Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) - Agenda - September 14, 2018

University of Wisconsin-Madison Graduate Faculty Executive Committee 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m., Room 52 Bascom Hall September 14, 2018

Introduction
1:30  GFEC Overview and Charge and Introduction of New Members (William Karpus) GFEC.20180914.02
1:35  Automatic Consent approval of the minutes from May 11, 2018 Minutes - May 11, 2018

Approvals
1:40  Request to approve new Named Option “Professional” in the MS Electrical Engineering from the Department of Computer and Electrical Engineering effective Spring 2019 (Barry Vanveen) GFEC.20180914.03
1:50  Request to approve new Named Option “Research” in the MS Mechanical Engineering from the Department of Mechanical Engineering effective Fall 2019 (Gregory Nellis) GFEC20180914.04
2:00  Request to approve new Named Option “Educational Specialist in School Psychology” in MS Educational Psychology from the Department of Educational Psychology effective Fall 2019 (Julie Mead, Craig Albers & Brad Brown) GFEC20180914.05
2:15  Request to approve extension to graduate faculty status for Professor Lyn Turkstra from the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders (Parmesh Ramanathan) GFEC20180914.06

Program Reviews and Updates
2:20  Botany MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor Program Review Update (Parmesh Ramanathan) GFEC20180914.07
2:25  Manufacturing Systems Engineering MS Institutional 10-Year Program Review (Yu Hen Hu) GFEC20180914.08
2:45  Latin American, Caribbean, and Iberian Studies MA/Doctoral Minor Institutional 10-Year Program Review (Lisa Martin) GFEC20180914.09
3:05  Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies MA/PhD with Named Options "Classics" and "Hebrew Bible" and Doctoral Minors Classics, Greek, Hebrew Bible, and Latin Institutional 10-Year Program Review (Christa Olson) GFEC20180914.10

2018–2019 Meeting Schedule
October 5, November 9, December 14, January 11, February 8, March 8, April 12, May 10, June 14
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
52 Bascom Hall

Office of the Dean
217 Bascom Hall  500 Lincoln Drive  Madison, WI  53706-1380  grad.wisc.edu
Email: GraduateSchoolDean grad.wisc.edu  Phone: (608) 263-1353  Fax: (608) 265-9505
## Graduate Faculty Executive Committee Membership

- **Green font** = new members
- Faculty membership representative of divisions, departments, and school/college
- 4-year terms
- **Red font** = GSAPC member
- Members on sabbatical receive a formally appointed substitute

*Indicates sabbatical in Fall 2018
*Indicates sabbatical in Spring 2019

Blue font = substitutes for sabbatical

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

### GFEC Membership 2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Dept/Program</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Last Acad Yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potter, Pamela</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpless, John</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tejedo, Fernando</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>Spanish &amp; Portuguese</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander, Caroline</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>Oncology</td>
<td>SMPH</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perna, Nicole</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>Genetics</td>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfotenhauer, John</td>
<td>PHY</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Engr</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith III, Leslie*</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroepfer, Tracy</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu, Yu Hen</td>
<td>PHY</td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engr</td>
<td>Engr</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson, Christa</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai, Steph</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Resources</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, Monica**</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier, Lara</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Pharm</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lempp, Steffen</td>
<td>PHY</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Chris</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward, Earlise*</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Nur</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressler, Alex*</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>CANES</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, Gail</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>SMPH</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, Bret</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stahl, Shannon</td>
<td>PHY</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GFEC Duties

- Read meeting agenda materials
- Participate on 2-3 program review committees per year
- Attend GFEC meetings
- May serve on subcommittee; Serve on GSAPC in Year 4
GFEC 2017-2018 Year in Summary

- Program Reviews: 24
- New Programs: 13
- Other Approvals: 11
- 3-year Check-ins: 6
- Discontinued Programs: 7
- Review Updates: 7
- Information Items/Discussion: 7
Members Present: Caroline Alexander, Lara Collier, Kristin Eschenfelder, Mike Graham, Yu Hen Hu, William Karpus, Lisa Martin, Nicole Perna, John Pfotenhauer (arrived before fourth voting item), Parmesh Ramanathan, Tracy Schroepfer, Monica Turner

Members Absent: Alex Dressler, Steffen Lempp, Christa Olson, Leslie Smith III, Steph Tai, Earlise Ward

Guests: Jake Blanchard, Lee DeBaillie, Max Coller, Sridhara Dasu, Jaal Ghandhi, Don Hausch, Elaine Klein, Sarah Kuba, Jim Morris, Greg Nellis, Mark Saffman, Joan Schmit, Doug Reindl

Staff: Judy Bauman, Katie Block, Michelle Holland, LaRuth McAfee, Emily Reynolds

Dean William Karpus called the meeting to order.

The minutes of April 13, 2018, were approved as a matter of automatic consent.

Approvals:

1. Dean Karpus introduced Professor Doug Reindl to present a request from the Department of Mechanical Engineering to suspend admissions to Named Option “Controls” in the MS Mechanical Engineering effective Fall 2018. They are looking at the possibility of reconfiguring the program in the context of other online programs in Mechanical Engineering.

Motion: Moved and seconded to suspend admissions to Named Option “Controls” in MS Mechanical Engineering effective Fall 2018. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Dean Karpus introduced Professor Greg Nellis from the Department of Mechanical Engineering, who presented a request for a new Named Option “Accelerated Program” in the MS Mechanical Engineering effective Fall 2019. This would be a courses-only, non-pooled named option that would allow students to finish in 12 months. Dean Karpus asked how faculty bandwidth to advise students would be addressed and Professor Nellis pointed to the College of Engineering’s student services hub as a way to alleviate the advising load.

Motion: Moved and seconded to approve a new Named Option “Accelerated Program” in MS Mechanical Engineering effective Fall 2019. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Dean Karpus introduced Professor Don Hausch from the School of Business, who presented a request for a new Graduate/Professional Certificate in Business Analytics effective Fall 2018. This certificate
would provide a way to give existing MBA students greater proficiency in business analytics, a skillset for which recruiters are looking. It would be difficult for students outside of the School of Business to finish this certificate, but their goal was to utilize existing resources, courses and instructors. In the future the School of Business is interested in pursuing a way to partner with others on campus to create pathways for non-Business students to complete the certificate.

**Motion:** Moved and seconded to approve the Graduate/Professional Certificate in Business Analytics effective Fall 2018. The motion passed with 1 abstention.

4. Associate Dean Ramanathan presented a request from the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders in the College of Letters and Science to extend graduate faculty status for former professor Jan Edwards, who resigned in June 2016 to accept an outside offer at the University of Maryland. She is the primary advisor serving on the doctoral dissertation committees for two graduate students in Communication Sciences and Disorders. The department explained it would be difficult to find another advisor for these students, making the option of having Professor Edwards serve as co-advisor untenable.

**Motion:** Moved and seconded to approve the extension of graduate faculty status for Professor Jan Edwards. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Dean Karpus introduced Physics Professor and Chair Sridhara Dasu and Physics Professor Mark Saffman, who presented a request for a new Named Option “Quantum Computing” in the Physics MS effective Fall 2019. This would be a non-pooled program that would expect to primarily enroll international students. Dean Karpus emphasized the need to make this program accessible to all applicants and requested the program to recruit both domestic and international students. In response, Professor Dasu mentioned that he will be visiting US companies involved in commercialization of quantum computing technology in order to market the program to them. This field is rapidly growing, with related scientific research beginning to move into commercialization. UW-Madison Physics will be the first to offer a master’s program in this area and capitalize on this interest. Members of the GFEC asked if this field was more appropriate for work at the doctoral level; Professor Saffman described how some of the courses that will be used in the new option are currently taught at the master’s level, though ready undergraduate students will likely have to have received a degree in Physics to be prepared for the curriculum.

**Motion:** Moved and seconded to approve new Named Option “Quantum Computing” in Physics MS effective Fall 2019. The motion passed unanimously.

**Program Reviews and Updates:**

6. Associate Dean Ramanathan presented an update from the graduate programs in Mathematics following their institutional program review addressing the GFEC’s concerns about disproportionate numbers of female doctoral students failing their qualifying exams as well as the reliance of their
program on a single faculty member and a handful of universities in China in their Masters of Sciences named option Foundations of Advanced Studies. The department reports they have formed committees to look into the problems. Dean Karpus expressed concern about a lack of a cogent plan to address and keep the GFEC informed of progress. Members of the GFEC requested that representatives of the program come to GFEC at the October meeting to address the original concerns with an update their progress.

7. Associate Dean Ramanathan presented a summary of the five-year supplemental review of the Capstone Certificate in Post-Graduate Psychiatric Nursing from previous GFEC member Cynthia Czajkowski. The review committee did not find any issues and she would recommend the GFEC approve the committee’s report.

**Motion:** Moved and seconded to accept the Five-Year Supplemental Review of the Capstone Certificate in Post-Graduate Psychiatric Nursing. The motion passed unanimously.

8. GFEC Member Mike Graham introduced the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor in Agricultural and Applied Economics. Graham noted strengths of the program include four-year guaranteed funding for 90 percent of students, clear expectations for students and a detailed graduate student handbook, and strong job placements. Graham discussed review committee recommendations, including addressing the significantly longer time-to-degree for some students, lower completion rates compared to peers, as well as improving diversity in the program, which has a very small domestic targeted minority population.

**Motion:** Moved and seconded to accept the Institutional (10-Year) Review of the MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor in Agricultural and Applied Economics. The motion passed unanimously.

9. GFEC Member Kristin Eschenfelder presented the Institutional (5-Year) Review of the Capstone Certificate in Actuarial Science. The strengths of the program include excellent career prospects and good job placement, good climate and community, and staff and faculty who actively manage the capstone to respond to student needs. Eschenfelder also discussed the review committee recommendations, which included admitting more students by increasing marketing both on and off campus, ensuring availability of a handbook, and creating an assessment program.

**Motion:** Moved and seconded to accept the Institutional (5-Year) Review of the Capstone Certificate in Actuarial Science. The motion passed with 1 abstention.

**Adjournment**

Motion: Moved and seconded to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.
May 9, 2018

William Karpus, Dean
Graduate School
University of Wisconsin - Madison

Dear Bill,

At the March 21, 2018 meeting of the College of Engineering Academic Planning Council, the following new named option program was recommended for approval:

- Master of Science Electrical Engineering, Major: Electrical Engineering, Option: Professional.

The proposal is attached.

We are excited about the prospects for increasing our enrollment of terminal Masters students, given the accelerated nature of the proposed option and which targets individuals not typically served by research-oriented programs. In addition, we have created these with efficiency in mind and we envision common administrative and advising staff support to help us achieve these goals. We are now requesting approval from the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee.

Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely,

James P. Blanchard
Executive Associate Dean
jake.blanchard@wisc.edu
PROPOSAL FORM  
NAMED OPTION

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

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

1. Overview  
   1.1. Named Option: Professional  
   1.2. Academic Major: Electrical Engineering  
   1.3. Home Department: Electrical and Computer Engineering  
   1.4. School/college: Engineering, School of  
   1.5. Partner department(s)/units/schools/colleges: College of Engineering  
   1.6. Chair of the Major (name, title, email): John Booske, Chair, jhbooske@wisc.edu  
   1.7. Primary faculty or staff contact for the proposal (name, title, email): Rebecca Willett, Associate Professor of ECE, willett@discovery.wisc.edu  
   1.8. Primary school/college dean’s office contact (name, title, email): Jake Blanchard, Executive Associate Dean, jake.blanchard@wisc.edu  
   1.9. Briefly describe the type and purpose of the named option.

   We propose a non-pooled tuition program for a Master of Science degree. The purpose of the named option is to provide a Master of Science degree for students improving their technical capabilities for near-term entry into industry. The program allows students the flexibility to customize their technical emphasis, complete the degree within an accelerated and predictable timeframe (16 months or fewer), and participate in professional development activities such as industry-sponsored summer internships. The named option contributes to the mission of the department by targeting a professional body of students not typically served by research-oriented programs (such as the traditional MS in EE). The student demographic is self-funded, non-research, terminal, and professionally focused. The named option provides the flexibility needed to implement and support this coursework-only program that allows credits for degree-relevant internships.

