisfaction with programs and students’ perceptions of learning in them, this type of indirect assessment often is not useful to programs with very small student numbers. (And indeed, the CLFS self-study also expressed concern about how generalizable survey results may be.) APC members suggest that as the faculty in Comparative Literature and in Folklore discuss program redesign, they give serious consideration to revisiting the survey approach for assessing student learning. Also, since Comparative Literature courses serve students in other programs, it is worth considering, how to assess and improve learning at the course level, to ensure that the discipline’s contributions to other areas of study is secure and strong. Council members encourage you also to consider methods of more directly assessing student learning, and to use what is found to guide program improvement in both areas.

The L&S Academic Planning Council approved a motion to accept this review as complete, with the understanding that there is a considerable amount of work to be done and several steps to be taken to address concerns raised in the report, to protect students enrolled in CLFS programs, and to ensure that there is a future for the discipline at UW-Madison.

This report, and the department’s response to it, signals a beginning of a much longer conversation about the future of CLFS, which will involve faculty from Comparative Literature and Folklore as well as the input from colleagues from other units. I want to commend the review committee for its work and for making what were certainly difficult recommendations. This review, and the seriousness with which it was undertaken by all parties, reminds us that academic program review affords us all 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 embracing this opportunity.
March 3, 2017

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

FROM: Review Committee, Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies (CLFS):

Guillermina De Ferrari (Spanish and Portuguese) Chair
Maria Lepowsky (Anthropology)
Venkat Mani (German, Nordic, Slavic)
Kirsten Wolf (German, Nordic, Slavic and GFEC Representative)

Re: Review of CLFS academic programs

CC: Elaine Klein, Assistant Dean for Academic Planning, L&S
    Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean for the Arts and Humanities, L&S

Please find attached the academic program review of the Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies (CLFS). As requested, we are providing a brief report discussing the following items: 1) summary of committee activity; 2) overview of the department; 3) academic programs in Folklore (undergraduate and graduate); 4) academic programs in Comparative Literature (undergraduate and graduate); 5) culture and governance; 6) Comparative Literature in the nation vs. at UW; 7) recommendations.

1. Summary of Committee Activity:

The Committee met with Associate Deans Sue Zaeske and Elaine Klein for information about our charge. We read and considered the self-study by CLFS and the additional relevant materials provided in “Box.” We conducted one-on-one interviews with Mary Layoun, the current Chair; Tom DuBois, Chair in Fall 2016; Jordan Rosenblum, the Director of Graduate Studies; and all remaining faculty members. We also interviewed Rob Howard, former affiliate and former Chair; 1 emeritus professor; 2 academic staff members, including the Undergraduate Studies advisor; 2 affiliate faculty; and the department administrator, who was very generous and efficient in organizing these interviews. In addition, we talked to 17 students representing all academic programs housed in the department in groups of 3-4. Based on these meetings and interviews, we developed a solid understanding of the quality of the undergraduate and graduate academic programs as well as areas of concern that merit discussion as the Department looks to the future.

During our interviews, the Committee solicited information about each of the academic programs—individual as well as combined; the likely impact of course offerings in the academic training of students; and the strategies that the two programs—individually and together as a combined unit—have developed since their merger to attract, serve, and enrich the academic...
experience of graduate and undergraduate students at UW-Madison. Three additional areas of interest emerged during our interviews: governance/climate; the mentoring of assistant professors; and the role of affiliates. We will discuss these issues in items 5 and 6 below.

2. Overview

UW-Madison’s Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies (CLFS) is the only department in the US (and probably worldwide) that has tried to merge these two academic disciplines. While such merger is intellectually possible and could potentially be a source of distinction, its benefits are not self-evident within the logic of current academic markets. In addition, the minimum administrative and curricular steps required to turn the two fields into one successful program were never taken. Instead, serious problems have become increasingly apparent. Almost everyone in CLFS agrees that Folklore Studies faculty has not been fully integrated into the merged department. There are substantial disagreements between the two programs concerning the teaching of students, especially the training of graduate students and TA allocation, as well as approaches to governance. The most serious structural problem is no doubt the small number of faculty identified with Folklore Studies. Four tenure-track assistant professors have been added to CLFS in the last few years, all of them via the mechanism of partner/spousal hires and all of them to the comparative literature side of the joint department. This imbalance has exacerbated existing faculty concerns on the folklore side regarding Comparative Literature colleagues plus L&S support for Folklore Studies. Overall, we found that the schism between Folklore Studies and Comparative Literature is very large and almost insurmountable in its current form. In addition to curricular and academic divisions, we found different cultures in governance. At the same time, conflicts within each program also exist. These can be addressed in ways that would not only solve but also strengthen existing programs.

Comparative Literature at UW-Madison is a longstanding, degree-granting program with tenure lines. The challenges of the merger have had the unintended consequence of distracting the Comparative Literature program from addressing its own internal problems. For a long time, Comparative Literature was an insular department organized around a narrow definition of the field. They consequently neglected some of the most interesting developments taking place on campus and elsewhere. Comparative Literature tenured faculty members have shown uneven degrees of productivity and of responsibility in advising and governance. New faculty members joined the department as a result of internal transfers, and four new assistant professors were recently hired. Currently, the program is an eclectic group of faculty members, many of whom are productive and have the capacity to steer the discipline in current and exciting directions. The academic programs in Comparative Literature are demanding and in need of revision. There are too few undergraduate majors in Comparative Literature, but the graduate program is healthier. Funding of graduate students is dramatically insufficient.

Folklore Studies is an intellectual conglomerate of scholars and teachers who have contributed immensely to the study of folklore in the Midwest, the US, and in international settings. Folklore Studies offers an undergraduate certificate and a flexible PhD program. However, the Folklore Studies program in CLFS presents three problems: it never successfully integrated; curricular and academic requirements of the Folklore PhD option, approved by the Graduate School, are internally disputed by CLFS faculty; faculty members have retired or have left in frustration.
These problems become more apparent in the graduate program, as students have difficulty fulfilling requirements in their own discipline and are rarely selected for TAships in Folklore Studies undergraduate courses. The undergraduate certificate, on the other hand, is a healthy program and has provided much needed stability to CLFS.

More than one Folklore faculty member described a mismatch of academic cultures with Comparative Literature. Issues include the relative formality or informality of procedures for working out appropriate teaching and advising. There were internal differences in their views of proper training of students, particularly graduate students, and what should be required or expected in terms of classwork and the content of preliminary examinations. Another issue was the longstanding tradition of public folklore, which some folklore faculty felt was not valued or considered as appropriate academic productivity by their Comparative Literature colleagues.

In an effort to gauge how the department currently defines its mission, the Committee raised questions to faculty members about the way the significance and relevance of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies was articulated to its potential students. Many agreed that no cohesive message was being sent out to students, partially because of the diversity of faculty research and teaching interests in Comparative Literature or Folklore Studies. A member of the “publicity committee” charged with producing a coherent message, suggests that “we are a comparative cultures department.” This may not be enough to “package” the heterogeneity of the program as is; however, it articulates the direction pursued by most Comparative Literature departments in the country. This vision may in fact be the foundation for a new and revised department.

3. Academic Programs in Folklore Studies

With the likely retirement of Professor Janet Gilmore, and the recent retirements of James Leary and Theresa Schenk, Folklore Studies is left with one budgeted faculty member at .5 FTE in CLFS. The number of Folklore-affiliated faculty has been shrinking, with several folklore-related faculty declining to renew their affiliations in the last few years. Given UW budgetary and other constraints, there is no realistic expectation of additional faculty lines in Folklore Studies in the near future. There are simply not enough faculty left at this point to sustain a graduate training program in Folklore Studies within CLFS. Sustaining the undergraduate certificate in Folklore Studies in itself is proving a considerable challenge due to the current lack of faculty to teach classes.

The Center for Upper Midwest Studies was founded by members of the former Folklore Studies Program. While it too has suffered recent retirements, the Center holds continuing grants worth about half a million dollars and employs academic staff as folklorists. The Center was not part of this program review. There seems to be little overlap at this point between the activities of the Center and the academic activities of CLFS. This is a connection that may be explored.

If folklore-related faculty affiliates were to become more active in contributing to the teaching as well as in the mentoring of undergraduate certificate students, and if a certificate curriculum were to be revised and formalized to incorporate selected classes taught by affiliates in other departments (e.g. Garlough's Gender and Performance classes in Gender and Women's Studies),
the Folklore Studies certificate could continue to make a valuable contribution to UW undergraduate education in the humanities, wherever the certificate program is housed in future.

**Undergraduate Program in Folklore Studies**

There is no major in Folklore Studies in the CLFS department. There is a small but viable undergraduate certificate program in which 15 students are currently enrolled. The gateway course, Folklore 100, enrolls dozens of students and employs TAs. Due to the shortage of active faculty, staffing the course has become challenging, and there are very few upper-division electives in CLFS. Accordingly, students routinely take courses in a wide variety of departments and programs including GNS, GWS, Anthropology, and Religious Studies.

The one undergraduate student with a Folklore Studies emphasis whom we met and interviewed seemed to be satisfied with the program and with staff and faculty advising. The undergraduate and graduate staff adviser is shared by the joint department. Formal data on job placement of folklore students after graduation was lacking, but individual faculty provided us with information dating back to the stand-alone Folklore Studies Program. The certificate program has had an impressive track record over the years, in combination with training in other majors, in placing students in relevant kinds of professional employment. Among students obtaining the certificate, 13 have gone on to folklore or related studies at graduate schools. Employment has ranged from positions with the National Park Service to museum work to founding folklore-related production companies.

**Graduate Program in Folklore Studies**

There is a PhD Option in Folklore Studies in CLFS. Applicants are admitted with the expectation that they will continue for a PhD rather than for a terminal MA. Previously, during the Folklore Studies Program era, doctoral students would receive a Special Committee Degree. The chance to offer a PhD in Folklore Studies was a primary incentive, on the folklore faculty side, for going ahead with the merger into CLFS. Stand-alone PhD Programs in Folklore are increasingly rare in North America, with Indiana University the largest and most prestigious program. Faculty members note that annual PhD production in Folklore is “tiny” and give that as a realistic reason why CLFS has not recruited new faculty in Folklore Studies.

CLFS also houses a PhD minor in Folklore Studies, one that has been utilized in recent years by doctoral students from Anthropology, GNS, and Hebrew and Semitic Studies, among other programs. PhD minors take courses for the minor distributed across multiple departments. Private conversations with PhD minors have revealed general satisfaction with the minor option despite the current lack of faculty in CLFS with a folklore emphasis.

The CLFS PhD Option in Folklore Studies faces particular challenges at this point. The recent and impending retirements of core faculty (some hired via a now-defunct Folklore Cluster) mean that there have recently been few to no courses on offer at the graduate level in a given semester and very few potential faculty advisers. If faculty are teaching Folklore 100, for example - and thereby supporting TAs in the combined CLFS - they are unavailable to offer a graduate seminar in Folklore Studies. More fundamentally, there seems to be considerable disagreement among
faculty from Comparative Literature versus Folklore Studies as to what constitutes an appropriate progression of graduate courses and even what should constitute an appropriate preliminary examination for graduates on the folklore track. One gateway graduate seminar on Translation (822) is required for all graduate students in CLFS. However, it is only offered every two or three years. Comparative Literature students mentioned having had to request that the course be offered so they would not fall behind. A folklore faculty member reports being unable to convince colleagues of the value of teaching a version of the Translation course oriented to Folklore Studies.

