MINUTES

Members Present: Wendy Crone, Caroline Alexander, Duncan Carlsmith, Cynthia Czajkowski, Ted Golos, Mary Louise Gomez, Michael Graham, Robert Howell, Daniel Kleinman, Pamela Potter, José Pincheira, Tracy Schroepfer, Fernando Tejedo, Susan Thibeault

Members Absent: Brian Gould, Stephen Quintana, Kevin Shinners, Kirsten Wolf

Guests: Ian Coxhead, Barbara Forrest, Marsha Mailik, Bill Provencher

Staff: Alissa Ewer, Kelly Haslam, Elena Hsu, Jennifer Martin, Kathi Matthews-Risley, LaRuth McAfee, Linda Scholl

Interim Dean Wendy Crone called the meeting to order.

The minutes of September 12, 2014 were approved as written.

Information Items:

1. Interim Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education Marsha Mailik provided an update to the GFEC regarding the split to the leadership positions in the Graduate School and creation of two new positions: a Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education, and a Dean of the Graduate School. Mailik informed the GFEC that a new governance group named the University Research Council will be created to serve the Office of the VCRGE and research centers under its purview. It is planned that the University Research Council will first appoint members from the research community on campus for one, two, and three-year terms; as members leave the committee they will be replaced with new members that have been voted in by University governance processes.

2. Interim Dean Wendy Crone presented the memo titled Changes to Graduate School Structure and Staff. The memo notes the creation of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education and its relation to the Graduate School, and details personnel changes related to the roles of the former Associate Deans in the Graduate School. The Graduate School offices of Academic Planning & Assessment, Admissions & Academic Services, Diversity, Inclusion & Funding, and Professional Development & Communication will continue to provide graduate education support and expertise to campus.

3. Associate Dean Daniel Kleinman spoke to the GFEC regarding the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate School Restructuring. Members of the committee represent each of the four divisions. The committee, chaired by Kleinman, will participate in a series of meetings in fall 2014; the committee members will meet with various groups and stakeholders across campus to work through the details of restructuring, and provide direction for graduate education into the future. Associate Dean Kleinman asked the GFEC
members to please let the committee know if they have suggestions regarding who the committee should contact in their fact-finding charge.

4. Assistant Dean Alissa Ewer spoke to the GFEC regarding the planned Scholarly Publishing Symposium event; hosted by the Graduate School, the event will create a space for a campus-wide conversation regarding the way graduate students and early-career faculty approach publishing decisions. The Scholarly Publishing Symposium is scheduled for October 30, 2014 in the Pyle Center; registration is already full, but Ewer encourages those interested in attending to register on the waitlist. Any relevant and available materials will be posted online after the event. Ewer and her team hope to offer the event annually.

5. Assistant Dean Kelly Haslam re-presented the Graduate Program Handbook Template (available in the Graduate School’s KnowledgeBase at https://kb.wisc.edu/GSAdminKB/page.php?id=34123); the template is intended as a resource for graduate program administrators in developing handbooks for their program’s students. The Graduate Program Handbook Template, which provides detailed suggestions for content ranging from program-specific grievance procedures to curricular requirements and advisor selection, was developed summer 2013 with collaboration from staff across Graduate School offices and graduate program coordinators across campus. The graduate program handbook is often discussed as part of program reviews; the strength of a handbook is often representative of the strength of the graduate program.

Approval:

1. Associate Dean Kleinman and Ian Coxhead and Bill Provencher from Agricultural and Applied Economics presented the request to approve the named option titled “Resource and Energy Demand Analysis” (REDA) with the Agricultural and Applied Economics M.A. program. Coxhead and Provencher noted that the REDA named option is intended to train professionals to interface information and technology with public and industry constituents. The named option is an Educational Innovation and program revenue-generating initiative; the curriculum is designed to take students 10 months of full-time enrollment to complete. The GFEC noted concern regarding sufficient demand for the program, and voiced interest in learning of how the first few cohorts fared with job/career placement after graduation. Associate Dean Kleinman noted that those programs associated with the Educational Innovation initiative have scheduled informal status updates with an Associate Dean in the Graduate School, usually two to three years after implementation of the program.

Action: Moved and seconded to approve the request to create a named option titled “Resource and Energy Demand Analysis” within the Agricultural and Applied Economics M.A. degree. The motion was passed unanimously.