   What prints on the diploma: Master of Science-Electrical Engineering 
   What prints on the transcript: Master of Science-Electrical Engineering, Major: Electrical Engineering, Option: Professional
Named option types are described in the Policy Guidelines for Named Options within Academic Majors: 1. Area of curricular emphasis within the major for undergraduate programs; 2. Honors in the major for undergraduate programs; 3. Area of curricular emphasis within the major for graduate programs; 4. Non-pooled tuition revenue programs; 5. Distance/Online Programs; 6. Off-Campus Location for graduate, professional, or undergraduate programs

1.10. Date form completed: 1/29/2018

2. Approval Implementation and Expectations for Review
2.1. School/College Approval Date: 3/21/2018
2.2. GFEC Approval Date (graduate level named options only): Click here to enter a date.
2.3. UAPC Approval Date: Click here to enter a date.
2.4. Expected first term of student enrollment (typically the first fall after UAPC approval): Fall 2019
2.5. Year of three-year progress report to GFEC (3 years after first student enrollment; graduate level named options only): 2022
2.6. Year of first program review (5 years after first student enrollment): 2024
2.7. Are all academic programs in the home department up to date for program review? Yes

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

3. Background/Rationale
3.1. How does the named option relate to the major and to other named options in the major, if relevant?

This program is complementary to the research-focused programs (such as the traditional MS in EE), but has a practical focus with a course-only curriculum and an accelerated 16-month completion time. The program offers more flexibility to customize a technical focus than the two existing named options – Power Engineering (an online program) and Machine Learning and Signal Processing (a residential program). The proposed program will also strongly encourage students to gain professional development by participating in a summer internship or by taking specialized professional development courses.

3.2. What is the purpose of the named option? How does the named option contribute to the mission of the sponsoring unit?

The purpose of the named option is to provide a Master of Science degree for students improving their technical capabilities for near-term entry into industry. The program allows students the flexibility to customize their technical emphasis, complete the degree within an accelerated and predictable timeframe (16 months or fewer), and participate in professional development activities such as industry-sponsored summer internships. The named option contributes to the mission of the department by targeting a professional body of students not typically served by research-oriented programs (such as the traditional MS in EE). The student demographic is self-funded, non-research, terminal, and professionally focused.
A marketing and recruiting initiative will target this demographic group to create awareness of the new degree program. Additionally, and as with UW as a whole, attracting diverse applicants is considered a source of creativity and innovation for the program. Contributions by unique and underrepresented individuals strengthens the educational mission of the program and supplies a diverse workforce to serve both industry and society. Support is available through student organizations such as Graduate Women in Science, the Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers and the Wisconsin Black Engineering Student Society, among others.

3.3. What is the evidence that there is a student demand for the named option?

The number of electrical engineering master’s degrees awarded nation-wide has increased from 5,026 in 2007 to 8,513 in 2016 – a 69% increase [1]. During the academic year 2016-2017, 23% of UW-Madison ECE BS graduates pursued a graduate degree [2].

With respect to industry demand, during the 2016-2017 academic year, 210 employers approached the UW engineering campus to interview Electrical and Computer Engineering students for employment. Fifty percent of those employers were interested in hiring MS students – attesting to the demand for enhanced technical skills in industry [3]. Additionally, the Bureau of Labor statistics estimates growth (2016-2026) in electrical engineering and computer engineering occupations at 8.6% and 21.4% respectively [4]. For electrical engineering, in particular, there is churn predicted in various sub-fields, such as a 25% decrease in electrical engineers in communication equipment manufacturing, or a 25% increase predicted for consulting services, or the 9% drop in fossil-fuel power generation [4]. It is important that industry-minded students can develop technical depth in specific areas poised for growth, and do so in a timely and predictable timeframe - 50% of traditional electrical engineering MS students take over 2 years to graduate [5]. This proposed named option will address these issues by offering a technically flexible, accelerated, and industry-focused path to a Master of Science degree. The target audience will be recent engineering BS graduates and working professionals in the first five years of employment.

4. **Curriculum**

4.1. **Delivery modality:**

   Face-to-face

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

4.2. Provide a complete list of named option requirements.

   Students are required to complete 30 credits of coursework, and 24 of those credits must be in Electrical and Computer Engineering. We focus on a broad curriculum that allows us to adapt to evolving student demands and respond quickly to employer priorities in the rapidly changing high-tech industry.

   Up to 6 of the required 30 credits may be taken outside of Electrical and Computer Engineering. The College of Engineering has developed an internal system for sharing tuition revenue between engineering departments. Furthermore, the College of Letters & Science (L&S) and the College of Engineering (CoE) have developed a memorandum of agreement (attachment B) for revenue-sharing to encompass all cross-college enrollments of L&S and CoE program students.

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

4.3. ☒ Attach a full curriculum including all required and elective courses.

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

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

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

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

**Checklist for Verification of Curricular Policy Requirements** *

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

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

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

5. **Assessment**

5.1. ☒ Attach a program assessment plan when submitting this proposal.

*Assessment plans for a named option should be integrated with the assessment plan for the major. See the [Basic Assessment Plan](#) for instruction and accompanying template. The Basic Assessment Plan and Template are minimum expectations for this information. Programs that have developed plans that exceed what is specified in the basic plan may provide that information.*

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

**Student Learning Goals:**
1. Demonstrate a strong understanding of mathematical, scientific, and engineering principles in the field.
2. Demonstrate an ability to formulate, analyze, and solve advanced engineering problems.
3. Demonstrate creative, independent problem solving skills.
4. Apply the latest scientific and technological advancements, advanced techniques, and modern engineering tools to these problems.
5. Recognize and apply principles of ethical and professional conduct.

**Method for assessing learning:**
The student and his/her academic advisor will select one specific MS course (from a list of assessment-eligible courses) from which the assessment data will be collected. The instructor of the assessment-eligible course will review the applicable work (course-specific) and complete the College’s learning goals checklist before the end of the semester. This data will be collected by the program.

**Plan for review of the assessment information:**
The GPAC will lead a discussion and review of the assessment data at a faculty meeting once a year and report the program assessment results – both the data summary and any recommendations -- to the Dean's Office. The Dean's Office will present all program assessment reports to the College Academic Planning Council (APC).

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

6. **Overlap and Related Programs**

6.1. Specify any other degree/majors, named options, or certificates that may not be earned in combination with this named option.
No other ECE MS degrees may be earned in combination with this named option. Concurrent enrollment in another UW-Madison degree or certificate is not allowed, nor is enrollment in courses outside of this named option curriculum.

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

7. Admissions & Enrollment

7.1. For graduate programs proposing a named option with admissions requirements that are distinct from the major with no named option, explain the admissions criteria and process. The same admissions criteria and process will be used for both the named option and the major.

7.2. What is the projected annual enrollment in the named option?
Initially 10 for the Fall19 term, ramping up to 50 over time.

7.3. What is the maximum enrollment (using existing instructional and student resources)?
Up to 40 students are possible with existing instructional and student resources, based on recent enrollment maximums (see Appendix A). The budget in section 10.3 assumes that 50 students per year are maintained long-term with additional TA, staff and faculty resources obtained using program revenue.

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

Additional lecturers, professors of practice, TAs and staff time will be obtained using revenue from the program. The college of engineering, using centralized named option revenue, will support a program director and additional graduate student services coordinator staff as programs increase in size. Student assistance with career advising and obtaining internships (resumes, interviews, etc.) will be provided centrally by Engineering Career Services.

Checklist for Verification of Admission Policy Requirements for Undergraduate Named Options*
You will have an opportunity to provide explanation and rationale for any Admission Policy Requirements that have not been affirmed in the text box that follows the checklist.

☐ Named option admission requirements are consistent with admission requirements for the major with no named option, if the major has any admission requirements beyond admission to the University. Admission limits should be related to interest or aptitude for the content and not based solely on a high GPA cutoff.

☐ The named option will be declared and canceled using the e-Declaration process in the student information system.

☐ Undergraduates will not be advised to declare or remain enrolled in a named option if it will extend their time to graduation. Undergraduate students are to be discouraged from earning more than one named option that represents an area of curricular emphasis within the major.
*Provide explanation and rationale for any Admission Policy Requirements that have not been affirmed in the above checklist. Type explanations for Admission Policy Requirements not affirmed here.

8. Advising

8.1. List name(s) of major and named option advisor(s) with title and departmental affiliation(s).
   Major: Electrical and Computer Engineering
   Named option advisor(s): ECE Faculty listed at https://directory.engr.wisc.edu/ece/faculty.

8.2. Describe how there will be sufficient advising and academic support for all students in the major (both the existing major’s students and the new students that will be served by the named option).
   The ECE department has up to 50 faculty who can advise graduate students and teach courses. Additional advisory support, using program revenue, will be provided centrally by the College of Engineering to support graduate student services coordinators and a program administrator. Further career and internship services will be provided by Engineering Career Services.

8.3. ☒ Confirm that major and named option advisor(s) have been consulted and reviewed this proposal.

9. Governance & Faculty

9.1. ☒ The named option must be governed by the same department or academic unit that oversees the major. Any sub-committee governing the named option must report to the faculty governance committee for the major.
   9.1.1. If a sub-committee governs the named option, describe procedures including how faculty are identified and provisions for transitions in the committee.
   N/A

9.2. List core faculty and staff with title and departmental affiliation(s).
   The program will be governed by the ECE department curriculum committee and graduate committee. The membership of these committees changes annually. The current curriculum committee chair is Rebecca Willett, Associate Professor, and the current graduate committee chair is Nader Bedad, Professor.

10. Fiscal Structure and Ongoing Commitment

10.1. Provide an overview of plans for funding the named option including but not limited to program administration, instructional/curricular delivery, technology needs, and program assessment.
   The College of Engineering is working to expand named options across the college and has hired staff to assist all departments. The current plan is for up to 20% of program revenue to be charged to ECE by the COE to help pay for this staff support. These staff will assist with program marketing, admissions, visa requirements, and program assessment. Other aspects of the program can be administered initially with existing resources and supplemented with program revenue as-needed in the future.

10.2. How will the named option impact staffing needs beyond the immediate program? How are those needs being met?
   Additional staff will be provided by the COE, and additional department needs will be met using program revenue.
If there is no change in staffing, please describe how the duties of current employees will evolve to support this named option.

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

An on-going enrollment of 50 students per year is estimated. On average, each student will generate about $25,000 over the 16-month program. At steady state, overlapping cohorts will generate $25,000 per entering student per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Tuition/Student/Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Annual Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Assessment (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering College (20%)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional TA Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Staff Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Associate (1 FTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Sharing L&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Revenue</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated. Includes centralized administration, student services, marketing and recruitment.

10.4. For graduate programs supported using pooled tuition, provide a plan for how new graduate students will be funded.

Required attachments
☒ Cover letter from the Dean of the school/college that will be the home of the named option

When a proposal for a new named option is forwarded for approval, it will have a cover letter to the provost from the supporting dean.
☒ Supporting letters/memos

Proposals must be accompanied by letters or memos submitted by the chair or director of other academic units that have overlapping interest. These notes may comment on shared resources, competition for students or other ways in which the programs will interact surrounding the named option. This will include departments/schools/colleges, share a student audience, represent a closely related area of study, have overlapping faculty, or have program names that are similar.
☒ Full curriculum including all required and elective courses
☐ For undergraduate named options, attach a four year roadmap.
For graduate named options, attach a chart outlining minimum degree requirements and elements for satisfactory progress.

Assessment plan

Named options supported using non-pooled tuition must attach:
- Core Criteria Checklist
- Additional Requirements Checklist

See the current Non-pooled Program Requirements Process document posted at https://kb.wisc.edu/vesta/page.php?id=59300
Curriculum
Master of Science Electrical Engineering, Named Option: Professional
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Credits Requirement: 30

Suggested Course Credit Allocation:
- Fall Semester I: 9-12 Credits
- Spring Semester: 9-12 Credits
- Summer Session (optional): 0-3 Credits
- Fall Semester II: 0-12 Credits

Mandatory Courses
- ECE 610: Graduate Seminar 1 credit (take once)

Elective Courses
- 12 of the 30 credit hours must be taken within one of the sample curriculum paths below. (Special topics courses ECE 601 or 901 may be used for up to 3 of these credits with advisor approval.)
- Remaining ECE electives are listed at [http://guide.wisc.edu/courses/e_c_e/](http://guide.wisc.edu/courses/e_c_e/). Most elective courses will be from this list and numbered 500 and above.