While the data is not broken down in the CLFS self-study, faculty report that there are currently four continuing graduate students in the Folklore Studies option. The sole dissertator is doing research in Norway and is still advised by an Emeritus faculty member (Leary). Two additional PhD students are advised by Gilmore, one of whom is expected to take a preliminary exam next year. The fourth, an internal transfer from Anthropology, is advised by DuBois. Currently on leave, she lacks the Translation course (being taught Spring 2017) and would need to substitute an Independent Study before she is permitted to take the preliminary examination in CLFS next year. A fifth graduate student with folklore interests has been advised by Christine Garlough, a faculty affiliate. Two of these graduate students have either informed us directly or, we have been told by others, that they are planning to switch to another department by next fall. At least one folklore-option applicant was offered admission this season (we have received differing reports of the number). Another promising applicant was declined admission due to lack of faculty advising.

Folklore Studies faculty are concerned by the lack of funding for graduate students. A structural issue is that CLFS TAships, mainly generated by Folklore 100, are awarded by seniority. This practice has meant that the more junior graduate students, who tend to be part of the newer Folklore PhD option, have been at a disadvantage when competing for TAships. Pedagogically too this has been a challenge for faculty instructors, who report that the Comparative Literature grads are more likely to get TAships than Folklore grads even though the former are not trained in Folklore Studies.

The graduate students we met generally valued their faculty advisers and mentors. A couple of students felt that there was not a good fit intellectually or academically and planned to depart for other programs. All were concerned with the shortage of faculty due to recent retirements. A few students complained that graduate advising can be confusing and contradictory, with the academic staff person (listed as advising both graduates and undergraduates in CLFS) telling them one thing about requirements and the faculty adviser telling them something quite different. The unavailability of the required Translation seminar at a suitable moment in their graduate careers was an issue flagged to us by both Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies graduate students.

Two faculty members report that the content of the Preliminary Examination for Folklore Option PhD students has been an unresolved and contentious issue. Fortunately, it is one that has apparently been kept away from graduate students in the program. This is a serious problem and a further sign of the current lack of integration or agreement on what constitutes appropriate graduate and professional education in the currently merged department.
The PhD in Folklore is very recent; accordingly, there is very little data. The number of students applying to the Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies in 2016-17 was 26, and of these 5 have been admitted. The committee is concerned about the sustainability of the PhD with so few faculty /academic staff members.

4. Academic Programs in Comparative Literature

The current faculty in Comparative Literature is the result of several geological layers. Three senior faculty members are the remainders of the pre-merger Comparative Literature department. As is well known, the department suffered losses due to retirement and other incidents and they were not allowed to hire for a long time. Though not uniformly, these faculty members uphold a traditional view of the field with a focus on European literature, an ambitious language proficiency requirement, and the idea that all of its courses must be taught by comparatists (most programs in the country follow a system combining core faculty and affiliates with a variety of theoretical and interdisciplinary interests). Several members described some of the senior people as “checking out,” and described the Comparative Literature program as insular. Besides affiliates, who are used unevenly, additions to the faculty roster have been made by transfers from other departments. We were particularly impressed by the energy and vision of two joint-appointments. The new assistant professors have also been welcome additions to the department. They certainly have the expertise to potentially renew the program and attract new students.

Most faculty members interviewed insist on the need to rethink the program, build bridges with other units and to organize their course offering in clusters around themes that could attract students and give coherence to the program. Overall, the program has a large selection of interesting courses (although a few, like courses on yoga, seemed surprising at first sight). Two faculty members suggested the need to create a few themes or areas of strength and build courses around them, such as the environment, race, justice, science and technology, etc. This seems a smart way to use available resources on campus, connect to other faculty members, and promote itself as a distinctive product. All faculty agree on the need to fund graduate students better.

Undergraduate Program in Comparative Literature

With a requirement of 39 credits, the Comparative Literature undergraduate major is designed to train undergraduate students for a career in academia following a traditional, outdated model. Not surprisingly, the program only has 4 majors (although one major we interviewed loved the program and didn’t find it too demanding). A senior faculty member blamed the rise of corporate thinking as a reason for the lack of interest in languages and in Comparative Literature as a major field of study. Given the career goals of our students—who are burdened every year by the rising cost of higher education—it is not hard to surmise why Comparative Literature is rather unpopular. Another faculty member had a very constructive suggestion of trying to reformulate the program to cater to students for whom Comparative Literature might be a second major, not the first. The program really needs to repackage itself—focusing on disciplinary, not just linguistic diversity—in order to sustain itself and serve students well. Additional suggestions to improve the program include the creation of a gateway course to build a cohort, and a capstone course for assessment. Current assessment in the form of an exit survey is not sufficient.
Graduate Program in Comparative Literature

Graduate degree programs comprise an MA in Comparative Literature of 30 credits, seen as a part of the PhD program not a terminal degree, plus an MA exam, and a PhD in Comparative Literature for a total of 51 credits. The language requirement of two modern foreign languages and one ancient/medieval or non-Western language is equal or above the norm in other Comparative Literature departments. Some faculty members described the program to us as overly regimented, and overly Eurocentric. Two faculty members concentrate most dissertators.

Within the last 10 years, the number of applicants has dropped from 43 (2006-7) to 24 (2015-16), which is an all-time low with the exception of 2007-8, when only 19 students applied. (This was also a year in which no students were admitted.) New enrollments remain average. Within the last 10 years, 1-7 students have been admitted (5 were admitted in 2015-6). Of these, the vast majority are domestic students. Only 5 domestic targeted minority students have applied since 2010-11 (and of these 4 enrolled). The number of international students is low as well. In the last 10 years, Comparative Literature has had a total of 7 international students. Financial aid comes in the form of teaching assistantships and whatever fellowships the Department can get from the Graduate School. Many of the graduate students serve as TAs in departments other than CLFS, and generally first-year students are not funded (unless they get a fellowship). The Department endeavors to provide four semesters of a TA-ship. Students typically take a long time to complete their degrees. Time to degree is 8.8 years. This is largely due to the language requirements: knowledge of two modern languages (in addition to English) and reading knowledge of an ancient/medieval or non-Western language. Maybe as a result of this, quite a number of graduates do not complete their degrees within 10 years (in comparison with peer institutions)

Job placement is not a strong suit in the department. While a few students find employment within their field of study at small colleges, most of them find employment outside of academia. The graduate students who volunteered to be interviewed expressed satisfaction with the program. However, a few students and also a number of faculty members were concerned about the MA reading list, which, according to them, had not been updated in 30 years. In their opinion, it was too rigid, too focused on European literature and philosophy, too male-centered, and too insistent on the idea of a canon of literature. In addition, the Translation course (822), which is mandatory for graduates in both Comparative Literature and Folklore, is offered only every two or three years.

The committee was disturbed to learn from the graduate students that no guidance was given on dissertation topics until after the completion of the PhD prelims, and that while working on their dissertations, they were not encouraged to publish and present papers at conferences within the field. In addition, the committee learned that there was no professional seminar in order to help students prepare their CVs, teaching philosophy statements, and job applications. Students mentioned that for help in these matters, they had to approach their advisors. While the placement of PhDs has been relatively good, not all students have been able to get academic positions.
As a point of reference, Comparative Literature PhD graduates tend to find jobs in either Comparative Literature or national language departments. An informal tally of MLA lists done in December 2016 indicates that 23 assistant professor positions were advertised in Comparative Literature, compared to 35 in Spanish, 15 in French, and 104 in English).

The CLFS Polyseminar, which has evolved and transformed itself in many ways since its introduction in 2014, is intended to bring graduate students in Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies together, but not everyone felt that it had succeeded in forging a closer relationship between the two cohorts of students or faculty.

5. Culture:

Governance:

We heard repeated complaints that the concentration of power was in very few hands, as well as the operation on the basis of consensus in Folklore Studies vs rules in Comparative Literature. Each governance style was seen as conducive to successful governance by some and as arbitrary and exclusive by others. An additional problem mentioned is that written guidelines are not always updated, and they are selectively ignored. Problems reported stalling on decisions made during meetings, decisions happening outside meetings, or, conversely, decisions that were secretly “undecided” after meetings. Agendas are not circulated ahead of meetings. The department clearly needs to revise guidelines and use them appropriately and consistently, with agendas and minutes, and predictable follow-up.

Elections have been complicated. Everyone agrees that having two chairs this academic year, one in the Fall and another one in the Spring, was problematic.

Assistant Professors:

Four new hires were added to the department (exclusively in Comparative Literature) in the last few years. The Committee found that while three the new assistant professors might not have been trained in the discipline, they conduct interdisciplinary, international, and/or transmedia comparative research and are contributing to the profile of the Comparative Literature program. In most cases, we were impressed by their teaching interests and areas of expertise, as well as by their desire to make their program work to its best potential.

During our interviews, we observed that mentoring of assistant professors has been uneven. It required activism on their part to be given tenure guidelines. It came to our attention that a tenure track faculty member has not taught a graduate seminar, nor has s/he been scheduled to teach one before coming up for tenure soon. Additional mentoring would be desirable for those faculty members that have not been trained in literature to make sure they publish in proper venues and in appropriate quantity. One Assistant Professor coming up for tenure in the near future expressed concern about the selection of outside reviewers given the disconnect between Comparative Literature tenured faculty and her/his field. Comparative Literature EC should be encouraged to enlist affiliates or even guest collaborators to participate in tenure committees in
the candidates’ fields so as to ensure that relevant outside evaluators are approached, and to help contextualize individual narratives for the A&H Divisional Committee.

6. Comparative Literature in the Nation vs Comparative Literature at UW

The wealth of any Comparative Literature department lies in its capacity to pull into two directions at once: concentration and flexibility. The concentration aspect requires the creation of core Comparative Literature courses that teach the history, theories and methods of the discipline, as well as a small selection of seminars that show how Comparative Literature is done in practice. This is essential to show that the discipline is more than a collection of national literature courses. Most programs in the country address this by requiring 3-5 courses taught by Comparative Literature core faculty. Flexibility, in turn, has been cherished by most programs for decades. This makes sense. The point of comparative studies is to make connections between literary or cultural aspects that are unlikely to be charted in any given national literary tradition. To study the uncharted in a coherent pre-existing program is impossible and, therefore, contrary to the discipline. Most programs in the country provide flexibility (and rigor) by using a robust pool of affiliates from other disciplines and linguistic traditions. The requirement of foreign languages, for instance, is compatible with both needs, the need for concentration and flexibility. Most successful programs offer the option of applying credits in a non-literary discipline in lieu of credits in a language department. Flexibility is ultimately what allows the field to adapt to new times. Most Comparative Literature programs today are hubs for interdisciplinary work.