Program Reviews and Updates:

1. Associate Dean Kleinman presented the program review follow-up for the Bacteriology M.S. degree, in response to the program’s GFEC review on May 2, 2014. The GFEC commends the program on its recent improvements, and agreed that no further program follow-up was needed.
AGENDA

Introduction

Approvals and Updates
1:35 Request to Change Administrative School/College of Theatre and Drama MFA from the College of Letters and Science to the School of Education (Wendy Crone/Patricia Boyette/David Rosenthal) GFEC2014.12.12.04
  - Request to Create MFA in Theatre and Drama within the School of Education
  - Request to Discontinue MFA in Theatre & Drama within the College of Letters and Science


Program Reviews and Updates
2:20 Program Review Follow-up Updates (Wendy Crone)
  - Materials Engineering M.S./Ph.D. GFEC2014.12.12.05
  - Entomology M.S./Ph.D. GFEC2014.12.12.06
  - Chemical Engineering GFEC2014.12.12.07


Discussion Item
3:05 Draft of Check-in Process for Recently Approved Revenue-Generating Programs (Kelly Haslam) GFEC2014.12.12.09

2014-15 Meeting Schedule
February 13, March 13, April 10, May 8
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
52 Bascom Hall
Minutes

Members Present: Wendy Crone, Caroline Alexander, Duncan Carlsmit, Cynthia Czajkowski, Ted Golos, Mary Louise Gomez, Brian Gould, Michael Graham, Robert Howell, José Pincheira, Stephen Quintana, Tracy Schreepfer, Kevin Shinners, Fernando Tejedo, Susan Thibeault, Kirsten Wolf

Members Absent: Daniel Kleinman, Pamela Potter

Guests: Patricia Boyette, Alan Lockwood, Jocelyn Milner, David Rosenthal

Staff: Eileen Callahan, Kelly Haslam, Michelle Holland, Elena Hsu, Jennifer Martin, LaRuth McAfee, Linda Scholl

Interim Dean Wendy Crone called the meeting to order.

The minutes of November 14, 2014 were approved as written. The revised minutes of September 12, 2014 were approved as written.

Approvals and Updates:

1. Interim Dean Wendy Crone introduced Patricia Boyette from the Department of Theatre and Drama and David Rosenthal from School of Education, who presented the request for approval for changes to the Theatre and Drama MFA graduate program. The Theatre and Drama MFA plan will be newly created in the School of Education, and discontinued from within the College of Letters and Science. This approval request complements the November 14, 2014 GFEC approval for changes to the Theatre and Drama MA/PhD program. Boyette informed the committee that the Theatre and Drama MFA program students will transition from the College of Letters and Science to the School of Education with no disruption; teaching assistantships will continue to be allocated as they have in the past, the curriculum will remain unchanged, and faculty in Theatre and Drama will continue affiliate status with the Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies M.A. /Ph.D. program (and vice versa). Boyette noted that the Theatre and Drama MFA program will complete a program review in 2015.

Motion: Moved and seconded to approve the changes to MFA in Theatre and Drama, including newly establishing the Theatre and Drama MFA plan in the School of Education, and discontinuing the Theatre and Drama MFA plan from within the College of Letters and Science. The motion was passed unanimously.

2. Interim Dean Wendy Crone introduced Alan Lockwood from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, who presented the request to approve the Curriculum and Instruction follow-up report to the Provost regarding the four named options (Secondary English Education, Secondary Mathematics Education, Secondary Science Education and Secondary Social Studies Education) in the Curriculum and
Motion: Moved and seconded to accept the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the Afro-American M.A. program, with a request the program report back to the GFEC regarding the review committee’s recommendations by April 2015. The motion was passed unanimously.

Discussion Item:

Assistant Dean Kelly Haslam presented the draft check-in process for recently approved revenue generating programs, and asked the GFEC for feedback. Haslam noted that programs will be reviewed three years after the semester in which they implemented their program-revenue generating program. Three to six months prior to the three-year review, the Office of Academic Planning and Institutional Research and the Graduate School will provide to the program the check-in document and key data, enrollment and budget reports. Haslam confirmed that while GFEC members will not be individually assigned to participate in programs’ three-year check-in, the GFEC body as a whole will receive the data reports and programs’ check-in response for consideration and approval at GFEC meetings. The GFEC agreed that it will be important to invite program representatives to those GFEC meetings at which the three-year check-in reviews are approved. A GFEC member suggested that the check-in document include inquiry regarding whether programs are attracting and admitting the high quality of students for which the University prides itself. Haslam noted that the Graduate School will make edits to the check-in document, and that the GFEC will have another opportunity to review the document.
Check-in Process for Educational Innovation (EI) Revenue-Generating Programs

**Background:** The mission of Educational Innovation is to transform teaching, learning and engagement in order to inspire students and empower communities. One of the goals within this initiative is to build innovative, professional Master’s-level degrees and other lifelong learning opportunities. Over the past few years, this has triggered a wave of new revenue-generating graduate degree and capstone certificate programs. Each of these revenue-generating programs was presented to the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) for approval and prompted GFEC to request a “check-in” process at the three-year mark to ensure each program was on a path to success and aligned with the EI principles endorsed by GFEC as well as the intended goals of the program.