Other Course Requirements
- 24 of the 30 credit hours must be taken in ECE. Approved graduate or undergraduate transfer credits may count towards the 24 ECE credits.
- 15 of the 30 credit hours must be at the graduate level; 9 of these must be in ECE
- No more than 3 independent study credits count towards the degree. This includes ECE 699 and ECE 999.
- Thesis credits are not allowed (ECE 790 or ECE 890)

Professional Development Activities
Students are strongly encouraged to participate in one of the professional development activities below:
- With assistance from Engineering Career Services, obtain a summer internship and enroll in up to 2 credits of ECE 702 Graduate Cooperative Education
- Enroll in the summer course InterEGR 601 Introduction to Interdisciplinary Design and Innovation - 3 credits.
- Enroll in up to three credits of ECE 699 and be co-supervised by an advisor working in industry (choice of industry advisor is subject to program approval).
- Complete at least two of the online Foundations of Professional Development courses. Each course is eight weeks and 1 credit.
  - EPD 701 Writing for Professionals
Sample Curriculum Paths

The curriculum paths below are examples aligned with curricular groups within the ECE department. Students may take courses from combinations of different paths to create custom degrees that are well-aligned with their professional goals.

**Computer Engineering (CMPE)**
ECE 453 - Embedded Microprocessor Design
ECE 454 – Mobile Computing Laboratory
ECE 537 - Communication Networks
ECE 551 – Digital System Design and Synthesis
ECE 552 – Introduction to Computer Architecture
ECE 554 – Digital Engineering Laboratory
ECE 555 – Digital Circuits and Components
ECE 556 – Design Automation of Digital Systems
ECE 707 – Mobile and Wireless Networking
ECE 750 – Real-Time Computing Systems
ECE 751 – Embedded Computing Systems
ECE 752 – Advanced Computer Architecture I
ECE 753 – Fault-Tolerant Computing
ECE 755 – VLSI Systems Design
ECE 756 – Compute-Aided Design for VLSI
ECE 757 – Advanced Computer Architecture II

**E&M Fields and Waves**
ECE 453 – Embedded Microprocessor System Design
ECE 545 – Advanced Microwave Measurements for Communications
ECE 547 – Advanced Communications Circuit Design
ECE 552 – Introduction to Computer Architecture
ECE 740 – Electromagnetic Theory
ECE 742 – Computational Methods in Electromagnetics
ECE 744 – Theory of Microwave Circuits and Devices
ECE 748 – Linear Waves
ECE 749 – Coherent Generation and Particle Beams
ECE 841 – Electromagnetic Radiation and Transmission
ECE 848 – Nonlinear Waves

**Energy and Power Systems**
(The on-campus program, not the online MSEE Power Engineering program)
ECE 411 – Introduction to Electric Drive Systems
ECE 412 – Power Electronic Circuits
ECE 427 – Electric Power Systems
ECE 504 – Electric Machine and Drive System Laboratory
ECE 511 – Theory and Control of Synchronous Machines
ECE 512 – Power Electronics Laboratory
ECE 711 – Dynamics and Control of AC Drives
ECE 712 – Solid State Power Conversion
ECE 713 – Electromagnetic Design of AC Machines
ECE 714 – Utility Applications of Power Electronics
ECE 723 – On-line Control of Power Systems
ECE 731 – Advanced Power System Analysis

**Solid State/Photonics**
ECE 434 - Photonics
ECE 445 – Semiconductor Physics and Devices
ECE 466 – Electronics of Solids
ECE 536 – Integrated Optics and Optoelectronics
ECE 541 – Analog MOS Integrated Circuit Design
ECE 542 – Introduction to Microelectromechanical Systems
ECE 544 – Processing of Electronic Materials
ECE 548 – Integrated Circuit Design
ECE 549 – Integrated Circuit Fabrication Laboratory
ECE 741 – Semiconductor Diode Lasers and Other Optoelectronic Devices
ECE 743 – High-Power Diode Lasers and Amplifiers
ECE 745 – Solid State Electronics
ECE 746 – Quantum Electronics
ECE 845 – Transport in Semiconductor Devices
ECE 901 – Special Topics in Electrical and Computer Engineering
**Electrical and Computer Engineering**

**MINIMUM DEGREE REQUIREMENTS & SATISFACTORY PROGRESS**

*Schools/Colleges, Departments and Programs may set more rigorous expectations and requirements than the Graduate School*

- If describing multiple degree plans at the same level (M.A. and M.S.) or multiple named options and tracks within a plan, indicate requirements for all plan variations.
- Please note that “Example” in the chart provides an example of policy – but is not necessarily reflective of Graduate School’s policy. For the actual Graduate School policies, you may consult the Graduate School Degree Requirements chart at [http://grad.wisc.edu/catalog/degreq_criteria.htm](http://grad.wisc.edu/catalog/degreq_criteria.htm) to ensure program compliance with Graduate School degree requirements.
- If the program policy aligns with Graduate School degree requirements, please reiterate the policy in your program’s degree requirement chart – do not simply provide “Follow Graduate School Policy”.
- Programs are responsible for monitoring more restrictive requirements.

### Master’s Degrees:
Masters of Science (MS), Named Option: Professional

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Graduate Residence Credit Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 credits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Graduate Coursework (50%) Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least half of degree coursework (15 out of 30 total credits) must be graduate coursework. 9 of the 15 need to be in ECE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prior Coursework Requirements: Graduate Work from Other Institutions**

With program approval, students are allowed to count no more than 9 credits of graduate coursework from other institutions. Coursework earned five or more years prior to admission to a master’s degree is not allowed to satisfy requirements.

Up to seven credits from an undergraduate degree earned at a non-UW-Madison institution may count toward a UW-Madison graduate degree with program approval when the following two conditions are met:

1. students have received their undergraduate degree in the same discipline as they are pursuing graduate work (Electrical and Computer Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Computer Engineering, Computer Science and Engineering, etc), and
2. the undergraduate degree has been granted from a program which is accredited by the same accrediting body as the UW-Madison program (ABET).

**Prior Coursework Requirements: UW-Madison Undergraduate**

With program approval, up to 9 credits numbered 300 or above from a UW-Madison undergraduate degree are allowed to count toward the degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits per Term Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS – all options and tracks: 15 credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program-Specific Courses Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECE 610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Grade Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Probation Policy**

The status of a student can be one of three options:
1. Good standing (progressing according to standards; any funding guarantee remains in place).
2. Probation (not progressing according to standards but permitted to enroll; loss of funding guarantee; specific plan with dates and deadlines in place in regard to removal of probationary status).
3. Unsatisfactory progress (not progressing according to standards; not permitted to enroll, dismissal, leave of absence or change of advisor or program).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Advisor / Committee</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students are required to conduct a yearly progress report meeting with their advisor, scheduled by December 17 and completed by April 30. Failure to do so will result in a hold being placed on the student’s registration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Assessments and Examinations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student and his/her academic advisor will select one specific MS course (from a list of assessment-eligible courses) from which the assessment data will be collected. The instructor of the assessment-eligible course will review the applicable work (course-specific) and complete the College's learning goals checklist before the end of the semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Time Constraints</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If students have been absent for five or more years, they must file a new Graduate School application for admission and submit it with a new application fee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree students who have been absent for five or more consecutive years lose all credits that they have earned before their absence. Students may count the course work completed before their absence for meeting graduate degree credit requirements; the Graduate School will not count that work toward the Graduate School’s minimum residence credit minimum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Language Requirements</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No language requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Plan – M.S. Degree Programs in the College of Engineering

Whether program personnel decide to paste information into this template or to utilize a pre-existing document, all bolded items must be included and clearly labeled.

Identifying Information
School/College: College of Engineering
Graduate Degree/Major Program Name: Electrical and Computer Engineering
Graduate Degree Level (M.S., M.A., Ph.D., DMA, etc.): M.S.
Faculty Director Contact/Title: Rebecca Willett, Chair of ECE Curriculum Committee
Primary Contact Information: willett@discovery.wisc.edu

Student Learning Goals (What)
Assessment of graduate-level learning goals is one of the many ways in which our campus ensures the integrity of its degrees and the quality of the student experience. List the graduate student learning goals for this academic degree program below. Feel free to add rows if the academic degree program has more than five learning goals. The student learning goals that have been submitted for your academic degree/major program can be found on the Inside Assessment website (https://provost.wisc.edu/inside-assessment/).

1. Demonstrate a strong understanding of mathematical, scientific, and engineering principles in the field
2. Demonstrate an ability to formulate, analyze, and independently solve advanced engineering problems
3. Apply the relevant scientific and technological advancements, techniques, and engineering tools to address these problems
4. Recognize and apply principles of ethical and professional conduct

Plan for Assessing Each Student Learning Goal
For each of the degree major/program student learning goals, indicate how the program plans to assess whether or not students are meeting the expectation, as well as when each learning goal will be assessed. Keep in mind that each academic degree program is expected to engage in at least one assessment activity per year and assessment activities, in total, must include one direct assessment method. While programs do not need to assess each learning goal every year, all learning goals must be assessed within a period of three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Planning (How)</th>
<th>Learning Goal #1</th>
<th>Learning Goal #2</th>
<th>Learning Goal #3</th>
<th>Learning Goal #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method for assessing learning (at least one direct method required)</td>
<td>The student and his/her academic advisor will select one specific MS course (from a list of assessment-eligible courses) from which the assessment data will be collected. The instructor of the assessment-eligible course will review the applicable work (course-specific) and complete the College’s learning goals checklist before the end of the semester.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetable for assessment activity (at least one activity each year; all goals reviewed in a 3-year cycle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data collected at the end of every semester (via the learning goals checklist) will be compiled in aggregate form and reviewed annually.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For examples of direct and indirect methods of assessment, see: http://provost.wisc.edu/assessment/doing-assessment.htm.
You may elect to copy and paste this table multiple times if your program has more than five learning goals.

Also provide answers to the following questions as part of your assessment plan.

1. **Who is responsible for assessment?** (identify an individual or team who will coordinate the implementation of the plan on an annual basis):
   The department graduate program coordinator (staff) will remind all faculty members serving as M.S. faculty advisors to ensure that one of the assessment-eligible courses has been identified from the coursework plan. The student will notify the instructor of that selected course that the assessment will take place that semester. The instructor (faculty) is responsible for completing the learning goals checklist and submitting it to the department graduate program assessment coordinator (GPAC) – a role filled by a faculty member appointed by the department chair. The GPAC will compile and summarize the department’s learning goals assessment data on an annual basis.

2. **What is the plan for review of the assessment information?** (typically during an annual meeting of the program faculty and staff; note that at this meeting the program may want to review enrollment information, course progression, degree completion, and other structural features of the student experience in addition to the evidence about student learning):
   The GPAC will lead a discussion and review of the assessment data at a faculty meeting once a year and report the program assessment results – both the data summary and any recommendations -- to the Dean's Office. The Dean's Office will present all program assessment reports to the College Academic Planning Council (APC).

3. **What is the plan for production of an annual summary report?** (the annual summary report includes the materials that form the basis of discussion at the annual meeting of the program faculty and staff, along with any recommendations made after considering the student learning assessment information presented):
   The Dean's Office will compile an annual College-wide summary report consisting of the individual reports from each CoE graduate program and a brief statement of any additional recommendations provided by the CoE APC.

4. **How will recommendations be implemented?** (explain the general process by which recommendations will be implemented):
   The annual College-wide summary report, including any APC recommendations, will be shared with each GPAC for implementation in individual programs.

**Graduate Degree Program Curriculum Mapping Worksheet (Where)**
This worksheet, or similar document, must be included with the submission of the program’s assessment plan.

- **Learning Goals** – Enter the academic degree program learning goals identified in the assessment plan on the top row of the following chart. (If the learning goals have been submitted to the Office of the Provost, a pre-populated template is available; contact
Feel free to add columns if the academic degree/major program has more than five learning goals.