A problem of the Comparative Literature department at UW long before its merger with Folklore was the overbearing attention to the concentration aspect of the field. This has slightly improved with the acceptance of affiliates who nevertheless remain largely marginalized. Since Comparative Literature began accepting affiliates, their names are listed on their website, but little coordination happens beyond that. The assignment of courses is exclusively done at the initiative of the affiliate. The system is extremely open-ended in that affiliates teach courses with Comparative Literature designated course numbers in a “meets with” format so that they can also use course numbers in their home departments. Affiliate-taught courses contribute to the diversity of the academic program in Comparative Literature, but often its ad-hoc quality makes this improvement merely cosmetic. Their participation in governance is also voluntary. Exam committees barely use affiliates. Reaching out to affiliates and even to specialists not formally linked to the department would be beneficial to students, whose final dissertations will have to stand up to scrutiny in a job market that will intersect with a variety of specialists. Historically, many Comparative Literature graduates find jobs in language departments.

There are many potential benefits for Comparative Literature to work more actively with affiliates. A department with a coherent pool of actively involved faculty can be a platform for interdisciplinary work. Affiliates and students benefit from crossing departmental lines and create an intellectual community around areas of strength. Centers with no faculty lines, like the Center for Visual Cultures or the Center for the Humanities, to name a few, can take advantage of the international and interdisciplinary nature of a modern Comparative Literature department to develop academic programs that wouldn’t naturally belong in any department (an example is a slow but ongoing discussion to house a Comics Studies program in this department). Besides the historical hostility of the Comparative Literature department, the strongest deterrent for affiliates
today is the metrics, which forces every faculty member to stay put for the benefit of their tenure department. Comparative Literature could be one “sanctuary” on campus where current metrics is suspended so that the large pool of faculty members across campus can coordinate their efforts along common research interests. This will greatly enhance current academic offerings with minimum effort, and no use of additional resources.

7. Recommendations

1) Separate Folklore Studies from Comparative Literature in each and every way.

2) Recommendations for Folklore Studies:

   a) House remaining Folklore Studies faculty in their current tenure home departments. Possible locations for a reconstituted Folklore Studies Program: Co-administered with Religious Studies or with GNS

      Alternately, continue to offer the undergraduate certificate through a new Program to be housed elsewhere. Revise and formalize the undergraduate certificate to include courses regularly taught by Folklore faculty affiliates in other units.

   b) Continuing graduate students: Move the Folklore Option PhD to the home department of the faculty adviser or do a "teach-out" via CLFS of the continuing students in the Folklore Option PhD

   c) Continue the PhD minor through the new Folklore Studies Program. Actively recruit faculty affiliate to renew and become more active, especially in graduate advising and teaching. Pause admission of Folklore Option PhD students at least until above goals have been met.

   d) Consider whether or not in the future there should be a Folklore Option PhD housed in GNS or elsewhere given declining numbers of Folklore PhDs produced nationwide plus shortage of suitable faculty at UW in the future Folklore Studies Program, which will be heavily dependent on affiliates to teach required and elective courses.

   e) Consider whether future interested graduate students admitted via GNS or other related departments should instead receive a Special Committee PhD Degree as in the past at UW.

3) Recommendations for Comparative Literature:

At a minimum, these aspects of current programs need to be revised:

   a) Undergraduate major: reduce requirements/create a certificate. Create a FIGs or use Mellon Morgridge courses to build community. Consider organizing the major around new themes. Consider adding new cultural studies majors under the Comparative Literature umbrella.
b) MA: reduce and update requirements; revise/update reading list dramatically to reflect current interests; reconsider the need of an exam.

c) PhD: consider a more flexible program; revisit Prelims to include a dissertator prospectus; reduce language requirements, and/or consider encouraging other courses in other disciplines instead of a language; create a Placement committee; create a Proseminar or use the existing Polyseminar to encourage professionalization; organize exams and dissertation committees that include one outside faculty member from the start.

We debated the convenience of dismantling Comparative Literature but the option of revising or, ideally, remodeling the department and program seemed more productive. Much is to be gained by keeping a Comparative Literature or Comparative Studies department/program at UW. The first reason is the discipline itself: it is the longest standing interdisciplinary field in the humanities, and its annual convention houses thousands of people. Ideally, UW shouldn’t lose a program with such national importance. At the same time, the program needs to redefine what Comparative Literature is in the 21st century and how to best serve UW-Madison today. This need is not a problem in itself. Redefining Comparative Literature is in the DNA of the discipline, as mentioned in past state-of-the-discipline decennial reports as well as in the latest one, which will be published as Futures of Comparative Literature (Routledge 2017), though an earlier website version can be found here: https://stateofthediscipline.acla.org/. According to most contributors, the future of the discipline is to be the hub of interdisciplinary work in the literary humanities. Many programs in the nation reflect that in their efforts to rename departments. Some examples include: Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies, Comparative Literatures and Cultures, and Comparative Studies Department. We believe a change in this direction would allow it to house a series of well-selected and properly articulated cultural studies programs.

Regardless of whether the Comparative Literature department is revised or substantially remodeled along the lines recommended above, the changes are dramatic enough that they are perhaps better executed by an outside chair.

If the department is substantially remodeled, guidelines should be clearly established to avoid two possible outcomes:

- that all programs become absorbed by the current Comparative Literature program
- that the new rubric lacks impact by stretching the definition of cultural studies too thin

4) In all cases, assessment is insufficient and needs to be revised.

***

Thank you for the opportunity to review this department and its academic contribution to the College and University. We hope that this report and its recommendations will be useful to our
colleagues in the Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies, the College of Letters & Science, and the Graduate School.

For the Committee:

[Signature]
Dear Elaine and Sue,

Thank you for the opportunity for CLFS to respond to “factual errors” in the recent L&S Review. The CLFS Executive Committee response is attached here.

I’d like to be clear on the process we followed. As I mentioned in an earlier email and as we specify, though briefly, in opening of the attached memo, I forwarded the review report to the CLFS Executive Committee as soon as they returned from spring break. And we met last Tuesday to discuss a response both to the factual errors and to the report’s central recommendations about the future of CLFS. As the EC agreed at its meeting, all EC members, those on campus and those on leave, were asked to respond by the end of the day last Friday with any corrections of or annotations to errors of fact and with their succinct vision of the future for CLFS.

Vinay Dharwadker and I worked over the weekend to sort, filter, compile and write up the final document. We included all corrections of “errors of fact,” filtering out only those comments that were not corrections of factual errors but expressions of preferred language or opinion or reported speech. We consulted with Ernesto Livorni, CLFS’ preferential choice for incoming chair, about specific passages of the response. And I sent him the final document late yesterday for his review.

I will post the completed review to the CLFS EC folder on Box so the entire EC has a copy of the final document.

I’m happy to speak with you about any questions or comments you might have. We look forward to working together to make the future of Comparative Literature and of Folklore at U.W. Madison the strongest and best it can be. There is good reason to be hopeful about that opportunity and challenge!

Thanks again,
Mary

Mary N. Layoun,
Professor of Comparative Literature and Chair,
Department of Comparative Literature & Folklore Studies
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Dear Mary,

The review committee report for the academic programs in CLFS has been submitted. Per our usual process, I’m sharing the report with you with a request for correction of factual errors that may have found their way into the report. I understand that the recommendations in this report may make it difficult to limit response to “factual errors,” though – if you have questions or concerns about that, please feel free to talk with me or with Sue about it and we’ll help you navigate that. It’s important to know that the L&S APC will be presented with the self study and all of the materials that
were submitted by CLFS about the programs, so the review committee report is read in dialogue with those materials – and the APC is generally pretty good about reading all of the documents, reading between the lines, and asking good questions about gaps or differences in information or interpretation. (Does that make sense?)

I should mention, though, that if there is a clear vision about what you and your colleagues see as the next steps you wish to take, as informed by the review, you may want to talk with Sue about that and about whether to include a brief statement about that in your response. Technically, that’s not correcting a factual error – but a short statement saying “we look forward to the APC’s counsel about the review and hope that we will be able to do XYZ” is a reasonable closing paragraph for a memo, I think. (I’ve copied Sue on this so she can weigh in.)

It would be most useful to have a response by April 11, which will allow the APC to discuss this review on April 18. Wrapping up the review this year would be good.

Thanks,
Elaine

Elaine M. Klein
Associate Dean for Academic Planning, L&S
elaine.klein@wisc.edu | 608-265-8484

Please note that there are two “Elaine Kleins” on campus; are you sending your messages to the right one?
MEMORANDUM
April 10, 2017

TO: Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean for the Arts and Humanities, College of Letters & Science; Elaine Klein, Associate Dean for Academic Planning, College of Letters & Science

FROM: Mary Layoun, Chair, for the Executive Committee of the Department of Comparative Literature & Folklore Studies

RE: Department of Comparative Literature & Folklore Studies Response to the Review Committee’s Report

I. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies Review Committee Report of 3 March 2017 (hereafter Report) was sent to the CLFS Chair on 14 March 2017 and made available to the CLFS Executive Committee (hereafter EC). The EC met to discuss the Report, and all its members were invited to annotate any substantive errors in the Report, and to provide succinct responses to the major recommendations. EC members submitted their notes and responses to the Chair and to a second EC member for collation of their input.

The following document, then, is a collation and summary of the EC’s input. Quotation marks are used to identify key passages in the Report (by page and paragraph, and in italics), and sometime to reproduce the individual EC members’ comments. For the record, the document also distinguishes between “substantive errors” (unintended but significant errors of fact), and “other corrections” (for lesser mistakes due to data, ambiguity, or over-generalization). The Department’s overall response to the central recommendations of the Report is summarized in the conclusion. Five Appendices are included at the end.

We would like to state at the outset that the Report makes a number of significant recommendations. Some of these are excellent, constructive suggestions for improvements in the areas of student advising, student support and funding, degree requirements, program building and revision, use of faculty resources, alignment with institutional priorities, and local and national visibility. Some of the
recommendations also provide strong and compelling suggestions to re-conceptualize and realign disciplinary and inter-disciplinary commitments as well as departmental organization.

The Report has identified many practical issues that need to be addressed internally in the Department, even as we move forward with larger concerns about field, discipline, faculty productivity, job-markets, and the national and international academic environments for Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies. We plan to engage positively and productively with this range of recommendations in the coming weeks and months.

II. SUBSTANTIVE ERRORS

The Report inadvertently contains a number of errors of fact, some of which have significant consequences for the Committee’s analysis of the Department, and for the Department itself. The following notes address these substantive errors, and offer clarifications that will help to resolve the underlying issues.

A. Academic Programs in Folklore Studies

Page 3, Paragraph 5: “... the Center holds continuing grants work about half a million dollars ...”

We note that recent prestigious multi-year grants totaling upwards of $1.75 million have added three new Folklore PhD academic staff whose missions require teaching and development of Folklore Studies courses.

Page 3, Paragraph 6: “... if a certificate curriculum were to be revised ... to incorporate ... classes taught by affiliates in other departments ...”

This is already embedded in the Folklore Certificate options, if implicitly. The great majority of courses listed with a Folklore number on the Folklore Certificate Form are cross-listed courses not taught by CLFS faculty but by Folklore faculty in other departments. In addition, Folklore advisors now and in the past DO count affiliate coursework on a case by case basis, for certificates & degrees. See Appendix 1 for the Folklore Certificate Form and list of applicable courses.

B. CLFS Graduate Degrees

Page 5, Paragraph 3:

TAships in CLFS are not “mainly generated by Folklore 100.” Folklore TAships are generated by FL 100. Before and since the creation of CLFS, Folklore has had two dedicated 45% TAships (for FL 100); before and since the creation of CLFS, CL has had nine 38% TAships, 3 or 4 in the Fall, 5 or 6 in the Spring each year. Since Folklore has only one TA-assisted course (FL 100), Folklore graduate students teach for both FL and CL courses. See Appendix 2 for details.