**Process:** Three to six months prior to the completion of the third year of implementation, the Graduate School will contact EI revenue-generating programs and request a written response to the topics below. The request will be accompanied by enrollment/credit data as well as fiscal data (these reports are still in development) which should be addressed in the program’s response. These check-in reports will be included on GFEC agendas similar to the follow-up reports that are commonplace for program reviews.

**Context of Questions/Topics:** The questions and topics we would like addressed in the 3-year check-ins are based upon existing campus EI documents as well as issues of interest GFEC has raised in its own review of EI revenue-generating proposals.

**Academic Success**
1. Provide a description of how the program has maintained meaningful intellectual encounters, both inside and outside the classroom, between faculty and students.
2. Provide a progress update on the program’s learning goals and assessment plan. What evidence do you have of student learning?
3. In approving new EI revenue-generating programs the GFEC wanted to ensure that these programs enhance, not dilute, the UW-Madison’s overall reputation for quality education. Include an evaluation of the impact of your EI program on your existing undergraduate and graduate programs; please consider the questions below:
   a. Provide evidence of how the program has maintained the quality of new and existing degree programs.
   b. To what extent, if at all, has the introduction of your EI revenue-generating program affected students or courses in your traditional programs?
   c. Are students in your traditional programs taught by different faculty than they were before the introduction of your EI program? Please explain.
   d. Do students in your traditional programs have easy access to faculty outside of class time? Has this situation been affected by the introduction of your EI program? Please explain.
   e. How, if at all, has the introduction of your EI revenue-generating program affected the overall student culture across all of your programs? Do students in your EI revenue-generating (or traditional) program(s) feel a part of your unit? Please explain.
   f. Is there confusion among students, faculty, and/or staff about the role of the EI program relative to other programs? Please explain.
4. In approving new EI revenue-generating programs the GFEC wanted to ensure that programs were sustainable beyond the one or two active leaders initiating the creation
of the program. Please describe how your program has ongoing and broad commitment to ensure its continued success.

Operational EI Revenue-Generating Requirements

1. New EI revenue-generating programs are required to bring in new and additional students over and above prior enrollments; they are not to draw students away from existing programs. Using the included data reports, illustrate how the program has brought in NEW and ADDITIONAL students, and how overall enrollment in your related programs has remained steady. In addition, using the included data reports, illustrate how the program is and will remain fiscally viable.

2. Illustrate how the program meets the needs of non-traditional audiences. Among other things, consider the following:
   a. Whether the program has an applied, practice-oriented curriculum
   b. Whether the program is offered in a way that allows non-traditional audiences to attend (evening, weekend, distance, intensive, or some combination thereof)
   c. Whether there is a clear workforce demand for graduates of the program
   d. Whether the program’s curriculum is clearly defined and “self-contained”, meaning that the program does not depend on courses outside of the program revenue program
   e. Whether the program is structured to make concurrent enrollment with other programs unlikely or to discourage such concurrent enrollment
   f. Whether the program’s pathway and timeline for student completion is clear and dependable
   g. Whether the program provides career services to its students

3. If the program admits students needing ESL services, demonstrate that sufficient ESL support has been built into the program’s fiscal model.

4. Confirm the program’s understanding that it forgoes revenue for any student who is concurrently enrolled in both a program-revenue program and a program supported through traditional (101) funding.

Program-Specific Questions
This would be an area where program-specific issues cited in the GFEC approval memo could be mentioned and/or implementation issues confronted by the Graduate School.
Three-Year Progress Report for New Programs

The Graduate School’s core mission is to foster excellence in graduate education. New program development contributes to this excellence in a variety of ways – providing offerings in new, emerging fields; meeting the current needs of students; transforming teaching and learning; and engaging students in a variety of learning modes. The underlying values for all new programs are that they be strong in academic quality and ensure student success. Thus, the Graduate School has developed a progress report process at the three-year mark to ensure each program is on a path to success that is consistent with these overarching goals as well as the intended goals of the program.