- **Degree/Major Program Courses/Experiences** – List all degree requirements (in some cases co-curricular experiences may also be included). Feel free to add rows as needed.
- Indicate with a check (X) where the course or learning experience contributes to each of the learning goals. Courses may contribute to multiple learning goals.

| Curriculum Map *(Where)* | Enter program-level learning goals and check (X) which course or experience contributes to which learning goal. |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| **Degree Program Required Courses or Experiences** | Learning Goal #1 | Learning Goal #2 | Learning Goal #3 | Learning Goal #4 |
| M.S. coursework | X | X | | |
| ECE 610 | | | X |
| Portfolio review with faculty advisor | X | X | X | X |

*Add additional rows as needed to capture all requirements.*

Minimally, all of the courses/experiences required to complete the major degree program should be listed. Optionally, elective courses may be included in addition to the required courses.

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

For Undergraduate Degree Program Assessment Plan Template, see [http://provost.wisc.edu/assessment/](http://provost.wisc.edu/assessment/)
APPENDIX A. CORE CRITERIA CHECKLIST
FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS WITH NON-POOLED TUITION

1. New and Additional Student Enrollments to Support Program Costs

✓ The program must bring in NEW and ADDITIONAL students. Overall enrollment in all other school/college programs must not be eroded. The program cannot compete with or draw students away from existing programs that support the central tuition pool.

✓ Faculty/staff must plan for sufficient enrollments to have enough tuition to cover instructional, direct student support costs, and any other fixed or required costs. Experience shows that enrollments of at least 30 students are necessary to have enough tuition to meet direct program costs.

✓ School/college Budget Officers must be involved in planning and must approve plans and budgets for these programs before the program is submitted to the school/college APC for academic approval.

2. Designed for Non-Traditional Students

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

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

✓ Has demonstrated a workforce demand for the program graduates

✓ Has defined learning goals that are oriented to market considerations

□ Has a clearly defined curriculum that is “self-contained”, meaning that program students are confined only to courses from the approved, prescribed curriculum

□ Has a clearly defined (often lockstep) curriculum with few options or electives that follows a predictable timeline for offerings and completion

3. Distinctly Identifiable Program (Code) With Governance Approval

✓ The program must be distinctly identifiable in the student record system, either as a degree/major or as an option of a degree/major, or as a Capstone certificate.

✓ The program must develop a proposal for the academic approval process, during which it must demonstrate that the school/college Dean and Budget Officer are aware and supportive of the program being run on a non-pooled tuition model.
APPENDIX B. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST
FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS WITH NON-POOLED TUITION

Use this checklist in conjunction with the Core Criteria Checklist

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

1. Fiscal Requirements:

  ✔ School/college budget officer has approved the budget and fiscal plan.

  ✔ School/college dean and budget officer are committed to assuming fiscal responsibility for costs not covered by non-pooled tuition to the program. The school/college will back up the budget with a commitment to cover any costs not met from tuition from other sources.

  ✔ The program structure fits within standard academic administrative structures and allocates expenses of the program so that the program does not create additional burdens on traditional/101 program resources or student services such as advising, ESL, Registrar’s Office, Bursar’s Office, Graduate School and other support services.

  ✔ Programs have two options for tuition. One option is to charge standard graduate tuition according to the UW-Madison tuition schedule. This includes standard rates for WI resident, MN, and non-resident students and any compulsory fees that apply. Or, for fully online programs, they have the option of charging all students one of tuition tiers (Appendix D). Although not currently allowed, it is potentially possible in the future the tiered tuition may be available to face-to-face programs.

  ✔ Because students who have graduate assistantships receive tuition waivers, some non-pooled tuition graduate degree programs choose to prohibit students from accepting a graduate assistantship (RA/TA/PA). If a program allows their students to take graduate assistantships they it must forgo the tuition revenue. To ensure full receipt of non-pooled tuition and to counter challenges from students, the program must adhere to the following:

    ✔ The program faculty/staff must disclose this program policy to students in the recommendation of admission letter, program website, program handbook, and program orientation.

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

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

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

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

3. **Requirements for Program/Course Enrollment:**

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

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

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

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

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

  - For students who enroll in the non-pooled program and then decide they want to pursue traditional/101 programs that allow dual enrollment, the program must help the student transfer to a different program(s) that allow such activity.
Attachment A

Graduate School Time to Degree: 2008-2017

- Select Degree Level: Master's
- Select Student Category (A1)
- Disciplinary Division: Physical Sciences
- Academic Plan: Electrical Engineering MS

This visualization was created by the UW-Madison Graduate School Office of Academic Planning and Assessment. Questions should be directed to Peter Kinsey, peter.kinsey@wisc.edu.
Attachment B
Memorandum of Agreement between the College of Letters & Science and the College of Engineering for 131 Program Revenue Sharing

April 30, 2018

While revenue-generating (fund 131) programs are intended to be largely self-contained (with the home department providing most of the instruction), program students may benefit from the opportunity to take courses in other departments or colleges. Because tuition paid by program students flows directly to the home department, this necessitates a revenue-sharing agreement with the department providing the instruction. To avoid the proliferation of bilateral agreements between departments, the College of Letters & Science (L&S) and the College of Engineering (CoE) have developed the present revenue-sharing agreement to encompass all cross-college enrollments of L&S and CoE program students.

Scope of this agreement:

- This agreement covers all enrollments of L&S program students in CoE courses, and all enrollments of CoE program students in L&S courses.
- This agreement covers all revenue-generating programs in both colleges: capstone programs, masters programs, and Visiting International Student Programs (VISPs).
- This agreement supersedes an earlier MOA to permit CoE program students to enroll in English as a Second Language (ESL) courses.

Revenue sharing:

- Toward the end of each fiscal year, the L&S Budget Office will use Credits-Follow-Instructor (CFI) data to determine the number of credits taken by L&S program students in CoE courses, and the number of credits taken by CoE program students in L&S courses.
- Both colleges will have an opportunity to review the CFI data and discuss corrections before any funds are transferred between colleges. To the extent that errors in CFI data stem from payroll errors (e.g., miscoding an instructional appointment as a research appointment), each college will work to eliminate these payroll errors going forward.
- All instruction is valued at $600 per credit.
- For administrative simplicity, the college responsible for taking the larger number of credits will make a single payment to the other college. For instance, if L&S program students took 300 credits in CoE courses, and CoE students took 180 credits in L&S courses, then L&S would transfer $600 * (300 – 180) = $72,000 to CoE. Conversely, CoE would pay L&S if CoE program students were responsible for more cross-college credits than L&S program students.
- Each college is responsible for internal fund transfers to or from its departments.

Consultation between colleges:

- When new programs are under consideration, the home college will contact the other college to request permission for cross-enrollments, providing curricular details and enrollment estimates to help the instructional departments assess the impact on their teaching capacity.
- Existing programs should notify instructional departments of any anticipated change in program enrollment as soon as possible, giving the instructional department time to adjust capacity.
- We anticipate that instructional departments will routinely grant requests for new or increased cross-enrollments, with the $600/credit payments being adequate to cover incremental costs. However, in exceptional circumstances, instructional departments will may prohibit or limit
cross-enrollments in cases where they lack adequate capacity. Timely communication between the programs and instructional departments about projected enrollments will be important, providing more time for instructional departments to increase capacity, and for programs to consider curricular alternatives when necessary.

- Unless otherwise agreed, the instructional department will determine if and when to offer courses following its usual scheduling practices. There is no obligation to teach additional or designated sections for program students.
- Further consultation between home and instructional departments will be undertaken as needed (e.g., regarding ESL placements of program students).

Period of agreement:

- This agreement will be effective for 2018-19 and 2019-20.
- In Spring 2020, L&S and CoE will discuss whether to continue or revise the terms of this agreement.

Signatures:

- College of Engineering _____  
  _____Date 5/2/2018____

- College of Letters & Science _____  
  _____Date 5/8/2018_____
May 17, 2018

William Karpus, Dean
Graduate School
University of Wisconsin - Madison

Dear Bill,

At the May 16, 2018 meeting of the College of Engineering Academic Planning Council, the following new named option program was recommended for approval:

- Master of Science: Mechanical Engineering, Named Option: Research MS in Mechanical Engineering.

The proposal is attached.

This option is the traditional, research-oriented degree (pooled) obtained by graduate students in Mechanical Engineering. Each student is required to have a research adviser and is required to complete a thesis or participate in independent research as part of the program.

The addition of the named option “Research MS in Mechanical Engineering” clarifies the role of this option relative to other named option alternatives available to students interested in graduate studies in Mechanical Engineering.

We are now requesting approval from the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee.

Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely,

James P. Blanchard
Executive Associate Dean
jake.blanchard@wisc.edu
PROPOSAL FORM
NAMED OPTION: Research MS in Mechanical Engineering

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

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

1. Overview
   1.1. Named Option: Research
   1.2. Academic Major: Mechanical Engineering
   1.3. Home Department: Mechanical Engineering
   1.4. School/college: College of Engineering
   1.5. Partner department(s)/units/schools/colleges: none
   1.6. Chair of the Major (name, title, email): Jaal Ghandhi, Chair, jaal.ghandhi@wisc.edu
   1.7. Primary faculty or staff contact for the proposal (name, title, email): Greg Nellis, Associate Chair, gfnellis@engr.wisc.edu
   1.8. Primary school/college dean’s office contact (name, title, email): James Blanchard, Executive Associate Dean, jake.blanchard@wisc.edu
   1.9. Briefly describe the type and purpose of the named option.

   This will be a pooled tuition program for a Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering. The purpose of the named option is to provide a Master of Science program that is research-based either through a thesis or an independent study. This option is the traditional degree obtained by graduate students in ME. Each student is required to have a research adviser and is required to participate in some form of independent research as part of the program. The purpose of the program is to prepare students for the PhD program or for research jobs in industry and the national labs.

   What prints on the diploma: Master of Science-Mechanical Engineering
   What prints on the transcript: Master of Science-Mechanical Engineering, Named Option: Research
   Major: Mechanical Engineering, Option: Research

   1.10. Date form completed: 5/16/2018

2. Approval Implementation and Expectations for Review
   2.1. School/College Approval Date: Click here to enter a date.
   2.2. GFEC Approval Date (graduate level named options only): Click here to enter a date.
2.3. UAPC Approval Date: Click here to enter a date.
2.4. Expected first term of student enrollment (typically the first fall after UAPC approval): Fall 2019
2.5. Year of three year progress report to GFEC (3 years after first student enrollment; graduate level named options only): Fall 2022
2.6. Year of first program review (5 years after first student enrollment): 2024-2025
2.7. Are all academic programs in the home department up to date for program review? Yes.

The Self Study for the Certificate in Thermal Energy Systems has been completed this spring and was presented to the CoE APC in their May meeting. At that point the review was sent to the Graduate School.

The Campus Assessment Plan and Implementation Form of the Certificate in Manufacturing Engineering was submitted to the graduate school. This certificate is not due for a self study or review until 2020.

3. Background/Rationale

3.1. How does the named option relate to the major and to other named options in the major, if relevant?

Currently the ME program has two tracks in its pooled MS program - the thesis option and course option. In fact, both options require some research, either a thesis project (thesis option) or an independent study project (course option). Further, both options require that students identify a research adviser in order to start the program (international students must identify a research adviser in order to be admitted). As part of our preparation for the implementation of an Accelerated MS Named Option, ME is proposing this single, research option for its pooled MS program. Because the degree requires research, students typically finish in no less than 3 semesters (typically 2 years) and students are focused on obtaining a research-based job or continue for the Ph.D.

3.2. What is the purpose of the named option? How does the named option contribute to the mission of the sponsoring unit?

The purpose of the named option is to provide a Master of Science – Mechanical Engineering program that is research-based. ME undergraduates must take a wide breadth of classes. This option allows these students to focus at an advanced level on a particular area of Mechanical Engineering and carry out independent research under the supervision of a faculty adviser in order to prepare themselves for further study in a PhD program or for research-related positions. The named option contributes significantly to the mission of the Department of Mechanical Engineering by enhancing the reputation of the Department and the College nationally and internationally. The addition of the named option Research clarifies the role of this option relative to other named option alternatives available to students.