C. The CL Undergraduate Major

Page 6: The following correctives are essential here.

(a) CL 690, a capstone proseminar required for the UG CL major is taught virtually every year and is a cornerstone of UG assessment; it is currently being team-taught by two CLFS faculty.

(b) The current UG assessment plan is on file with the campus. The plan’s submission was delayed until early 2017 due to departmental error. Please see Appendix 3.
A senior faculty member blamed the rise of corporate thinking as a reason for the lack of interest in languages and in Comparative Literature as a major field of study.

“This statement misreports the interviewee’s words and meaning. The interviewee did not say anything about ‘corporate thinking’ and certainly did not say students are uninterested in studying Comparative Literature. Rather, the interviewee said that neoliberal austerity policies pressure students to turn aside from their interests, and that all of the Humanities need to better articulate how they prepare students for life after graduation.”

Page 7, Paragraphs 3-4:
(a) Paragraph 3 begins with “Job placement is not a strong suit in the department . . . most of them find employment outside of academia.” While this is an error of fact, the conclusion of paragraph 4 on the same page corrects this error: “While the placement of Ph.D.s has been relatively good, not all students have been able to get academic positions.” In the latter sentence, the final clause is no doubt true of many Ph.D. programs in the Humanities.
(b) The Report cites interviewees who claimed that the M.A. Reading List in CL “had not been updated in 30 years.” The last page of the list posted on the CLFS website specifies the dates of the list’s initial formulation (2000 – 17 years ago) and of its several substantive revisions. It has not, however, been reviewed or revised in 5 years, since the creation of CLFS in 2012.

D. Organizational and Governance Issues

Page 8, under “Culture” and “Governance”:
Agendas are posted to the departmental or EC folder in “Box” prior to each meeting, and all members of the DC and the EC have ample opportunity to review the agendas in advance. Currently, agendas are posted at least one week in advance of meetings.

Page 9, Paragraph 2:
(a) “. . . affiliates who nevertheless remain largely marginalized.”

Since the establishment of an L&S mandated CL departmental affiliate policy in 2000, affiliates have played an active role in the Department. Two early affiliates (from 2002) were long-time members of the EC in CL: one left the university; the other, after more than ten years of affiliation with EC governance, moved 25% of his FTE to the Department. A third affiliate changed his FTE after a considerably shorter time as an affiliate with EC governance. And, more recently, another long-time affiliate requested executive governance and joined the EC.

On exams and dissertation committees, affiliates and other faculty and academic staff not formally linked to the department are a norm, not an exception; they have been serving on exams and dissertations committees since at least 2002, if not earlier.

After the creation of CLFS, the affiliate program was admittedly left to itself. Recently, however, all interested affiliates have been invited to renew their affiliation and virtually all of them have done so. If they wish for a more active role in the department, as one of our recently renewed affiliates does, they begin attending departmental meetings as a prelude to requesting governance rights.

E. Discipline, Field, and Intellectual Orientation

(a) The review observes that courses covering yogic literature, philosophy, and related cultural expressions "seemed surprising at first sight.” Yoga is central to the literary traditions of South Asia as well as to traditions, such as Sufi poetry and Buddhist literature, that are important across a wide range of cultures and that cannot be understood without recognizing the influence of yogic
thought. It is unclear why a document calling upon CLFS to take an interdisciplinary and multicultural approach should seem to question courses seeking to do exactly that.

(b) Pages 6-7: “Eurocentrism.” The criticism is simply misguided. As a corrective, please see Appendix 4, which lists the languages, literatures, and/or cultures in which selected CLFS faculty and graduate students work. And, though they’re not included in this list, one CL UG major works in Russian, another in Italian and Spanish, and a third in Chinese. This corrective applies to various references to “Eurocentrism” on these pages of the Report.

III. OTHER CORRECTIONS

The following corrections focus on smaller errors in the Report, and are listed primarily for the record. These mistakes arise from the use of erroneous data, from ambiguous statements, from interviewees’ comments that may not be reported accurately, and/or from invalid generalization.

Page 3, Paragraph 1: “. . . rarely selected for TAships in Folklore Studies undergraduate courses.”

This mis-statement can be corrected by referring to Appendix 2, which lists CLFS TAs and their teaching assignments since 2012-13.

Page 3, Paragraph 3: “. . . no cohesive message was being sent out to students, partially because of the diversity of faculty research and teaching interests.”

This is primarily an advising problem, rather than one of diversity of faculty interests.

Page 3, Paragraph 4, under “Academic Programs in Folklore Studies”:

(a) Only one Folklore Affiliate (a former CLFS Chair) has declined to renew his affiliation.

(b) Throughout this discussion in the Report, “Folklore Studies Program” should read “Folklore Program” when referring to the pre-CLFS Folklore Program.

Page 5 (top):

Rotation of courses to ensure that they are well-enrolled is not inherently a problem, so long as there is careful advising and supervision of graduate students by their advisors and by the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS). The current CLFS DGS works closely with the Student Status Advisor to carefully track students’ progress to degree and satisfaction of degree requirements, as outlined in the Graduate Handbook.

Page 7, under “Graduate Program in Comparative Literature”:

(a) Paragraph 1: The M.A. remains available as a terminal degree, since particularly (though not only) international Fulbright students make use of that option.

(b) Paragraph 2: Students complete their language requirements fairly early in their graduate careers, as an examination of their transcripts could verify.

Paragraph 2, last five lines: The time to degree is high not only because graduate students receive only four semesters of a TA-ship, but also because the salaries are so low. In other departments students are granted even six or eight semesters; yet, they end up getting jobs in town, whether as tellers in banks or baristas in cafés.

(c) Paragraph 4, last sentence: Some dissertators or recent Ph.D.’s are working outside academia because they were not interested in academic positions. Personal and logistical matters often play a role in such a decision.
Page 8
(a) The CLFS Polyseminar: Offered as CL 976, this was re-instituted in 2012-13, and has included several sessions on professionalization and preparation for the academic and non-academic job market. It was transformed in 2013-14 into a forum for CLFS faculty, affiliate, and graduate student scholarly presentations as well as presentations by other faculty and students and visitors.

Page 11:
In 2015-16, CLFS finalized a graduate assessment plan of considerable complexity; the UG assessment plan is more recent and only for the CL UG major. These materials were probably not available to the Review Committee. They are attached here as Appendix 5.

IV. RESPONSES TO MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

We look forward to working with South Hall and the L&S APC over the coming weeks and months to accomplish some of the excellent goals recommended by the Review Committee. However, there are two crucial recommendations that we feel must be addressed immediately. Many of the Committee’s more specific suggestions for improvement flow directly from these two ideas.

1. Separation of Folklore Studies and Comparative Literature. At this point in time, the CLFS EC as a whole does not have a unified vision of the future with the requisite clarity, but in the coming months we would like to discuss among ourselves the very strong recommendation of the Review Committee to separate the two programs.

   Earlier this semester and well before the Review, we had contacted the Office of Quality Improvement to facilitate conversations this semester—among graduate students, among faculty and staff, and among all of us together—about the future of CLFS and the challenges of that future. It wouldn’t be a radical shift to now organize those conversations around this decisive recommendation of the Review Committee.

   At present, at least one EC member emphatically endorses that recommendation: “I agree with the Review-of-CLFS Committee’s Recommendations, on p. 11, points 1 & 2 of the report, to separate Folklore Studies from Comparative Literature, as soon as possible, and to begin exploring the proposed Recommendations under point 2 to find reasonable solutions expeditiously.”

   But another colleague is puzzled by it: “To separate Folklore Studies from Comparative Literature in each and every way’ seems an unexpected recommendation after all these years.”

2. Chair of CLFS. The recent departmental election of Professor Ernesto Livorni as CLFS Chair for the coming year is a response a vant la lettre to the Review Committee’s recommendation for an outside chair. Professor Livorni is a strong “compromise” in light of the Report: he has fifteen years’ experience as a CL/CLFS affiliate with executive governance, but still has 75% of his tenure home in the Department of French and Italian. He both is and isn’t “external,” and would be in an excellent position to implement several of the Review Committee’s recommendations designed to move the Department forward in a productive way.

   We appreciate the time and effort that the Review Committee and the College has devoted to the review of the Department of Comparative Literature & Folklore Studies, and we look forward to working with the APC on their constructive recommendations.
V. APPENDICES

Appendix #1: Folklore Certificate Form

A certificate in Folklore Studies requires a minimum of 15 credits distributed as follows:

1. **Introduction to the field (at least one)**
   - [ ] Folklore 100
   - [ ] Folklore 250
   - Introduction to Folklore
   - Introduction to American Folklore

2. **Genres of folklore (at least one)**
   - [ ] Folklore 105
   - Introduction to Music Cultures of the World
   - Global Language Issues
   - [ ] Folklore 257
   - Heroes, Rogues, and Scoundrels in Global Perspective
   - The Folk Tale
   - [ ] Folklore 359
   - Studies in Folklore and Ethnic Genres in Performance
   - Shamanism
   - [ ] Folklore 369
   - Myth
   - Foodways
   - [ ] Folklore 450
   - The Ballad
   - The Supernatural in the Modern World
   - [ ] Folklore 460
   - Folk Epic
   - The Folklore of Festivals and Celebrations
   - [ ] Folklore 565
   - Comparative World Drama
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 102</td>
<td>Introduction to Comparative Ethnic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 270</td>
<td>The African Storyteller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 279</td>
<td>The Hero and Trickster in African Oral Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 320</td>
<td>Introduction to Turkish Folk Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 329</td>
<td>Folklore of Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 345</td>
<td>Folklore 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 347</td>
<td>Introduction to Asian Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 370</td>
<td>Folklore 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian (Gypsy) Culture in Russia and E. Europe</td>
<td>Folklore 371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 401</td>
<td>Folklore 402 Musical Cultures of the World:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 403</td>
<td>Folklore 404 Music Cultures of the World:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 405</td>
<td>Folklore 406 Structures of African Oral Narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 431</td>
<td>Folklore 432 Schools of African Oral Narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 437</td>
<td>Folklore 438 American Indian Folklore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 440</td>
<td>Folklore 441 American Indian Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian-American Folklore</td>
<td>Folklore 442 Semi Culture, Yesterday and Today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 444</td>
<td>Folklore 445 Slavic and East European Folklore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 446</td>
<td>Folklore 447 Celtic-Scandinavian Cultural Interrelations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 510</td>
<td>Folklore 511 Russian Folklore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 512</td>
<td>Folklore 513 Javanese Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Examining folklore in relation to a cultural area (at least one)

- [ ] Folklore 455  Javanese Performance Repertory
- [ ] Folklore 517  The Irish Tradition
- [ ] Folklore 518  The Scottish Tradition
- [ ] Folklore 535  American Folk and Vernacular Music
- [ ] Folklore 540  Local Culture & Identity in the Upper Midwest
- [ ] Folklore 612  Prison Narratives of the African Diaspora
- [ ] Folklore 630  Seminar on American Folklore
- [ ] Folklore 640  Topics in Ethnographic Textiles

### 4. Examining the issues, theories, or methods of folklore studies (at least one)

- [ ] Folklore 344  Anthropological Approaches to Folklore
- [ ] Folklore 339  Studies in Folklore and Ethnic Genres in Performance
- [ ] Folklore 410  Folklore Studies in Historical Perspective
- [ ] Folklore 428  Gender and Expressive Culture
- [ ] Folklore 471  Oral Tradition and the Written Word
- [ ] Folklore 490  Field Methods and the Public Presentation of Folklore
- [ ] Folklore 491  Practicum in Public Folklore
- [ ] Folklore 510  Folklore Theory
- [ ] Folklore 512  Material Culture Analysis
- [ ] Folklore 515  Proseminar in Ethnomusicology
- [ ] Folklore 520  The Arts and the Consumer Society
- [ ] Folklore 522  Digitally Documenting Everyday Communication
- [ ] Folklore 530  Topics in Folklore
- [ ] Folklore 560  Folklore in a Digital Age
- [ ] Folklore 639  Field School: Ethnography of Wisconsin Festivals
The Undergraduate Major in Comparative Literature
Department of Comparative Literature & Folklore Studies
College of Letters & Science

Faculty Director Contact/Title: CLFS Chair and Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUGS)
Contact Information: 608 262 3059

CL Student Learning Goals:
1. Literary fluency in a language other than English
2. Comparative understanding of a selected range of literary and cultural texts
3. Critical intellectual familiarity with concepts and theories of the literary and of the comparative
4. Ability to engage in the comparative analysis of literary and cultural texts
5. Critical reading, thinking, writing, and speaking skills to express and communicate the above.