Progress Report Process

Three to six months prior to the completion of the third year of student enrollment, the Graduate School will contact new programs and request a progress report on the topics below. The request will be accompanied by the following data resources that are applicable:

- Graduate School degree program profiles which includes data on admissions, enrollment, student funding, and degrees
- Academic Planning Institutional Research (APIR) certificate award reports
- Academic Planning Institutional Research (APIR) enrollment reports for non-pooled programs

Data from these reports should be addressed in the program’s progress report. These progress reports will be included on GFEC agendas, and program representatives will be asked to attend GFEC if additional information is requested regarding their check-in report.

Progress Report Questions/Topics

Academic Quality and Student Success

1. Provide an update on the program’s curriculum, learning goals and assessment plan. What evidence do you have of student learning?

2. Describe the program’s typical course design with respect to various modalities of learning (e.g., face-to-face sessions, asynchronous discussions, web conferences, recordings, team/individual assignments, etc.). Briefly explain how the program measures student and instructor satisfaction with those modalities, and how course/program design has evolved based on experience in the initial years.

3. Provide evidence that with the introduction of your new program you have been able to maintain or improve the quality of new and existing programs as well as the quality of the student experience.

4. Please describe how your program has ongoing and broad faculty commitment to ensure its continued success.
Operational Requirements

1. Using the included data reports, illustrate how the program has either brought in NEW and ADDITIONAL students (required for non-pooled programs), and/or how overall enrollment in your related programs has remained steady. If unanticipated overlap with existing programs has resulted, discuss steps to mitigate the overlap.

2. Funding Considerations
   a. For traditional/pooled programs -- Using the available program profiles, illustrate how the program is successfully funding its students. Supplement the profiles with additional information if appropriate.
   b. For non-pooled programs -- Referencing the program’s past three fiscal years of financial results, illustrate how the program is and will remain fiscally viable. For programs that are not yet fiscally viable due to start-up or other costs, provide a summary of past expenditures and budget projections demonstrating how the program plans to reach financial stability.

3. Report how operational realities align with expectations in the proposal and any adjustments that have been or are planned.

4. If the program admits international students, demonstrate how program processes address length of stay visa issues, online course restrictions, and needing ESL services.

Program-Specific Questions
This would be an area where program-specific issues cited in the GFEC approval memo could be mentioned and/or implementation issues confronted by the Graduate School.
Interim Dean Wendy Crone called the meeting to order.

The minutes of May 8, 2015 were approved as written.

Information Item:

Interim Dean Wendy Crone thanked Ted Golos, Pamela Potter, Steve Quintana, Kevin Shinners, and Susan Thibeault for completing their terms on GFEC, and thanked Susan Thibeault for agreeing to do an additional 1-year 2015-2016 term. New GFEC members starting their four-year terms in the 2015-2016 academic year include Kristin Eschenfelder, Nicole Perna, Patricia Rosenmeyer, and a faculty member from the Physical Sciences who will be appointed in advance of the September 2015 GFEC meeting.

Approvals:

1. Associate Dean Daniel Kleinman introduced Jeff Beneker from the Department of Classics and Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean in the College of Letters and Science, who presented the request for approval of the following:

   - Suspend Admissions to Hebrew and Semitic Studies M.A./Ph.D. effective Fall 2015
   - Discontinue Greek M.A. effective Fall 2015
   - Discontinue Latin M.A. effective Fall 2015
   - Rename Classics M.A./Ph.D. to Classics and Ancient Near Eastern Studies M.A./Ph.D. effective Fall 2016
   - Create named option titled “Classics” in the Classics and Ancient Near Eastern Studies M.A/Ph.D. effective Fall 2016
   - Create named option titled “Hebrew Bible” in the Classics and Ancient Near Eastern Studies M.A./Ph.D. effective Fall 2016
   - Rename doctoral minor in Hebrew and Semitic Studies to doctoral minor in Hebrew Bible effective Fall 2016

Beneker described how the Hebrew and Semitic Studies M.A./Ph.D. program will merge with the Classics M.A./Ph.D. program, which will be renamed “Classics and Ancient Near Eastern Studies” (CANES). Designed to integrate common ground of study in classics and Hebrew bibles, the newly reorganized CANES graduate
PhD”) on the Graduate School e-application. The GFEC endorsed the Deans’ revised December 15, 2015 deadline for the program to come into full compliance with the requested actions detailed in the Deans’ March 2014 memo.