3.3. What is the evidence that there is a student demand for the named option?

The department currently serves approximately 100 M.S. students, all but 4 of whom would fall into this category of a Research Named Option.

4. Curriculum

4.1. Delivery modality:
   Face-to-face

4.2. Provide a complete list of named option requirements.
- Students are required to complete 30 credits of course work.
- Students are required to take the Graduate Seminar (ME 903, 0 credit) their first two semesters in residence
- A minimum of 9 credits must be formal course credits in ME taken at the UW-Madison.
- Either at least 9 thesis credits (ME 790) followed by an oral examination or at least 3 independent study credits (ME 699) followed by a final report must be accomplished to satisfy the research requirement.
- At least 18 formal course credits with a thesis or 24 formal course credits with an independent study.
- At least one formal course must be numbered 700 or higher (excluding ME 964).
- A GPA of at least 3.0 must be maintained based on all formal course credits.
- At least 50% of the credits must be courses designed for graduate work.

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

4.3. ☒ Attach a full curriculum including all required and elective courses.

4.4. For undergraduate named options, attach a four year roadmap.  
Named options for undergraduate majors will have requirements totaling 120 credits and students should be able to complete the degree/major within four academic years.

4.5. ☒ For graduate named options, attach a chart outlining minimum degree requirements and elements for satisfactory progress.  
Master’s level programs will include at least 30 credits of requirements. Doctoral level programs will include at least 51 credits of requirements.

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

☒ Courses are offered on a regular basis.
☒ Courses have enrollment capacity for students in the named option.
☒ All courses required for the named option are fully approved. (ME459 is in the approval process)
☒ Units must maintain Named Option requirements so that they are up-to-date; all curriculum changes must be approved through the appropriate school/college academic planning council (APC) or curriculum committee. The school/college APC or curriculum committee will notify the Office of the Registrar and the Graduate School (graduate level named options only) about approved curricular changes to the named option. Typically, any changes in requirements will be effective no sooner than the fall semester after approval.

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

5. Assessment

5.1. ☒ Attach a program assessment plan when submitting this proposal.  
Assessment plans for a named option should be integrated with the assessment plan for the major. See the Basic Assessment Plan for instruction and accompanying template. The Basic Assessment Plan and Template are minimum expectations for this information. Programs that have developed plans that exceed what is specified in the basic plan may provide that information.
5.2. Provide a summary of the program assessment plan, including learning goals for the major and any additional learning goals that are specific for the named option, key methods and assessment approaches, and how assessment information will be reviewed and acted on.

Student Learning Goals:
1. Demonstrate a strong understanding of mathematical, scientific, and engineering principles in the field.
2. Demonstrate an ability to formulate, analyze, and independently solve advanced engineering problems.
3. Apply the relevant scientific and technological advancements, techniques, and engineering tools to address these problems.
4. Recognize and apply principles of ethical and professional conduct.

Method for assessing learning:
The student’s faculty advisor will review the student’s course work performance and complete the College’s learning goals checklist before the end of the final semester.

Plan for review of the assessment information:
The graduate committee will review the assessment data, and report to the department faculty at a faculty meeting once a year and report the program assessment results – both the data summary and any recommendations -- to the Dean’s Office. The Dean’s Office will present all program assessment reports to the College Academic Planning Council (APC).

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

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

Students will not be permitted to earn more than one named option offered by the College of Engineering. Students in this named option cannot enroll concurrently in any other degree or certificate program at UW-Madison.

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

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

The same graduate admissions committee is used for all ME MS degrees. The named option will admit students that meet the minimum English language proficiency requirements of the graduate school, but will not allow lower scores. International students in the Research Named Option are required to have secured a research adviser prior to admission. All students must have identified a research adviser prior to starting the program.
7.2. What is the projected annual enrollment in the named option?

Approximately 50 students enroll each year.

7.3. What is the maximum enrollment (using existing instructional and student resources)? 75

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

The Research Named Option is the default MS degree in the Department. To the extent that enrollment has increased, the faculty in the department will work to add relevant courses or increase capacity as necessary.

Checklist for Verification of Admission Policy Requirements for Undergraduate Named Options*
You will have an opportunity to provide explanation and rationale for any Admission Policy Requirements that have not been affirmed in the text box that follows the checklist.

☐ Named option admission requirements are consistent with admission requirements for the major with no named option, if the major has any admission requirements beyond admission to the University. Admission limits should be related to interest or aptitude for the content and not based solely on a high GPA cutoff.

☐ The named option will be declared and canceled using the e-Declaration process in the student information system.

☐ Undergraduates will not be advised to declare or remain enrolled in a named option if it will extend their time to graduation. Undergraduate students are to be discouraged from earning more than one named option that represents an area of curricular emphasis within the major.

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

8. Advising

8.1. List name(s) of major and named option advisor(s) with title and departmental affiliation(s).

Major: Mechanical Engineering
Named option advisor(s): Sara Hladilek plus each student must have secured a faculty adviser.

8.2. Describe how there will be sufficient advising and academic support for all students in the major (both the existing major’s students and the new students that will be served by the named option).

The current advising structure is adequate for this program – we are not anticipating adding students in a major way.

8.3. ✒ Confirm that major and named option advisor(s) have been consulted and reviewed this proposal.

9. Governance & Faculty
9.1. ☒ The named option must be governed by the same department or academic unit that oversees the major. Any sub-committee governing the named option must report to the faculty governance committee for the major.

9.1.1. If a sub-committee governs the named option, describe procedures including how faculty are identified and provisions for transitions in the committee.

9.2. List core faculty and staff with title and departmental affiliation(s).

Core Advising Faculty: Sara Hladilek and the Graduate Committee.
Core Teaching Faculty: All of the Department of Mechanical Engineering provides graduate level class options that will be used for this program.

10. Fiscal Structure and Ongoing Commitment

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

There will be no change relative to how the program is funded now.

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

There will be no change relative to how the program is funded now.

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

N/A

10.4. For graduate programs supported using pooled tuition, provide a plan for how new graduate students will be funded.

N/A

**Required attachments**

☒ Cover letter from the Dean of the school/college that will be the home of the named option

*When a proposal for a new named option is forwarded for approval, it will have a cover letter to the provost from the supporting dean.*

☐ Supporting letters/memos

*Proposals must be accompanied by letters or memos submitted by the chair or director of other academic units that have overlapping interest. These notes may comment on shared resources, competition for students or other ways in which the programs will interact surrounding the named option. This will include departments/schools/colleges, share a student audience, represent a closely related area of study, have overlapping faculty, or have program names that are similar.*

☒ Full curriculum including all required and elective courses

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

☒ For graduate named options, attach a [chart outlining minimum degree requirements and elements for satisfactory progress](#).

☒ Assessment plan
Named options supported using non-pooled tuition must attach:
☒ Core Criteria Checklist
☒ Additional Requirements Checklist
See the current Non-pooled Program Requirements Process document posted at https://kb.wisc.edu/vesta/page.php?id=59300
Proposed Curriculum
Research MS in Mechanical Engineering

Credits required for graduation: 30

Required courses:
- ME 903 Graduate Seminar (both semesters)

Students must develop an individual course plan in consultation with their academic advisors.

Other notes on courses:
- Students are required to take the Graduate Seminar (ME 903, 0 credit) their first two semesters in residence
- A minimum of 9 credits must be formal course credits in ME taken at the UW-Madison.
- Either at least 9 thesis credits (ME 790) followed by an oral examination or at least 3 independent study credits (ME 699) followed by a final report must be accomplished to satisfy the research requirement.
- At least 18 formal course credits with a thesis or 24 formal course credits with an independent study.
- At least one formal course must be numbered 700 or higher (excluding ME 964).
- A GPA of at least 3.0 must be maintained based on all formal course credits.
- At least 50% of the credits must be courses designed for graduate work.
Research MS in Mechanical Engineering  
MINIMUM DEGREE REQUIREMENTS & SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

*Schools/Colleges, Departments and Programs may set more rigorous expectations and requirements than the Graduate School*

- If describing multiple degree plans at the same level (M.A. and M.S.) or multiple named options and tracks within a plan, indicate requirements for all plan variations.
- Please note that “Example” in the chart provides an example of policy – but is not necessarily reflective of Graduate School’s policy. For the actual Graduate School policies, you may consult the Graduate School Degree Requirements chart at: [http://grad.wisc.edu/catalog/degreq_criteria.htm](http://grad.wisc.edu/catalog/degreq_criteria.htm) to ensure program compliance with Graduate School degree requirements.
- If the program policy aligns with Graduate School degree requirements, please reiterate the policy in your program’s degree requirement chart – do not simply provide “Follow Graduate School Policy”.
- Programs are responsible for monitoring more restrictive requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master’s Degrees: Research MS in Mechanical Engineering</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Graduate Degree Credit Requirement</td>
<td>30 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Graduate Residence Credit Requirement</td>
<td>18 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Graduate Coursework (50%) Requirement</td>
<td>At least 50% of credits applied toward the graduate degree credit requirement must be completed in graduate-level coursework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior Coursework Requirements: Graduate Work from Other Institutions

Prior Coursework Requirements: UW-Madison Undergraduate

Prior Coursework Requirements: UW-Madison Undergraduate SPECIAL

Prior Coursework Requirement: UW-Madison University Special

Prior Coursework Requirements: UW-Madison University Special

Credits per Term Allowed 15 credits

Program-Specific Courses Required No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Graduate GPA Requirement</th>
<th>3.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Grade Requirements</strong></td>
<td><em>The Graduate School requires an average grade of B or better in all coursework (300 or above, not including research credits) taken as a graduate student unless conditions for probationary status require higher grades. Grades of Incomplete are considered to be unsatisfactory if they are not removed during the next enrolled semester.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probation Policy</strong></td>
<td><em>The Graduate School regularly reviews the record of any student who earned grades of BC, C, D, F, or Incomplete in a graduate course (300 or above), or grade of U in research credits. This review could result in academic probation with a hold on future enrollment or in being suspended from the Graduate School.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisor / Committee</strong></td>
<td><em>Every graduate student is required to have an advisor. To ensure that students are making satisfactory progress toward a degree, the Graduate School expects them to meet with their advisor on a regular basis.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessments and Examinations</strong></td>
<td><em>No formal examination required.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Constraints</strong></td>
<td><em>Master’s degree students who have been absent for five or more consecutive years lose all credits that they have earned before their absence. Individual programs may count the coursework students completed prior to their absence for meeting program requirements; that coursework may not count toward Graduate School credit requirements.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Requirements</strong></td>
<td><em>Contact the program for information on any language requirements.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research MS in Mechanical Engineering

Identifying Information
School/College: College of Engineering
Graduate Degree/Major Program Name: Accelerated MS in Mechanical Engineering
Graduate Degree Level (M.S., M.A., Ph.D., DMA, etc.): M.S.
Faculty Director Contact/Title: Greg Nellis, Associate Chair for Mechanical Engineering
Primary Contact Information: gfnellis@engr.wisc.edu

Student Learning Goals
Assessment of graduate-level learning goals is one of the many ways in which our campus ensures the integrity of its degrees and the quality of the student experience. List the graduate student learning goals for this academic degree program below.
1. Demonstrate a strong understanding of mathematical, scientific, and engineering principles in the field
2. Demonstrate an ability to formulate, analyze, and independently solve advanced engineering problems
3. Apply the relevant scientific and technological advancements, techniques, and engineering tools to address these problems
4. Recognize and apply principles of ethical and professional conduct.

Plan for Assessing Each Student Learning Goal
For each of the degree major/program student learning goals, indicate how the program plans to assess whether or not students are meeting the expectation, as well as when each learning goal will be assessed. Keep in mind that each academic degree program is expected to engage in at least one assessment activity per year and assessment activities, in total, must include one direct assessment method. While programs do not need to assess each learning goal every year, all learning goals must be assessed within a period of three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Planning (How)</th>
<th>Method for assessing learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method for assessing learning (at least one direct method required)</td>
<td>Each student is assessed at their defense or by their adviser based on their independent study report and course plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also provide answers to the following questions as part of your assessment plan.