CL UG major requirements:
6 credits 201, 202, 203, 205 introductory courses
6 credits 310, 371, 475 literary criticism and theory
9 credits literary/cultural coursework in a single language other than English
3 credits 690 capstone seminar
15 credits elective courses in CLFS

For Honors in the CL Major, 6 of these remaining 15 credits must be the two semester Senior Honors Thesis.

If you have questions, please contact regina.lowery@wisc.edu. (v. 08-23-15)
# Plan for Assessing Each Student Learning Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Planning</th>
<th>Learning Goal #1&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Learning Goal #2&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Learning Goal #3&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Learning Goal #4&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Learning Goal #5&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method for assessing learning (at least one direct method required)</td>
<td>9 cr. of literary/cultural coursework in a single language other than English; ability to use that knowledge in CL courses</td>
<td>Required course work in 200 level courses</td>
<td>CL 310, 371, 475 (literary criticism and theory)</td>
<td>Elective CL coursework for the major</td>
<td>CL 690 (capstone seminar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetable for assessment activity (at least one activity each year; all goals reviewed in a 3-year cycle)</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Every other spring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUGS) will provide assessment reminders and updates to all faculty and academic staff teaching CL courses, keep track of the assessment timeline, and remind the faculty teaching key courses to collect student work for assessment.

The DUGS and the Chair will compile and initially analyze all student learning assessment data.

That initial analysis and the data itself will be forwarded to members of the Curriculum Committee (which includes the Director of Undergraduate Studies) for evaluation and further dissemination.

At the September meeting of the Curriculum Committee (CC), assessment results compiled by the CC Chair and the DUGS will be reviewed and the CC will produce an initial summary. That summary will be circulated to the CL faculty and discussed at the subsequent fall departmental meeting.

---

<sup>2</sup> Literary fluency in a language other than English  
<sup>3</sup> Comparative understanding of a selected range of literary and cultural texts  
<sup>4</sup> Critical intellectual familiarity with concepts and theories of the literary and of the comparative  
<sup>5</sup> Ability to engage in the comparative analysis of literary and cultural texts  
<sup>6</sup> Critical reading, thinking, writing, and speaking skills to express and communicate the above.

*If you have questions, please contact* regina.lowery@wisc.edu.  *(v. 08-23-15)*
Undergraduate Degree Program Curriculum Mapping Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Map</th>
<th>Program-level learning goals and the courses that contribute to each learning goal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Goal #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #1</td>
<td>CL 20X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #2</td>
<td>CL 20X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #3</td>
<td>CL 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #4</td>
<td>CL 371 or 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #5</td>
<td>CL 371 or 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #6</td>
<td>CL elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #7</td>
<td>CL elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #8</td>
<td>Lit/culture*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #9</td>
<td>Lit/culture*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #10</td>
<td>Lit/culture*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #11</td>
<td>CL elective*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #12</td>
<td>CL elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #13</td>
<td>CL 690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience #1</td>
<td>MTW* essay competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 “9 credits of coursework in literature [or culture] in a single foreign language”
8 For the Honors in the CL major, these last two elective courses are CL 691 and 692, the two semesters of the Senior Honors Thesis.
9 The Maria Tai Wolff Award competition is conducted every spring for the best essay by an UG Comparative Literature student.
Appendix #4. Partial Range of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures in the Department

Select Faculty Skills
1. Dharwadker: Hindi, Marathi, Urdu, Punjabi (various periods), literary Sanskrit, English
2. Gilmore: German, Spanish, Latin, French, Russian, Italian, Middle English, Old English, American English dialect, and “African-American creoles”
3. Layoun: modern & classical Greek and modern & classical Japanese, Arabic, French
4. Livanos: Spanish, Italian, Russian, Sanskrit, Ancient Greek, Modern Greek, Latin.
5. Livorni: Romance languages, French, Spanish, Italian
6. Neyrat: French, English, German
7. Rosenblum: Hebrew (ancient and modern), Aramaic, Greek (ancient), Latin, Syriac, German, French, Spanish
8. Statkiewicz: French, German, Russian, Polish, Ukrainian, Czech, Slovak, Italian, ancient Greek and Latin.
9. Wells: Spanish and Portuguese

Select Graduate Student Skills
10. Chiuminatto: Latin, Ancient Greek, Old English, Middle High German, Middle English, French, German, Russian
11. Grelson: Russian, English, German, and Ancient Greek
12. Halls: Portuguese, Spanish, French, Hebrew
13. Koemets: Russian, and German
14. Ly: Vietnamese, French, and classical Chinese
15. Maity: Bangla (Bengali); Hindi; Japanese; Sanskrit
16. Massnick: German, French, Latin, Old Saxon
17. McMahon: Hebrew (Classical and Medieval), Aramaic (Old, Imperial, Jewish Palestinian, and Targumic), Phoenician and other Canaanite Dialects, Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Classical and Koine Greek, reading knowledge of German and Yiddish
18. Pulczinski: Armenian (Classical and Eastern), Spanish, Arabic, French
19. Ruiz-Rivera: Spanish, French, Portuguese, German
20. Sartbay: Kyrgyz, Russian
21. Steiner: Norwegian, Somali, and German
22. Treviño-Murphy: Spanish, French, Arabic, and American Sign Language
23. Tybon: French, Spanish, Arabic
24. Woods: Spanish, Portuguese, German, Russian
ASSESSMENT PLAN CLFS MA

Please email your program's Assessment Plan Template and Curriculum Map Worksheet to regina.lowery@wisc.edu by July 1, 2016.

Identifying Information
School/College: Letters and Science
Graduate Degree/Major Program Name: Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies
Graduate Degree Level (M.S., M.A., Ph.D., DMA, etc.): MA
Faculty Director Contact/Title: Jordan Rosenblum
Primary Contact Information: <jrosenblum@wisc.edu>

Approved Student Learning Goals (4/4/15)
found on the Inside Assessment website (https://provost.wisc.edu/inside-assessment/).

Knowledge and Skills Learning Goals
LG1. Articulates, critiques, or elaborates the theories, research methods, and approaches to inquiry and schools of practice in comparative humanities.

LG2. Identifies sources and assembles evidence pertaining to questions or challenges in comparative humanities.

LG3. Demonstrates understanding of comparative humanities in a historical, social, or global context.

LG 4. Selects and/or utilizes the most appropriate methodologies and practices.

LG 5. Evaluates or synthesizes information to questions or challenges in comparative humanities.

LG 6. Communicates clearly in ways appropriate to comparative humanities.

Professional Conduct Learning Goals
LG 7. Recognizes and applies principles of ethical and professional conduct.

Code for relative significance of measures in relation to learning goals.
- Not addressed in this instrument
M addressed to some degree in this instrument
H centrally addressed in this instrument
## Direct Measures of Student Achievement of Learning Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LG 1</th>
<th>LG 2</th>
<th>LG 3</th>
<th>LG 4</th>
<th>LG 5</th>
<th>LG 6</th>
<th>LG 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instr. A Writing Sample/Second-Yr product comparison</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. B Student paper review 702</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. C Student paper review 771/510</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instr. A. Compare student writing sample submitted on application to graduate program with Second Year Exam or Thesis in terms of achievement of LG 1-7

Instr. B. Student paper review 702 in terms of achievement of LG 1-7

Instr. C. Student paper review 771/510 in terms of achievement of LG 1-7
### Indirect Measures of Student and Curricular Achievement of Learning Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LG1</th>
<th>LG2</th>
<th>LG3</th>
<th>LG4</th>
<th>LG5</th>
<th>LG6</th>
<th>LG7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instr. D Syllabus content review CLFS 702</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. E Syllabus content review CLFS 771/510</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. F Student evaluation questions specific to LGs asked in CLFS 702</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. G Student evaluation questions specific to LGs asked in CLFS 771/510</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. H Exit survey review</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. I Survey of graduates five years after graduation</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instr. D. Syllabus content review 702. Syllabi from all iterations of 702 since last evaluation examined for service to LG 1-7

Instr. E Syllabus content review 771/510 Syllabi from all iterations since last evaluation examined for service to LG 1-7

Instr. F Student evaluation questions 702 review: students in the program in 702 are given supplemental evaluation questions related to LG 1-7 at end of course. Examination of each iteration of 702 since last evaluation.

Instr. G Student evaluation questions 771/510 review: students in the program in 771/510 are given supplemental evaluation questions related to LG 1-7 at end of course. Examination of each iteration of courses since last evaluation.

Instr. H Exit survey on graduation. Graduating students who leave the program with an MA are given survey asking their views on the curriculum’s achievement of LG 1-7. Surveys reviewed since last evaluation.

Instr. I Survey five years after graduation. Students who left the program after the MA and have graduated five years prior are surveyed regarding their retrospective views of the curriculum’s achievement of LG 1-7. Surveys reviewed since last evaluation.
Curriculum Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Courses and Events</th>
<th>LG1</th>
<th>LG2</th>
<th>LG3</th>
<th>LG4</th>
<th>LG5</th>
<th>LG6</th>
<th>LG7</th>
<th>Instr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLFS 702</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>B, D, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Exam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialization course (CL 771 or FL 510)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C, E, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Year Exam or Thesis</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Instruments addressing entire curriculum: H, I

Timeline for evaluations.

The Assessment plan calls for evaluation of courses and learning over the course of four years, allowing for at least two iterations of pertinent courses from one evaluation to the next. Evaluation reports will also compare results from the report five years earlier.

Year 1. Instr. A, Student learning as indicated in Second-Year essay or MA thesis, particularly as compared with writing sample submitted by students when applying to the graduate program.

Year 2. Instr. B, D, F: Student learning and curricular effectiveness related to 702, generally offered every second year.

Year 3. Instr. C, E, G: Student learning and curricular effectiveness of 771/510, generally each offered every second year.