3. Associate Dean Daniel Kleinman introduced discussion regarding the follow-up to the review of the M.S., MFA, and Ph.D. program in Human Ecology, in response to the program’s review at the June 2014 GFEC meeting. The GFEC commends the program on its efforts to better support students in response to program review recommendations, and recommends the School of Human Ecology continue to monitor and address graduate program climate.

4. GFEC member Pamela Potter presented the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the History M.A./Ph.D. program. Potter noted the program’s strengths, including dedication of the faculty leadership and academic staff, and high-quality research and teaching. Potter also noted the challenges facing the History graduate program, including an overburdened small portion of the faculty in leadership positions, a long time to Ph.D. degree compared to AAU peers, a disparate sense of climate and community for students depending on which of the 11 subject areas they are specializing, a need for a published student grievance procedure, and need for continuing efforts to ensure and sustain a smaller and better-funded graduate cohort. The GFEC joins the review committee in recommending the program develop a strategy to attend to these needs to ensure a better student experience.

Motion: Moved and seconded to accept the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the History M.A./Ph.D. program. The motion was passed unanimously.

5. GFEC member Pamela Potter presented the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the History of Science, Medicine and Technology M.A./Ph.D. program. Potter noted the program’s strengths including a positive program climate and community, productive efforts regarding professional development activities, and good student satisfaction regarding funding opportunities. The GFEC also discussed the program’s imminent restructuring and the care that will be needed to preserve the quality and stature of the program. The review committee recommends the program improve student advising regarding process and requirements for students if they wish to pursue a joint Ph.D. in History and History of Science, Medicine and Technology. The GFEC further recommends that the program continue to investigate how to achieve enhanced staff support while protecting the unique and positive identity and reputation of the existing program.

Motion: Moved and seconded to accept the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the History of Science, Medicine and Technology M.A./Ph.D. program. The motion was passed unanimously.

6. The Institutional (10-Year) Review of the M.A./Ph.D. in Philosophy was postponed to the first GFEC meeting of the next academic year.

Discussion Item:

Interim Dean Wendy Crone welcomed any final feedback regarding the updated draft of the Progress Report for Recently Approved Programs. GFEC members agreed that providing best-practice examples of responses would improve the document.
Three-Year Check-In for New Programs

The creation and maintenance of graduate programs and certificates represents significant resource commitments by faculty and staff. Given these investments, in 2014 the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) established a “check in” process for newly approved programs and certificates prior to their first formal university review (which occurs in the fifth year.) Through this “check-in,” the GFEC hopes program faculty and staff will assess the implementation of their new program and determine what mechanisms may be needed for sustained student success.

Progress reports will be included on GFEC agendas, and program representatives may be asked to attend GFEC if additional information is requested. In the interest of brevity, please keep responses to 300 words or less.

Program Name

Term of First Enrollments

Check-In Completed By

Date Completed

Academic Quality and Student Success

1. Provide an update on any changes to the program’s curriculum and learning outcomes. Include a description of the program’s typical course modalities (face-to-face, online, asynchronous discussion, team or individual assignments) and if courses have evolved based on faculty or student feedback.

2. Briefly explain the program’s learning outcomes assessment plan and discuss how you are or how you plan to evaluate student learning. Summarize any data collected to date showing evidence of student learning.

3. The GFEC is interested to learn how departments balance faculty and staff teaching loads and responsibilities between new and existing programs. Discuss how the department or program is achieving balance, and what challenges supporting multiple programs may
have created for teaching, student services, advising or funding. Also of interest is information on what if any assets are shared between programs, or additional benefits that have been realized.

4. Please describe how your program has ongoing and broad faculty commitment, including governance, to ensure its continued success. If applicable, reflections from faculty and staff can be included here or as an appendix. Also consider if implementation of this program is supporting the Department and/or School/College’s current strategic goals.

*Operations and Administration*

5. Illustrate how the program has either brought in NEW and ADDITIONAL students (required for non-pooled programs), and/or how overall enrollment in your related programs has remained steady. If unanticipated overlap with existing programs has resulted, discuss steps to mitigate the overlap.

6. Funding Considerations

   a. For traditional/pooled programs – How is the program successfully funding its students?

   b. For non-pooled programs – Provide a brief summary of projected vs. actual revenues and expenses. Does the program have sufficient enrollment for sustainability? Discuss the current market outlook compared to the original marketing study, and plans to grow or change the program to become sustainable.

7. If the program admits international students, describe how program processes address length of stay visa issues, online course restrictions, and needing ESL services.

8. Are there any issues impacting the program’s long-term sustainability? If so, what support would you like to help you succeed?