1. **Who is responsible for assessment?** (identify an individual or team who will coordinate the implementation of the plan on an annual basis):
   The Graduate Committee chair will provide assessment updates, keep track of the assessment timeline, and remind by email the faculty to collect the students’ course work performance for assessment. The Graduate Committee chair will compile and perform initial analysis on all student learning assessment data. Assessment data will be forwarded to the faculty involved in the program for further evaluation.

2. **What is the plan for review of the assessment information?** (typically during an annual meeting of the program faculty and staff; note that at this meeting the program may want to review enrollment information, course progression, degree completion, and other structural features of the student experience in addition to the evidence about student learning):
   The Associate Chair in collaboration with the Graduate Committee will lead a discussion and review of the assessment data. The program assessment results – both the data summary and any recommendations – will be presented at the Department Meeting.

3. **What is the plan for production of an annual summary report?** (the annual summary report includes the materials that form the basis of discussion at the annual meeting of the program faculty and staff, along with any recommendations made after considering the student learning assessment information presented):
   After reviewing the assessment summary and comments from the Department Meeting the Graduate Committee will decide which (if any) items are actionable and provide a report of those plans, along with the initial assessment summary to the Dean's Office.

4. **How will recommendations be implemented?** (explain the general process by which recommendations will be implemented):
   Any actionable items will be discussed during Graduate Committee Meetings held in the spring semester. If approved at that time, any curricular/programmatic changes will be implemented in the fall semester.

**Graduate Degree Program Curriculum Mapping Worksheet (Where)**
This worksheet, or similar document, **must be included** with the submission of the
program’s assessment plan.

- **Learning Goals** – Enter the academic degree program learning goals identified in the assessment plan on the top row of the following chart. (If the learning goals have been submitted to the Office of the Provost, a pre-populated template is available; contact regina.lowery@wisc.edu) Feel free to add columns if the academic degree/major program has more than five learning goals.

- **Degree/Major Program Courses/Experiences** – List all degree requirements (in some cases co-curricular experiences may also be included). Feel free to add rows as needed.

- Indicate with a check (X) where the course or learning experience contributes to each of the learning goals. Courses may contribute to multiple learning goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course # (all ME)</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Learning Goal #1</th>
<th>Learning Goal #2</th>
<th>Learning Goal #3</th>
<th>Learning Goal #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Biomechanics of Human Movement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>Intr. To Polymer Processing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>Engineering Design with Polymers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Injection Molding</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Polymer Composites Processing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>Statistical Experimental Design</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>Metal Cutting</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>Material Selection</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Intro to Robotics</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Intermediate Vibrations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Design Problems in Elasticity</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Mechatronics</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Automatic Controls</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>Computer Control of Machines</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>Mechanical Systems Analysis</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Redesign &amp; Prototype Fabrication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Kinematics and Dynamics of M/C</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>Computing Concepts for Applications in Engineering</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>Applied Thermal/Structural FE Anal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Thermal System Modeling</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>Internal Combustion Engines</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>Eng. Principles of Agricultural Machinery</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>Eng. Principles of Off-Road Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Composite Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Facilities Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Inspection, Quality Control, and Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>Additive Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>Theory and Applications of Pattern Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>Computer Aided Geometric Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>Intro to Artificial Neural Networks &amp; Fuzzy Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>Intro. To Eng. Optimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>Product Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Intro to Computational Geom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Intermediate Thermodynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>Intermediate Fluid Dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>Heat Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>Power Plant Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>Cryogenics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>Solar Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>Applied Combustion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Experimental Mechanics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>Intermediate Gas Dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>Computational Fluid Dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>Automatic Controls Lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Intro to Engg. Optimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Physics-based modeling for computer control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Digital Design &amp; Fabrication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Elements of Software Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Gas Turbine Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Applied Math for Mech. Engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Advanced Automation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>FE for Biomechanics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Design of orthopedic implants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Image Based Biomechanics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Introduction to Finite Elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>Tissue Mechanics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>Design and Human Disability and Aging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>Advanced Topics in Finite Elements</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>Plates, Shells and Pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>Advanced Composite Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>Molding &amp; Simulation of Polymer Proc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>Advanced Robotics</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746</td>
<td>Dynamics of Controlled Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748</td>
<td>Optimum Design of Mechanical</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751</td>
<td>Matrix Methods in the Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>753</td>
<td>Friction, Wear Lubrication</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td>Solid Modeling/Model-based engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759</td>
<td>HPC for Engineering Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td>Advanced Thermodynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>Advanced Conduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>769</td>
<td>Combustion Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>Advanced Experimental Instrumentation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>Kinetics of Combustion Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>Turbulent Heat &amp; Momentum Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>Vacuum Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Add additional rows as needed to capture all requirements.

Minimally, all of the courses/experiences required to complete the major degree program should be listed. Optionally, elective courses may be included in addition to the required courses.
May 21, 2018

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

FROM: Diana Hess, Dean

RE: Proposal for MS Educational Psychology Named Option (Educational Specialist in School Psychology)

The School of Education proposes to create a new named option in the MS Educational Psychology called “Educational Specialist in School Psychology.” We are proposing this new named option as a 131 revenue-generating program. The program will provide students with an opportunity to be certified for licensure as a school psychologist, a field which is in high demand in Wisconsin and nationally. Currently, students obtain certification for licensure by completing a PhD in Educational Psychology with a focus on School Psychology, but the PhD is an intensive, research-focused program that goes beyond the training needed to become a school psychologist. By creating the named option in the master’s program, the department intends to provide more targeted programming to students in both programs.

The proposal was approved at the department level on December 19, 2016 and at the School of Education Academic Planning Council on May 2, 2018. If possible, we request that the proposal be considered by the UAPC at its June meeting.

cc: Jocelyn Milner, Associate Vice Provost, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
    Sarah Kuba, Academic Planner, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
    Emily Reynolds, Academic Planning Specialist, Graduate School
    Parmesh Ramanathan, Associate Dean for Graduate Education, Graduate School
    Jeff Hamm, Associate Dean for Academic Services, School of Education
    Carolyn Kelley, Senior Associate Dean for Academic Programs, School of Education
    Elizabeth Jach, Policy/Planning Analyst, School of Education
    Brad Brown, Chair, Educational Psychology
    Craig Albers, Associate Professor, Educational Psychology
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROPOSING NAMED OPTIONS and USE OF PROPOSAL FORM

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

PLANNING A NAMED OPTION

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

APPROVAL STEPS FOR A NAMED OPTION

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

FOR INFORMATION AND FORMS: http://apir.wisc.edu/degreesmajorsoptions.htm
At this URL you will find links to the following information:
• These instructions and the Named Option Proposal Form, which includes detailed instructions
• Policy Guidelines for Named Options within Academic Majors, which is the policy framework for the proposal form (adopted April 2016)

QUESTIONS:
Jocelyn Milner, Director, Academic Planning and Institutional Research (jocelyn.milner@wisc.edu)
Sarah Kuba, Academic Planner, APIR (sarah.kuba@wisc.edu)
PROPOSAL FORM
NAMED OPTION

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

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

1. Overview
   1.1. Named Option: MS Educational Specialist in School Psychology
   1.2. Academic Major: Educational Psychology, School Psychology
   1.3. Home Department: Department of Educational Psychology
   1.4. School/college: Education, School of
   1.5. Partner department(s)/units/schools/colleges: N/A
   1.6. Chair of the Major (name, title, email): Craig A. Albers, PhD, Associate Professor, craig.albers@wisc.edu
   1.7. Primary faculty or staff contact for the proposal (name, title, email): Craig A. Albers, PhD, Associate Professor, craig.albers@wisc.edu
   1.8. Primary school/college dean’s office contact (name, title, email): Carolyn Kelley, PhD, Senior Associate Dean, carolyn.kelley@wisc.edu
   1.9. Briefly describe the type and purpose of the named option.

      The MS Educational Specialist in School Psychology named option, as a non-pooled tuition revenue program, will prepare Master of Science graduate students to become practitioners in the field of school psychology, enabling them to help children and adolescents succeed academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally within educational settings. As practitioners, they will be eligible for licensure by respective state departments of education. There is no other degree program at the University of Wisconsin – Madison that prepares students to be a Masters-level (or equivalent) school psychologist practitioner. The existing PhD program in school psychology emphasizes preparation of psychologists for academic and scholarly careers. At the July 16, 2018 Department of Educational Psychology's monthly meeting, the Department's faculty approved moving forward with separate named options for the existing MS/PhD programs. Decisions regarding whether to pursue named options in the Department's other program areas (i.e., Human Development, Learning Sciences, Quantitive Methods) will be made during Fall 2018. We feel that these changes will decrease the possibility for prospective and current students.

      The National Association of School Psychologist (NASP), which is the applicable accrediting agency for non-doctoral school psychology training programs, requires a minimum of three years of full-time graduate study beyond the bachelor's degree. The proposed Named Option will be an approximately 74 credit hour degree completed in 3 years. This includes 2 years of
full-time study on campus to complete coursework and corresponding practica, plus a full-time internship that is completed in the third year of the program. Our review of 36 existing national non-doctoral (EdS-equivalent) school psychology training programs indicated that the mean number of credits required for a combined Master’s and EdS degree was 69.19 credits (sd = 7.41 credits). Within Wisconsin, UW-Whitewater’s combined Master’s and EdS program requires the completion of 78 credits. UW-River Falls requires the fewest number of credits (66).

Whereas the PhD program is a professional psychology doctoral training program designed to be completed in 5 years, the MS Educational Specialist in School Psychology named option will be a school psychology practitioner-oriented program that will be completed in 3 years (74 credits post bachelors).

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

1.10. Date form completed: 7/30/2018

2. Approval Implementation and Expectations for Review
2.1. School/College Approval Date: 5/2/2018
2.2. GFEC Approval Date (graduate level named options only): Click here to enter a date.
2.3. UAPC Approval Date: Click here to enter a date.
2.4. Expected first term of student enrollment (typically the first fall after UAPC approval): Fall 2019
2.5. Year of three year progress report to GFEC (3 years after first student enrollment; graduate level named options only): 2022
2.6. Year of first program review (5 years after first student enrollment): 2024
2.7. Are all academic programs in the home department up to date for program review? Yes APIR will provide a list of programs and most recent review date if needed. If no, program reviews need to be completed before a new proposal is advanced at campus level (GFEC and UAPC). Please provide and information related to plans for completion of program reviews:
Type an explanation here. (1000 word limit).

3. Background/Rationale
3.1. How does the named option relate to the major and to other named options in the major, if relevant?

The proposed MS Educational Specialist in School Psychology Named Option will provide individuals with an entry-level route for becoming a school psychologist. The existing PhD program in school psychology emphasizes preparation of psychologists for academic and scholarly careers. Whereas the PhD program is a professional psychology doctoral training program designed to be completed in 5 years, the MS Educational Specialist in School Psychology Named Option will be a school psychology practitioner-oriented program that will be completed in three years (74 credits post-bachelor) and is designed for individuals who want to work in schools and other settings as a practitioner, as compared to a researcher. Thus, we view the proposed Named Option as a complement to the existing training.

3.2. What is the purpose of the named option? How does the named option contribute to the mission of the sponsoring unit?
The MS Educational Specialist in School Psychology Named Option is designed to provide individuals with additional training and preparation to become school psychologist practitioners. The level of preparation within a MS Educational Specialist Named Option is considered to be the entry level for students to be certified and/or licensed to begin practicing as a school psychologist and for accreditation by the National Association of School Psychologist. The Department of Educational Psychology's explicit mission is to "To advance education-related theory and methodology; to improve knowledge about the biological, psychological, technological, and social processes of learning, development, and mental health in diverse populations; and to enhance learning and mental health in educational and community contexts through innovative educational interventions and effective prevention/intervention programs. The Educational Specialist in School Psychology Named Option is directly applicable to (1) to improving knowledge of various processes of learning, development, and mental health in diverse populations; and (2) enhancing learning and mental health in educational and community contexts.