Year 4. Instr. H, I: Student learning and curricular effectiveness as indicated in survey analysis of graduating students immediately upon graduation and five years post graduation. Surveys administered to only terminal MA students.
ASSESSMENT PLAN CLFS PhD

Please email your program's Assessment Plan Template and Curriculum Map Worksheet to regina.lowery@wisc.edu by July 1, 2016.

Identifying Information
School/College: Letters and Science
Graduate Degree/Major Program Name: Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies
Graduate Degree Level (M.S., M.A., Ph.D., DMA, etc.): Ph.D.
Faculty Director Contact/Title: Jordan Rosenblum
Primary Contact Information: <jrosenblum@wisc.edu>

Approved Student Learning Goals
found on the Inside Assessment website (https://provost.wisc.edu/inside-assessment/).

LG 1. Articulates research problems, potentials and limits with respect to theory, knowledge and practice in comparative humanities.

LG 2. Formulates ideas, concepts, designs, and/or techniques beyond the current boundaries of knowledge in comparative humanities.

LG 3. Creates research, scholarship, or performance that makes a substantive contribution.

LG 4. Demonstrates breadth within their learning experiences.

LG 5. Advances contributions in comparative humanities to society.

LG 6. Communicates complex ideas in a clear and understandable manner.

LG 7. Fosters ethical and professional conduct.

Code for relative significance of measures in relation to learning goals.
- Not addressed in this instrument
M addressed to some degree in this instrument
H centrally addressed in this instrument
### Direct Measures of Student Achievement of Learning Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LG 1</th>
<th>LG 2</th>
<th>LG 3</th>
<th>LG 4</th>
<th>LG 5</th>
<th>LG 6</th>
<th>LG 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instr. A Writing Sample/PhD Prelim product comparison</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. B Second Yr product/dissertation comparison</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. C Student paper review 822</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. D Student paper review required elective in literary periods or ethnographic methods</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instr. A. Compare student writing sample submitted on application to graduate program with PhD prelim examination answers in terms of achievement of LG 1-7

Instr. B. Compare Second Year Exam or Thesis with Dissertation in terms of achievement of LG 1-7

Instr. C. Student paper review 822 in terms of achievement of LG 1-7

Instr. D. Student paper review of elective courses in literary periods or ethnographic methods in terms of achievement of LG 1-7
### Indirect Measures of Student and Curricular Achievement of Learning Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LG1</th>
<th>LG2</th>
<th>LG3</th>
<th>LG4</th>
<th>LG5</th>
<th>LG6</th>
<th>LG7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr. E Syllabus content review CLFS 822</strong></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr. F Syllabus content review CLFS required elective courses in literary periods or ethnographic methods</strong></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr. G Student evaluation questions specific to LGs asked in CLFS 822</strong></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr. H Student evaluation questions specific to LGs asked in CLFS required elective courses in literary periods or ethnographic methods</strong></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr. I Exit survey review</strong></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr. J Survey of graduates five years after graduation</strong></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instr. E Syllabus content review 822 Syllabi from all iterations of 822 since last evaluation examined for service to LG 1-7 (generally taught every second year)**

**Instr. F Syllabus content review required elective courses in literary periods or ethnographic methods. Syllabi from all iterations of these courses since last evaluation examined for service to LG 1-7 (courses offered regularly)**

**Instr. G Student evaluation questions 822 review: students in the program in 822 are given supplemental evaluation questions related to LG 1-7 at end of course. Examination of each iteration of 822 since last evaluation. (generally taught every second year)**

**Instr. H Student evaluation questions required electives review: students in the program in required elective courses in literary periods or ethnographic methods are given supplemental evaluation questions related to LG 1-7 at end of course. Examination of each iteration of courses offered since last evaluation. (courses offered regularly)**
Instr. I Exit survey on graduation. Graduating students given survey asking their views on the curriculum's achievement of LG 1-7. Surveys reviewed since last evaluation.

Instr. J Survey five years after graduation. Students who have graduated five years prior are surveyed regarding their retrospective views of the curriculum's achievement of LG 1-7. Surveys reviewed since last evaluation.
Curriculum Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Courses and Events</th>
<th>LG1</th>
<th>LG2</th>
<th>LG3</th>
<th>LG4</th>
<th>LG5</th>
<th>LG6</th>
<th>LG7</th>
<th>Instr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLFS 822</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C, E, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Prelim</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required elective course in literary periods or ethnographic methods</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>D, F, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD. Dissertation</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruments pertaining to all aspects of the student experience: I, J

Timeline for evaluations.

The Assessment plan calls for evaluation of courses and learning over the course of five years, allowing for at least two iterations of pertinent courses from one evaluation to the next. Evaluation reports will also compare results from the report five years earlier.

Year 1. Instr. C, E, G: Student learning and curricular effectiveness as reflected by measures of 822, generally offered every second year.


Year 3. Instr. A. Student learning and curricular effectiveness as reflected by PhD preliminary examination in comparison with product from second-year MA exam.

Year 4. B Student learning and curricular effectiveness as reflected in PhD dissertations produced since last evaluation.

Year 5. Instr. I, J. Survey analysis of graduating students immediately upon graduation and
Applicants, Admits and New Enrollments - MA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Divisions</th>
<th>School/College</th>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>Academic Major</th>
<th>Named Option</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>New Enrollments</th>
<th>Admits</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2006</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2007</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2008</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2009</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2010</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2011</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2012</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2013</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This visualization was created by the Graduate School. Questions should be directed to Peter Kinsley, peter.kinsley@wisc.edu.
Applicants, Admits and New Enrollments - PhD

This visualization was created by the Graduate School. Questions should be directed to Peter Kinsley, peter.kinsley@wisc.edu.
Applicants, Admits and New Enrollments

This point forward all images are of PhD.

- Fall Term

Division
- All

School / College
- All

Degree Level
- All

Academic Major
- Comparative Literature and Folk Lit.

Named Option
- All

Gender
- All

Diversity
- Domestic Targeted Minorities

- New Enrollments
- Admits
- Applicants

### Fall, 2006
- Applicants: 1
- Admits: 1
- New Enrollments: 1

### Fall, 2010
- Applicants: 1
- Admits: 1
- New Enrollments: 1

### Fall, 2011
- Applicants: 1
- Admits: 1
- New Enrollments: 1

### Fall, 2012
- Applicants: 1
- Admits: 1
- New Enrollments: 1

### Fall, 2014
- Applicants: 1
- Admits: 1
- New Enrollments: 1

### Fall, 2015
- Applicants: 1
- Admits: 1
- New Enrollments: 1

### Fall, 2016
- Applicants: 1
- Admits: 1
- New Enrollments: 1
Students with an Appointment of 33% or Higher

This visualization was created by the Graduate School. Questions should be directed to Peter Kinsley, peter.kinsley@wisc.edu.
This visualization was created by the Graduate School. Questions should be directed to Peter Kinsley, peter.kinsley@wisc.edu.
Applicants, Admits and New Enrollments

This visualization was created by the Graduate School. Questions should be directed to Peter Kinsley, peter_kinsley@wisc.edu.
Distribution of Elapsed Years to Degree (Fall 2006 - Fall 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>Doctorete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School / College</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Academic Major | Comparative Literature and Folklor.
| Gender       | All       |
| Diversity    | All       |

- 7-8 years: 25.0%
- 8-9 years: 33.3%
- 9-10 years: 16.7%
- More than 10 years: 25.0%

This visualization was created by the Graduate School. Questions should be directed to Peter Kinsley, peterkinsley@wisc.edu.
This visualization was created by Academic Planning and Institutional Research (APIR), Office of the Provost, UW-Madison. Questions should be directed to Sara Lazenby, sara.lazenby@wisc.edu.
Completion Rates by Fall 2016

- Completed: 37.5%
- Left with a Master’s: 37.5%
- Still enrolled: 25.0%

This visualization was created by the Graduate School. Questions should be directed to Peter Kinsley, peter_kinsley@wisc.edu.
PhD Retention/Completion Rates, Peer Comparison

Select a UW-Madison Program. Dashboard will populate the retention/completion rates for the UW-Madison program (top graph) and the retention/completion rates for comparable peer programs at other AAU institutions (bottom graph).

UW-Madison Retention/Completion Rates (Comparative Literature)

Percent of Entrance Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Not Enrolled</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>% Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of years since PhD entrance cohort entered program

Association of American Universities Peer Program Retention/Completion Rates (Comparative Literature)

Percent of Entrance Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Not Enrolled</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>% Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of years since PhD entrance cohort entered program

Student Status
- % Not Enrolled
- % Completed
- % Enrolled

This visualization was created by Academic Planning and Institutional Research (APIR), Office of the Provost, UW-Madison. Questions should be directed to Sara Lazenby, sara.lazenby@wisc.edu.
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May 24, 2017

To: Sarah Mangelsdorf, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

From: Ian Robertson, Dean of the College of Engineering

Re: Final Summary of Review for the Biomedical Engineering Graduate Program

The Biomedical Engineering Graduate Program review was completed by a review committee chaired by: Parmesh Ramanathan, Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering, with members: Daniel Nogueria, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering; Brian Pfleger, Professor of Chemical and Biological Engineering; and Nicole Perna, Professor of Genetics.

The review committee was charged with assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the program and recommendations for future directions. The College of Engineering APC discussed and approved the review committee report on May 17, 2017. Based on my review of their report and the APC response, I am providing the following executive summary of the program review:

Overview

Strengths of the BME Program include excellent faculty who are highly involved with students and degree programs, PhD students who are very satisfied with the program, an excellent track record of recruiting minority students, and a degree program that is highly tailored to student interests, is highly interdisciplinary, and has a clear set of learning goals as well as an assessment plan.

Weaknesses of the BME Program include limited communication from the department regarding changes being planned for the graduate program, research facilities in different locations on campus that create communication challenges, a program that is highly dependent on real-time faculty advising and personalized examinations, and a lack of a formal program structure that introduces challenges for students navigating graduate courses and examinations.

Recommendations

Recommendations include creating a periodic newsletter to communicate with students and faculty, investigating the creation of graduate tracks to create program structure, revising the qualifying exams, ensuring that junior faculty have opportunities to teach specialized graduate level courses, and leading efforts to obtain NIH training grants that would provide rotational opportunities for PhD students.
Attachments
Review Committee Report

Copies
Justin Williams, Chair, Department of Biomedical Engineering
Paul Campagnola, Associate Chair of Graduate Advising, Department of Biomedical Engineering
Parmesh Ramanathan, Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Chair, program review committee
Jocelyn Milner, APIR
Bill Karpus, Graduate School
Sarah Kuba, Associate Academic Planner, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Marty Gustafson, Assistant Dean for Academic Planning and Assessment, Graduate School
Jake Blanchard, Executive Associate Dean, College of Engineering
Susan Hagness, Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Affairs, College of Engineering
Laura Albert, Assistant Dean for Graduate Affairs, College of Engineering
Biomedical Engineering (BME) Program Review
April-May 2017

Review Committee Members
- Parmesh Ramanathan, Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering (Chair)
- Brian Pfleger, Professor of Chemical and Biological Engineering
- Daniel Noguera, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering
- Nicole Perna, Professor of Genetics (Graduate Faculty Executive Committee Representative)

Review Process
1. The committee met on April 12, 2017 to review the program materials. At this meeting, the committee identified a set of questions to be asked during the visits to the department.
2. The committee members visited the BME program on April 13, 2017. There were three meetings on this day. The first meeting was with Professor Paul Campagnola (Associate Chair for Graduate Advising) and Pamela Peterson (Graduate Program Coordinator). The second meeting was with all the four Assistant Professors in the program (Assistant Professors Kris Saha, Randy Ashton, Meghan McClean, and Jeremy Rogers). The third meeting was with a group of 10 doctoral students; the students were in different stages of the program, ranging from first-year to sixth-year.
3. The committee members also visited the BME program on April 27, 2017. There were two meetings on this day. The first meeting was with five BME MS program students. The second meeting with Professor Justin Williams (chair of the BME department).

Overview of the Program
The Master of Science (MS) degree in Biomedical Engineering has been offered in this campus since the mid-1970s. The doctoral degree (PhD) in Biomedical Engineering was established in 1999. Both programs are administered through the Biomedical Engineering (BME) department in the College of Engineering.

The core faculty for the BME programs come from the BME department. The BME department has 19 tenure-track faculty and 67 affiliate faculty. Although the affiliate faculty may supervise graduate students in the program, most of the graduate students in the program have the BME tenure-track faculty members as their primary advisor. The BME department was established only 18 years ago; in fact, across UW-Madison was among the first few institutions to establish a BME department. BME PhD program’s national ranking has fluctuated between 20 and 24 in the past 7 years. The BME program is first among the public institutions in research expenditures per FTE and third among the public Universities in total research expenditures. The BME department recently completed a strategic planning process to identify their areas of excellence and the areas
in which they can increase their visibility, which in turn, they hope will result in improved USNWR ranking.

The BME PhD program matriculates about 10 students each year. Most of these students are direct admit into a faculty member’s laboratory. There is one NIH training grant led by a faculty member (Professor Justin Williams) in the BME department. Almost all BME faculty are trainers in NIH training grants at UW-Madison. The BME program takes advantage of some of these training grants to offer flexibility to incoming graduate students. However, the faculty feel that BME program loses out in recruiting many top students due to the lack of financial resources to offer flexibility/rotation to graduate students in the first year.

Most of the students in the BME MS program were undergraduates at UW-Madison. Many of them are BME undergraduates who opt to stay for an additional year to complete the MS program. Many of these students also receive financial support in the form of TAships, either in the lower level BME undergraduate courses or in courses such as Physiology (Phys 335).

The BME department recently got approval for a PhD minor in Quantitative Biology. The minor will only begin in Fall 2017. It was not part of this program review.

**BME Program Strengths**

1. Faculty are excellent and appear to be highly involved with students and degree programs
2. PhD students appear to be very satisfied with the program.
3. Highly visible publications in top journals indicate strong research program
4. Student post-degree placement is satisfactory
5. Degree is highly tailored to match student interests
6. Research program is highly interdisciplinary and provides students with exposure to multiple disciplines
7. Although the graduate students’ laboratories are in different buildings (Engineering Centers Building (ECB), Wisconsin Institute for Medical Research (WIMR), and Wisconsin Institute for Discovery (WID)), the Ph.D. students seemed to feel a sense of community. There is a graduate seminar which brings these students together on a regular basis. The graduate student association also does a good job of organizing social events to maintain a community among the doctoral students.
8. The program has a clear set of learning goals and an assessment plan for both programs.
9. The PhD program is successful in recruiting domestic minority students (24% of the domestic students are minority, with 16% targeted minority). The program also has a good gender balance (60% males, 40% females), especially in comparison to other engineering programs.
10. The MS program is also successful in recruiting domestic minority students 41% of the domestic students are minority, with 29% targeted minority). The program
also has a good gender balance (65% males, 35% females), especially in comparison to other engineering programs.

11. The committee met a few MS program students. These students felt that the MS program added considerable value to their undergraduate degree. Because of the MS program, these students felt that they were more marketable for industrial positions.

**BME Program Concerns**

1. Not much communication from department regarding changes being planned to graduate program, e.g., planned changes to qualifying exams. The communication is sparse both to Assistant Professors and to graduate students.

2. Program is highly dependent on real-time faculty advising and personalized examinations, which may be challenging as program grows and faculty turnover.

3. Most official TA positions are awarded to MS students who completed the same course as an undergraduate at UW-Madison. Teaching opportunities for interested PhD students are limited and reliant on their primary mentor's teaching responsibilities.

4. The lack of formal program structure introduces challenges for new students to design and navigate their graduate course and examinations. This is particularly difficult for students of new faculty and further exaggerated by the distribution of labs across campus (see below).

5. Research facilities are in different locations on campus. Although not a weakness per se, it creates communication challenges.

6. The BME undergraduate program has a large number of students. The resulting large undergraduate teaching load, makes it difficult for faculty to offer specialized courses for graduate students.

7. The MS program students expressed dissatisfaction with Engineering Career Services (ECS). As per these students, many of the companies who recruit through ECS do not understand the value-add provided by the BME degree as compared to other engineering degrees such as Electrical Engineering, Computer Engineering, and Mechanical Engineering. As a result, the MS program students are not keen on using ECS services to find job opportunities. Instead, they rely on faculty advisors to help in identifying career opportunities. The students were optimistic about their career opportunities.

**Recommendations**

1. Have a periodic newsletter to communicate better with students and faculty. The newsletter can highlight faculty and student accomplishments, as well as draw attention to upcoming opportunities for professional development.

2. Investigate whether creating graduate tracks will help provide the missing structure.

3. Graduate students (at least the 10 who met with the committee) were satisfied with the structure of qualifying examinations. The program, on the other hand, is considering a revision of the qualifying examination procedure. The program
faculty should seek feedback from the graduate students regarding the qualifying examination as part of their process to revise the format.

4. Work with the College of Engineering to improve potential employers understanding of the scope and quality of BME student training. The scope and value-add provided by the BME training should be also be part of the messaging from Engineering Career Services to increase the career opportunities for BME students.

5. Consider alternate mechanisms to meet the different advising needs of PhD and MS students

6. Seek ways to ensure that junior faculty have the opportunity to offer specialized graduate level courses as part of their departmental teaching responsibility.

7. The limited resources for graduate fellowships is not likely to change dramatically in the next few years. To provide rotational opportunities to PhD students, the BME faculty may want to lead efforts to get one or two NIH training grants in the targeted areas of excellence.
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PhD Retention/Completion Rates, Peer Comparison

Select a UW-Madison Program. Dashboard will populate the retention/completion rates for the UW-Madison program (top graph) and the retention/completion rates for comparable peer programs at other AAU institutions (bottom graph).

UW-Madison Retention/Completion Rates (Biomedical Engineering)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Not Enrolled</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>% Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of years since PhD entrance cohort entered program

Association of American Universities Peer Program Retention/Completion Rates (Biomedical Engineering)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Not Enrolled</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>% Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of years since PhD entrance cohort entered program

Student Status
- % Not Enrolled
- % Completed
- % Enrolled
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May 24, 2017

Sarah C. Mangelsdorf, Ph.D.  
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

William Karpus, Ph.D.  
Dean of the Graduate School

Sent electronically

Re:  Review of the Physiology MS (non-admitting) and PhD programs

Dear Provost Mangelsdorf and Dean Karpus:

On behalf of the School of Medicine and Public Health, I endorse the ten-year review of the Physiology MS (non-admitting) and PhD programs.

After discussion at the May 17, 2017 meeting of the SMPH Academic Planning Council, APC members unanimously approved the report of the review committee, the recommendations of the committee for implementation, and the response of program leadership to the review committee’s report. Those reports are attached. The program’s response was delayed because the program explored mergers with other graduate programs and ultimately decided to remain independent.

Strengths include the program director, program administrator, mechanisms for creating an inclusive environment, and collaborations with other graduate programs through the Biomedical Graduate Program Consortium.

The committee suggested areas of opportunities, and the program has responded:

1. Enhance program cohesiveness. The program has noted improvements in seminar participation. The program considered implementing an annual retreat and decided that it is not practical given the small program size. APC members recommended that all programs in the Biomedical Graduate Program Consortium consider holding a joint retreat; the program will take this under consideration.

2. Increase number of applicants. The program has implemented suggestions from the committee. Numbers increased for 2017 admissions and will continue to be monitored.

3. Ensure continuity in leadership and add student representative to the program’s steering committee. The program is in the process of recruiting a co-director and recruiting a student member of the steering committee.

4. Develop alumni database. The program is in the process of hiring a student services coordinator. Among this individual’s responsibilities will be alumni relations.
Both the SMPH Academic Planning Council and I concur with the review committee’s recommendation to continue the programs. We recommend that the next review occur in ten years.

Thank you for your consideration. If you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Andrea Poehling.

Sincerely,

Robert N. Golden, M.D.
Robert Turell Professor in Medical Leadership
Dean, School of Medicine and Public Health
Vice Chancellor for Medical Affairs
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Copies to:
Donata Oertel, Physiology Graduate Program
Mark Marohl, Physiology Graduate Program
James Keck, School of Medicine and Public Health
Richard Moss, School of Medicine and Public Health
Andrea Poehling, School of Medicine and Public Health
Parmesh Ramanathan, Graduate School
Marty Gustafson, Graduate School
Emily Reynolds, Graduate School
Jocelyn Milner, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Sarah Kuba, Academic Planning and Institutional Research

Attachments:
1) Review committee report
2) Program response
March 11, 2016

To: Dr. Richard Moss
Senior Associate Dean of Basic Science, Biotechnology and Graduate Studies
University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health

From: Report of the Physiology Graduate Program

Dear Dr. Moss:

The following report summarizes our review of the Physiology graduate program.

Every idea, experiment, project, program and department needs a champion. The Physiology degree program has an amazing champion in Dr. Donata Oertel. She is highly commended for her thoughtful direction of the program and her unwavering commitment to the community of scientists as a whole, but most especially to the trainees. The program has many strengths including talented trainers with diverse interests and a well-established curriculum with flexibility.

Summary of Process

1. On January 7th, Dr. Halberg met with Dean Moss and Andrea Poehling to discuss the charge for the committee.
2. Drs. Alexander, Fabry, and Halberg read the self-study from Physiology program as well as additional data points provided by the Graduate School.
3. On January 20th, the review committee and Andrea Poehling met to discuss their initial impression of the Physiology degree program, identify issues to discuss during the site visit, and decide whom to invite to the site visit.
4. On March 3rd, the review committee met with Dr. Oertel, the steering committee, faculty members, Mr. Mark Marohl, and trainees.

Strengths

1. Strong institutional support and commitment from SMPH: As resources become more limited the tendency is for small communities to fold into larger communities. The cost is a loss of a sense of community as individuals have less in common or fewer shared experiences. The Physiology degree program became part of the Collaborative of SMPH Graduate Programs in 2011, which allows the Physiology program to benefit from being part of a larger group while maintaining its own sense of community. This group consists of four programs: Toxicology, Endocrinology, Molecular and Cellular Pharmacology and Physiology. The SMPH provides supports to each of these programs in the form of five student rotation slots per program (three one-month rotations during the first semester) as well as administrative support. Additional institutional support is given to the program through the collaborative recruitment grant from the Graduate School ($4,000-$10,000/year).
2. **Established administrative support:** The Physiology degree program benefits by being part of the Collaborative of SMPH Graduate Programs. Mr. Marohl, program administrator, is highly commended for his outstanding support of the program through administrative assistance, teaching, and guidance of trainees.