The proposed MS Educational Specialist in School Psychology Named Option is closely aligned with the UW–Madison’s Strategic Framework and the School of Education’s mission. Specifically, the UW–Madison’s Strategic Framework highlights the Wisconsin Idea, partnering with schools in Wisconsin, and applying practices to important state concerns. Through the Named Option program, we will expand our network of school partners across Wisconsin and train students to be leaders in school districts to build effective systems and practices to support children. In addition, the development of the Named Option is consistent with the School of Education’s Strategic Initiatives. In particular, by expanding our program to focus on training practitioners, we will increase our reach and broaden our impact in schools and districts in Wisconsin and across the country, which is particularly important in a climate wherein schools struggle to provide coordinated and effective services.

3.3. What is the evidence that there is a student demand for the named option?

There is a significant shortage and corresponding demand for school psychology practitioners in Wisconsin and across the United States. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2014) estimated the demand for school psychologists will result in a growth rate of 20% (classified as much faster than average) through 2024, equating to 30,500 new jobs. Castillo, Curtis, and Tan (2014) estimated the shortage of school psychologists to continue through 2025; and Curtis, Castillo, and Gelley (2012) predicted a national shortage of approximately 15,000 school psychologists by 2020. Dixon (2016) surveyed superintendents and pupil service directors in Wisconsin and found that approximately 23% of superintendents and 31% of pupil services directors reported school psychologist position vacancies. Despite the existence of EdS-equivalent training programs operating at full capacity at six UW–System universities (i.e., UW–Eau Claire, UW–La Crosse, UW–Milwaukee, UW–River Falls, UW–Stout, UW–Whitewater), Dixon reported 61 school districts in Wisconsin were still searching for school psychologists in August 2016 after all recent graduates were placed. Despite the need for school psychologists, the growth in institutions nationwide offering school psychology training is expected to remain modest (Fagan, 2014), with data indicating that only two institutions started offering new school psychology training programs from 2006 to 2013 (Rossen & von der Embse, 2014). These data suggest a shortage of school psychologists in Wisconsin and across the U.S. that is expected to grow over the next decade with insufficient training options to meet this demand. Given that U.S. News & World Report (2017) identified school psychology as the best social services job and 47th best job overall, there clearly is a strong demand for MS+ level school psychologists, and our proposed MS+ program is designed to meet these market needs.

4. Curriculum
4.1. Delivery modality: Face-to-face

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

4.2. Provide a complete list of named option requirements.

Completion of 74 credits post-bachelors degree
Satisfactory completion of internship
Completion of culminating portfolio project

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

4.3. ☒ Attach a full curriculum including all required and elective courses.

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

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

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

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

Checklist for Verification of Curricular Policy Requirements *

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

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

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

Provide explanation for Curricular Policy Requirements that have not been affirmed here. Not applicable.

5. Assessment

5.1. ☒ Attach a program assessment plan when submitting this proposal.

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

5.2. Provide a summary of the program assessment plan, including learning goals for the major and any additional learning goals that are specific for the named option, key methods and assessment approaches, and how assessment information will be reviewed and acted on.
Student Learning Outcomes for students in the MS Educational Specialist in School Psychology Named Option are:

1. Students will acquire a strong foundation in current and past theories, research findings, and methodologies and understand implications of these for practice within school psychology.
2. Students will apply knowledge and skills related to addressing issues of diversity and equity for individuals within specific contexts and in all professional activities.
3. Demonstrate professional skills and characteristics needed for effective practice as health-service psychologists, including communication, interpersonal, and technology skills; and responsibility, adaptability, initiative, and dependability.
4. Interpret and communicate assessment results in accordance with research-based and professional standards to inform case conceptualization, classification, diagnosis, and intervention.
5. Use data-driven methods to select, implement, and evaluate prevention and intervention for academic, behavior, social-emotional, mental health, and physical problems specific to treatment goals and assessment findings.
6. Apply knowledge to act in accordance with ethical, legal, and professional guidelines in all professional activities.

Assessment activities will include (a) satisfactory performance on assignments in required courses, (b) practica observations and ratings, (c) internship observations and ratings, and (d) a culminating portfolio project that is reviewed by the program's faculty and staff.

At the beginning of each semester, the program director and faculty will meet to review each student’s progress for the prior semester. The student’s faculty advisor will be responsible for compiling information from the various learning assessments (e.g., assignments in required courses; practica performance, observations, and ratings; internship performance, observations, and ratings (for students in their third year in the program); and the culminating project (for students in their third year in the program). The program director and support staff will compile and summarize the department’s learning goals assessment data on an annual basis.

The program director and faculty will meet at the end of each spring semester to review students’ annual progress and program information, including learning goals assessment data, course progression and whether content changes are needed, practica and internship settings, enrollment information and projections, ongoing revenue projections, and other program components. Program assessment data will then be reported to the School of Education’s Dean’s Office.

The program director will lead a discussion of the annual summary report, consisting of assessment data and recommendations, to the Department of Educational Psychology’s faculty and staff at the July faculty meeting. Once the Department approves the report and identifies actionable recommendations, the report will be sent to the Dean’s Office for review and further dissemination.

Any actionable items resulting from learning goals assessment data and the corresponding review of the program will be approved by the Department of Educational Psychology’s faculty and staff. Where appropriate, actionable items will go through the appropriate governance steps. Actionable items will be implemented after appropriate approval — when needed — is obtained. Actionable items that do not need to go through additional governance steps will be implemented in time for the following semester. The program director will be responsible for ensuring that actionable items are implemented and monitored.
The assessment summary should highlight how the named option is included in the overall assessment plan for the major. The named option must adhere to all learning goals for the major and may also have additional learning goals that are specific for the named option.

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

Students enrolled in the Named Option will not be able to concurrently enroll in other Department of Educational Psychology's MS degree options, nor will they be able to concurrently enroll in the Department's PhD programs. Students enrolled in the Named Option will not be able to take any double or dual degrees while enrolled in the program.

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

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

Admission's criteria for the MS Educational Specialist in School Psychology Named Option include:

1. A bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited U.S. institution or a comparable degree form an international institution is required. International applicants must have a degree comparable to a regionally-accredited U.S. bachelor's degree.
2. A minimum undergraduate grade-point average (GPA) of 3.00 on the equivalent of the last 60 semester hours (approximately two years of work) or a master's degree with a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.00 is required. Applicants from an international institution must demonstrate strong academic achievement comparable to a 3.00 for an undergraduate or master’s degree.
3. Every applicant whose native language is not English, or whose undergraduate instruction was not in English, must provide an English proficiency test score.
4. Reasons for graduate study/statement of purpose.
5. Curriculum vitae or resume.
6. GRE scores from within the previous 5 years.
7. Transcripts from previous institutions.
8. Letters of recommendation.

The Department's application deadline is December 1. Following the submission deadline, the named option program faculty and staff will review application materials and invite approximately 25 students to campus for an in-person interview during the third week in January. Following the interview process, program faculty and staff will make admissions decisions and provide offers of admission to those students meeting the criteria.

7.2. What is the projected annual enrollment in the named option? 15
7.3. What is the maximum enrollment (using existing instructional and student resources)? 20
7.4. What are the contingency plans for supporting enrollments higher than the stated maximum enrollment?

As a proposed non-pooled tuition program, revenue will be reinvested in the program as necessary and appropriate. During the Fall 2017 semester, the School Psychology Area conducted a search for a new faculty member to replace an existing faculty member who is retiring. After identifying and offering the position to the top candidate, we were also able to offer a position to the second ranked candidate based on the projected revenue from the proposed named option and corresponding non-pooled tuition program. If the demand is present and if the there are sufficient practicum and internships sites available, the program will pursue increased enrollment numbers.

Checklist for Verification of Admission Policy Requirements for Undergraduate Named Options*
You will have an opportunity to provide explanation and rationale for any Admission Policy Requirements that have not been affirmed in the text box that follows the checklist.

☒ Named option admission requirements are consistent with admission requirements for the major with no named option, if the major has any admission requirements beyond admission to the University. Admission limits should be related to interest or aptitude for the content and not based solely on a high GPA cutoff

☒ The named option will be declared and canceled using the e-Declaration process in the student information system.

☒ Undergraduates will not be advised to declare or remain enrolled in a named option if it will extend their time to graduation. Undergraduate students are to be discouraged from earning more than one named option that represents an area of curricular emphasis within the major.

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

8. Advising

8.1. List name(s) of major and named option advisor(s) with title and departmental affiliation(s).
Craig A. Albers, PhD, Associate Professor, Program Director, Dept. of Educational Psychology
Jennifer Asmus, PhD, Professor, Dept. of Educational Psychology
Katie Ecklund, PhD, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Educational Psychology
S. Andrew Garbacz, PhD, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Educational Psychology
Steve Kilgus, PhD, Associate Professor, Dept. of Educational Psychology
Stephen Quintana, PhD, Professor, Dept. of Counseling, Dept. of Educational Psychology

8.2. Describe how there will be sufficient advising and academic support for all students in the major (both the existing major’s students and the new students that will be served by the named option).

The proposed Named Option will consist of six tenured/tenure-track faculty. Each student enrolled in the proposed program will be assigned one of the above individuals as their academic advisor during their three years in the program. Additionally, our clinical faculty member (Kristy Kelly) is available to provide additional advising to students regarding clinical issues. The tenured/tenure-track faculty will continue to advise and mentor PhD students, of which we have 4-6 students enter each year.

8.3. ☒ Confirm that major and named option advisor(s) have been consulted and reviewed this proposal.
9. Governance & Faculty

9.1. ☒ The named option must be governed by the same department or academic unit that oversees the major. Any sub-committee governing the named option must report to the faculty governance committee for the major.

9.1.1. If a sub-committee governs the named option, describe procedures including how faculty are identified and provisions for transitions in the committee.

The Named Option program will be governed by the Department of Educational Psychology.

9.2. List core faculty and staff with title and departmental affiliation(s).

Craig A. Albers, PhD, Associate Professor, Program Director, Dept. of Educational Psychology
Jennifer Asmus, PhD, Professor, Dept. of Educational Psychology
Katie Ecklund, PhD, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Educational Psychology
S. Andrew Garbacz, PhD, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Educational Psychology
Kristy K. Kelly, PhD, Clinical Assistant Professor, Dept. of Educational Psychology
Steve Kilgus, PhD, Associate Professor, Dept. of Educational Psychology
Stephen Quintana, PhD, Professor, Dept. of Counseling, Dept. of Educational Psychology
Caroline Racine Gilles, PhD, Associate Faculty, Dept. of Educational Psychology

10. Fiscal Structure and Ongoing Commitment

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

The proposed Named Option will be a non-pooled tuition program. Our plan is to be able to implement, support, and sustain the Named Option training (with cohort sizes of approximately 15 students per cohort) through existing personnel and course offerings. Should there be a greater demand for this training program, cohort sizes could be expanded if program revenue is used to support additional faculty and staff hires. Required courses and practica currently exist within the PhD program; however, the sequence of existing course and practica offerings will be altered to accommodate the Named Option training. Similarly, existing faculty and staff will provide the appropriate supervision and mentoring. The PhD program currently has a Director (Dr. Albers); either Dr. Albers or an otherwise existing faculty/staff member will serve as the Named Option director. Typically, program administration includes institutional support (e.g., course release, summer support). As a proposed academic program with non-pooled tuition, paid tuition will allow for the department to offset the required costs associated with intensive clinical-training programs, such as the school psychology program. We also intend to use paid tuition revenue to fund 1-2 TA positions to support the larger number of students enrolled in these school psychology courses and fieldwork settings as a result of this new training option; these TA positions will provide ongoing financial support to our doctoral-level school psychology students, which is an ongoing challenge within the program.

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

Unless the program were to expand beyond the target enrollment of 15 students per year, we do not anticipate any additional staffing needs beyond what we currently have available. If there is no change in staffing, please describe how the duties of current employees will evolve to support this named option.

10.3. For named options supported using non-pooled tuition, provide a fiscal annual summary including planned enrollment, estimated paid tuition, instructional costs, and estimated excess
tuition available for reinvestment in keeping with the separate guidelines for non-pooled programs.
The fiscal annual summary is attached to this proposal.

10.4. For graduate programs supported using pooled tuition, provide a plan for how new graduate students will be funded.
Describe funding plans for new graduate students in the named option.