3. **Strong effort to provide a cohesive environment for trainees:** A key element in creating a good learning environment is Physiology 901. This course meets each Thursday. Students present papers or their research; UW-Madison faculty present their research. Beyond this course, Dr. Oertel has also hosted informal picnics. Such gatherings are critical to nurturing interactions between faculty and trainees as well as among trainees. Dr. Oertel has done a tremendous job in maintaining a sense of community among the Physiology trainees as she has created an environment in which they feel free to share ideas and discuss challenging scientific concepts.

4. **Diverse trainee group with commitment to Physiology training:** The committee met with three “junior” (1st and 2nd year) trainees. Junior students were outspoken and highly committed to Physiology training. The committee also interviewed four “senior” (4th and 6th year) trainees, who evaluated the program positively. One trainee who had been part of the program since 2011 noted that the training has improved significantly since the program was reorganized.

5. **Broad curriculum that serves trainees with different interest:** Numerous courses in neuroscience and cellular and molecular biology are accepted in the curriculum.

6. **Teaching requirement enriches the program:** Most students indicated that they enjoyed teaching experiences. All students are required to TA in Physiology 345 or 435.

**Potential Areas of Improvement**

**Improve program cohesiveness for trainers and trainees**

1. Physiology 901 is critical to establishing and maintaining a positive environment in which trainees are comfortable sharing ideas. Therefore, this course needs to continue. To improve the course, when a student presents either a paper or research, all members of the dissertation committee should be highly encouraged to attend the presentation.

2. The Physiology degree program should hold an annual retreat to allow program members to become familiar with one another and with each others’ research. Talks should be limited to a few slides presenting hypotheses and major findings since the membership of the program has quite diverse areas of interest. Faculty, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students, and research specialists should be strongly encouraged to attend, and all should be strongly encouraged to participate in the entire meeting.

**Improve program visibility and increase the number of applicants**

The number of applicants has been declining; it needs to be increased to maintain a critical mass. The current enrollment is 22, which is up from 12 students in 2011, but enrollment
numbers have been trending downward. There were 18 applicants in fall 2015; of those, 7 were invited for a visit and 4 were offered admission. The committee offers the following recommendations for increasing visibility of the program and to increase the number of applicants:

1. A website should be created for the Collaborative group (renamed by some appropriate umbrella term, for example, Medical and Translational Biology) as prospective students are likely to access such a website when performing broad internet searches. This website needs to be clearly designed and attractive.

2. The old website for the Department of Physiology ([http://www.physiology.wisc.edu/](http://www.physiology.wisc.edu/)) needs to be completely expunged. Currently, this defunct site redirects visitors to the website for the Physiology program. Although quickly redirected to the proper site, prospective students are likely to have a negative first impression.

3. The name of the Physiology degree program does not need to be changed to attract more prospective students. However, the website for the Physiology degree program needs to be updated such that specific keyword searches lead visitors to this website (for example, cardiovascular or endocrinology).

4. The website for the Physiology program needs to be updated to include upcoming events, current news, an accurate list of trainers, and current positions held by alumni. The website should be maintained so it does not contain outdated information.

5. Given the strengths of the Physiology degree program, it needs to be promoted.
   a. Faculty should offer to give recruitment presentations to undergraduates when traveling to other universities.
   b. Provide faculty members one Powerpoint slide that describes the Physiology degree program and ask them to include this in their slides when presenting seminars at other universities.
   c. Prepare a brochure that describes the Physiology program that can be handed out during poster sessions at regional and national meetings as well as mailed to other universities, especially those with undergraduate programs in physiology. This brochure could be a printed version of the Powerpoint slide mentioned above.

Strengthen the administrative structure of the program for continued success

1. Develop leadership plan to ensure program continuity. Dr. Oertel’s commitment to the program and students is exemplary. Her example is one that we should all admire and try to emulate. Replacing Dr. Oertel will be challenging even for a very talented person who shares the same energy and enthusiasm. Consequently, an Associate Director should be appointed and slowly transitioned into the position of Director with a steadily growing list of responsibilities. A plan to ensure stability in leadership during time of transition and a succession mechanism should be developed.
2. *Inclusion of student representation.* Feedback from the current students indicates that great effort has been made to fit the individual needs of each trainee, which is commendable. We suggest that there is some representation of trainees on the program's steering committee, probably one senior trainee, and one more junior, so that the program evolves alongside the students.

*Develop an alumni database*

The self-study indicated that the current position of 24% of the alumni is unknown. An alumni database would be useful not only as a metric for the program, but also as a recruiting tool, so that prospective candidates can observe the diverse careers open to successful trainees.

*Summary*

Overall, the Physiology degree program is strong. The recommendations are centered on the continued growth of the program through stronger recruitment and by nurturing relationships among trainers and trainees. In conclusion, our committee recommends that the Physiology graduate program continues and that the next program review occur in 2026.

Sincerely,

Caroline Alexander, Ph.D., Professor, McArdle Laboratory for Cancer Research (Graduate Faculty Executive Committee representative)

Zsuzsanna Fabry, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine

Richard Halberg, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Medicine and the McArdle Laboratory for Cancer Research (Chair)
Response to the Review of the Physiology Graduate Training Program of March 2016

Donata Oertel, Director, and Mark Marohl, Graduate Program Coordinator

March 2017

The review of this program came less than five years after the Physiology Graduate Training Program (PGTP) was converted from a departmental graduate program in the former Department of Physiology to a free-standing, campus-wide program that is based in the SMPH. In its present form, the PGTP has existed only since September 2011 although the departmental program has existed since 1906.

The review in March 2016 was the first formal review of the program in its present form and, as such, it provided a very thoughtful and valuable overview. We feel that the program has made substantial progress since its inception in 2011, which was captured in the report. The reason for the delay in the response is that we explored the possibility of joining another graduate training program. As no good possibility has arisen, we have continued to implement the suggestions that were made in the review and continue to run the program.

There seems no need to respond to the parts of the review that comment on the strengths of the program. For that reason, this response focuses on the Potential Areas of Improvement.

I. Improve program cohesiveness for trainers and trainees.

1. The reviewers made the recommendation that members of the dissertation committee of the student giving the presentation be encouraged to attend Physiology 901 seminars. Even before the review, Donata Oertel and Mark Marohl have made numerous requests and invitations to thesis advisors and members of the thesis committees. Every year the Director reminds students to let committee members know when they will be giving their presentations. In addition, the Program Administrator, Mr. Mark Marohl, notifies all program faculty weekly about who will be giving a seminar.

The response by faculty has improved. Since the review one year ago, the thesis advisors have attended the presentations of their students in almost every instance. In three instances, scheduling conflicts prevented the thesis advisors from being there. Also it has become common that other people from the labs of the students who are presenting attend the seminar. Usually it is one or two people from the lab but sometimes three or four people from the lab attend.

While attendance of the thesis advisors has improved, it is rare that all members of the Thesis Committee are able to attend. Knowing how difficult it is for students to schedule a meeting of the Thesis Committee, it is perhaps not surprising that many members of the committees do not attend.

2. The reviewers also recommended that the PGTP hold an annual retreat. We have thought about doing this but have not yet done it for several reasons.

One problem is that organizing such a retreat requires time and effort. Neither Mark Marohl or Donata Oertel have had the time to devote to organizing a retreat. Mr. Marohl has been serving two programs, each of which have had 10-year reviews in the past year while the
office has lost one of its staff members to retirement. Donata Oertel serves as chair of a large department, which also takes considerable time.

Another problem is that we are not convinced that such an effort is fruitful. It is unclear that faculty will take a day or even an afternoon for a retreat for a program that does not have training grant slots. Three of our students work with physicians, Marlowe Eldrige and Peter Nichol, whose time and effort is already stretched. Two students work with Meyer Jackson, who is kept busy serving as Director of the Biophysics graduate program. Until recently one student worked with Dean Moss who also does not have many spare afternoons. All these people have attended the seminars of their students, making huge contributions to the content of the seminars. We feel that we have to protect the time of these valuable mentors and investigators, not add another activity.

We do agree with the reviewers that the program would be strengthened by building more cohesiveness and have thought of other ways of building that. For example, there is more enthusiasm to participate in activities that help recruit strong students. This year graduate students in the program gave tours of their labs. We hope to make these tours even more interesting and engaging next year by having students, and if possible include faculty mentors, to give demonstrations to incoming students next year.

II. Improve the program visibility and increase the number of applicants.

We have implemented many of the recommendations made in the Review.

1. A website has been created for the Biomedical Graduate Program Consortium through which students can apply to any of the four graduate programs of the Consortium:
   http://www.med.wisc.edu/biomedical-graduate-program-consortium-application-process/49168

2. The old departmental Physiology website has been expunged.

3. The PGTP website has been improved but could use considerable further improvement.

4. There has simply not been anyone with the time and expertise to update the website. The person who used to take care of updating websites has retired.

5. Efforts have been made to increase the visibility and promote the PGTP.
   a. Dr. Duello has put considerable time and effort into making recruitment presentations but these efforts are directed mainly at recruiting underrepresented minorities.
   b. This is one of the few recommendations upon which we have not acted. As Director, Donata Oertel is reluctant to use a slide to advertise the PGTP herself and cannot therefore expect others to do this.
   c. Mr. Marohl has made business cards that members of the program have taken to meetings. Students have given these cards to potential students. In past years we have made brochures that were posted at meetings but our sense was that these were not very effective.

The efforts we have made, and continue to make, have produced results. The plot below shows that the number of applicants increased this past year.
Not only was the number of applicants reasonable but the quality was also. This year we made offers to 7 students of whom 5 are domestic and 2 are international. These were generally strong students whose mean GRE percentile scores were: V 70, Q 77, WA 49. Two of those students have accepted our offers and one has declined.

III. **Strengthen the administrative structure of the program for continued success**

1. Develop leadership plan to ensure program continuity.

Even before the review, Donata Oertel was concerned about program continuity. We have sought to identify someone willing and able eventually to take over the directorship. We sought to have that person serve as co-director for a year or two during a transition. We have not yet identified such a person. Those most eager to take on the task are too junior. Among the senior faculty, those who are most able to take on the task are already overburdened.

After the review, Dean Moss and Donata Oertel explored merging with another graduate program but each of the possibilities we have explored thus far has had drawbacks.

2. The suggestion that there be student representation on the Steering Committee is a fine one and will be implemented.

IV. **Develop an alumni database**

It is the discontinuity of the administration of the program that has led to so many of the alumni as not being tracked. The departmental graduate program was small and relatively little administrative effort was placed in the program. The fact that the program is now administered differently means that this will not be a serious problem in the future.
In summary, the Review committee made excellent suggestions, many of which have already been implemented. The fact that our applications increased by 25% over last year is, we think, a manifestation of that success. The most serious challenge is to assure continuity in leadership for the program.
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**UW-Madison Retention/Completion Rates (Physiology)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years since PhD entrance cohort entered program</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Entrance Cohort</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Association of American Universities Peer Program Retention/Completion Rates (Physiology)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years since PhD entrance cohort entered program</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Entrance Cohort</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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