Required attachments
☒ Cover letter from the Dean of the school/college that will be the home of the named option

When a proposal for a new named option is forwarded for approval, it will have a cover letter to the provost from the supporting dean.
☒ Supporting letters/memos

Proposals must be accompanied by letters or memos submitted by the chair or director of other academic units that have overlapping interest. These notes may comment on shared resources, competition for students or other ways in which the programs will interact surrounding the named option. This will include departments/schools/colleges, share a student audience, represent a closely related area of study, have overlapping faculty, or have program names that are similar.
☒ Full curriculum including all required and elective courses
☐ For undergraduate named options, attach a four year roadmap.
☒ For graduate named options, attach a chart outlining minimum degree requirements and elements for satisfactory progress.
☒ Assessment plan

Named options supported using non-pooled tuition must attach:
☐ Core Criteria Checklist
☒ Additional Requirements Checklist

See the current Non-pooled Program Requirements Process document posted at https://kb.wisc.edu/vesta/page.php?id=59300
Proposed Curriculum
Department of Educational Psychology

Master of Science (MS) Educational Specialist in School Psychology Named Option

1. **Credits required for graduation**: 74 credits post-bachelor degree

2. **Progress towards graduation sequence**: Fall - Spring progression

   **Year 1**
   - Fall Semester: 15 credits
   - Spring Semester: 13 credits

   **Year 2**
   - Fall Semester: 12 credits
   - Spring Semester: 15 credits

   **Year 3 (Internship)**
   - Fall Semester: 8 credits
   - Spring Semester: 8 credits
   - Summer: 3 credits

3. **Required courses and rules**

   - All students will need to complete a portfolio that will serve as the culminating project. This project will need to be approved by all program faculty and clinical staff.
   - All students are required to successfully complete the Year 3 internship.
   - All program courses must be completed.
   - No deviation from the required courses is allowed. Electives are not permissible.
   - There are six faculty advisors for this named option. Additionally, there is one clinical faculty member and one Associate Faculty member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
<th>Grad. Level</th>
<th>Year / Semester</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro to School Psychology</td>
<td>EP540</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 1 Fall</td>
<td>Katie Eklund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Behavior Analysis</td>
<td>EP541</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 1 Fall</td>
<td>Jennifer Asmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, Emotional, Behavioral Assessment</td>
<td>EP741</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 1 Fall</td>
<td>Steve Kilgus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment &amp; Intervention for Academic Skills Problems</td>
<td>EP742</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 1 Fall</td>
<td>Craig Albers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathology</td>
<td>EP844</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 1 Fall</td>
<td>Andy Garbacz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Assessment</td>
<td>EP740</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 1 Spring</td>
<td>Caroline Racine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Case Design</td>
<td>EP743</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 1 Spring</td>
<td>Jennifer Asmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>EP942</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 1 Spring</td>
<td>Andy Garbacz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotherapy</td>
<td>EP947</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 1 Spring</td>
<td>Andy Garbacz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Methods I</td>
<td>EP760</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 2 Fall</td>
<td>Varies by semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Science</td>
<td>EP880</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 2 Fall</td>
<td>Craig Albers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Ethnic and Racial Minority Children</td>
<td>EP726</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y2 2 Spring</td>
<td>Katie Eklund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Prerequisites</td>
<td>Year &amp; Term</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Methods II</td>
<td>EP761</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 2 Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Assessment &amp; Intervention</td>
<td>EP946</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 2 Spring</td>
<td>Steve Kilgus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Practicum</td>
<td>EP840</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 1 Fall (1 cr) &amp; Spring (1 cr)</td>
<td>Kristy Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Practicum</td>
<td>EP840</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 2 Fall (6 cr) &amp; Spring (6 cr)</td>
<td>Kristy Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>EP843</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yr 3 Fall (8 cr), Spring (8 cr), Summer (3 cr)</td>
<td>Craig Albers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MINIMUM DEGREE REQUIREMENTS & SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

**Master of Science (MS) Educational Specialist in School Psychology Named Option**

*Schools/Colleges, Departments and Programs may set more rigorous expectations and requirements than the Graduate School*

- If describing multiple degree plans at the same level (M.A. and M.S.) or multiple named options and tracks within a plan, indicate requirements for all plan variations.
- Please note that “Example” in the chart provides an example of policy – but is not necessarily reflective of Graduate School’s policy. For the actual Graduate School policies, you may consult the Graduate School Degree Requirements chart at [http://grad.wisc.edu/catalog/degreq_criteria.htm](http://grad.wisc.edu/catalog/degreq_criteria.htm) to ensure program compliance with Graduate School degree requirements.
- If the program policy aligns with Graduate School degree requirements, please reiterate the policy in your program’s degree requirement chart – do not simply provide “Follow Graduate School Policy”.
- Programs are responsible for monitoring more restrictive requirements.

Note: The proposed Name Option requirements are located in the middle column, also in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master's Degrees:</th>
<th>Master of Science (MS) Educational Specialist in School Psychology Named Option</th>
<th>Doctoral Degrees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• M.S., with available named option Professional Educator (MSPE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D., with available tracks in human development, learning science, quantitative methods, and school psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M.S., tracks in human development, learning science, quantitative methods, and school psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Graduate Degree Credit Requirement</th>
<th>Minimum Graduate Degree Credit Requirement</th>
<th>Minimum Graduate Degree Credit Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.S.—Professional Educator named option: 30 credits</td>
<td>74 credits</td>
<td>Ph.D. —human development track: 56 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.—human development, and quantitative methods track: 33 credits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D.—learning sciences, and quantitative methods tracks: 54 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.—learning sciences track: 36 credits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D.—school psychology track: 110 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.—school psychology track: 55 credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Graduate Residence Credit Requirement</th>
<th>Minimum Graduate Residence Credit Requirement</th>
<th>Minimum Graduate Residence Credit Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.S. –Professional Educator named option: 30 credits</td>
<td>58 credits</td>
<td>32 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.—human development, and quantitative methods track: 27 credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.—learning sciences track: 33 credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.—school psychology track: 52 credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Graduate Coursework (50%) Requirement</th>
<th>Minimum Graduate Coursework (50%) Requirement</th>
<th>Minimum Graduate Coursework (50%) Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% of credits applied toward the graduate degree credit requirement must be completed in graduate-level coursework.</td>
<td>All Named Option credits applied toward the graduate degree credit requirement must be completed in graduate-level coursework.</td>
<td>At least 50% of credits applied toward the graduate degree credit requirement must be completed in graduate-level coursework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Coursework Requirements: Graduate Work from Other Institutions M.S.—Professional Educator named option:</th>
<th>Prior Coursework Requirements: Graduate Work from Other Institutions No credits from other institutions are allowed to count toward the degree as indicated in Curriculum Plan.</th>
<th>Prior Coursework Requirements: Graduate Work from Other Institutions With program approval, students are allowed to count no more than 9 credits of coursework from other institutions. Coursework earned ten years or more prior to admission to a doctoral degree is not allowed to satisfy requirements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No credits from other institutions are allowed to count toward the degree.</td>
<td>Prior Coursework Requirements: UW-Madison Undergraduate No credits from a UW–Madison undergraduate degree are allowed to count toward the degree.</td>
<td>Prior Coursework Requirements: UW-Madison Undergraduate No credits from a UW–Madison undergraduate degree are allowed to count toward the degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.—all other tracks: With program approval, students are allowed to count no more than 9 credits of graduate coursework from other institutions. Coursework earned five or more years prior to admission to a master’s is not allowed to satisfy requirements.</td>
<td>Prior Coursework Requirements: UW-Madison University Special No credits taken as a UW–Madison University Special student are allowed to count toward the degree.</td>
<td>Prior Coursework Requirements: UW-Madison University Special No credits taken as a UW–Madison University Special student are allowed to count toward the degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Coursework Requirements: UW-Madison Undergraduate No credits from a UW–Madison undergraduate degree are allowed to count toward the degree.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior Coursework Requirement: UW-Madison University Special With program approval, students are allowed to count no more than 9 credits of coursework numbered 300 or above taken as a UW–Madison University Special student. Coursework earned ten or more years prior to admission to a doctoral degree is not allowed to satisfy requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Coursework Requirement: UW-Madison University Special M.S. Professional Educator named option:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No credits taken as a UW–Madison University Special student are allowed to count toward the degree.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.—all other tracks: With program approval, students are allowed to count no more than 9 credits of coursework numbered 300 or above taken as a UW–Madison University Special student. Coursework earned five or more years prior to admission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contact the program for information on any additional required courses for other tracks.

EP542: Biological Basis of Behavior
EP725: Life Span Human Development
820-729: Advanced Social Psychology
270-737: History and Systems of Psychology
EP762: Experimental Design
EP795: Introduction to Learning Sciences I
EP948: Research & Measurement Seminar in School Psychology
EP840: Clinic Practicum
EP840: Clinical & Supervision Practicum
EP943: 12 month internship
EP990: Research/Thesis

PhD School Psychology Track; additional required courses beyond the MS Named Option:

Doctoral Minor/Breadth Requirements
Doctoral students must complete a doctoral minor.

Overall Graduate GPA Requirement
3.00

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

Probation Policy
The Graduate School regularly reviews the record of any student who earned grades of BC, C, D, F, or Incomplete in a graduate course (300 or above), or grade of U in research credits. This review could result in academic probation with a hold on future enrollment or in being suspended from the Graduate School.

Advisor / Committee
Every graduate student is required to have an advisor. To ensure that students are making satisfactory progress toward a degree, the Graduate School expects them to meet with their advisor on a regular basis. An advisor generally serves as the thesis advisor. In many cases, an advisor is assigned to incoming students. Students can be suspended from the Graduate School if they do not have an advisor. An advisor is a faculty member, or sometimes a committee, from the major department responsible for providing advice regarding graduate studies. A committee often accomplishes advising for the students in the early stages of their studies.

Assessments and Examinations
Contact the program for information on specific tracks’ required assessments and examinations.

No formal examinations are required. However, students complete an in-depth case analysis as a culminating project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Constraints</th>
<th>Time Constraints</th>
<th>Time Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree students who have been absent for five or more consecutive years lose all credits that they have earned before their absence. Individual programs may count the coursework students completed prior to their absence for meeting program requirements; that coursework may not count toward Graduate School credit requirements.</td>
<td>Master’s degree students who have been absent for five or more consecutive years lose all credits that they have earned before their absence. Individual programs may count the coursework students completed prior to their absence for meeting program requirements; that coursework may not count toward Graduate School credit requirements.</td>
<td>Doctoral degree students who have been absent for ten or more consecutive years lose all credits that they have earned before their absence. Individual programs may count the coursework students completed prior to their absence for meeting program requirements; that coursework may not count toward Graduate School credit requirements. A candidate for a doctoral degree who fails to take the final oral examination and deposit the dissertation within five years after passing the preliminary examination may by require to take another preliminary examination and to be admitted to candidacy a second time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Requirements</strong></td>
<td><strong>Language Requirements</strong></td>
<td><strong>Language Requirements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No language requirements</td>
<td>No language requirements</td>
<td>No language requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Plan – Master of Science (MS) Educational Specialist in School Psychology Named Option

Identifying Information

School/College: School of Education
Graduate Degree/Major Program Name: Master of Science (MS) Educational Specialist in School Psychology Named Option
Graduate Degree Level (M.S., M.A., Ph.D., DMA, etc.): M.S.
Faculty Director Contact/Title: Craig A. Albers, Associate Professor, Director – School Psychology Program

Primary Contact Information: craig.albers@wisc.edu, (608) 262-4586

Student Learning Outcomes (What)
Assessment of graduate-level learning outcomes is one of the many ways in which our campus ensures the integrity of its degrees and the quality of the student experience. List the graduate student learning outcomes for this academic degree program below. Feel free to add rows if the academic degree program has more than five learning outcomes. The student learning outcomes that have been submitted for your academic degree/major program can be found in the Guide.

Student Learning Outcomes

1. Students will acquire a strong foundation in current and past theories, research findings, and methodologies in their program area.
2. Students will become acquainted with the implications of human diversity (in terms of individual abilities and orientations and sociocultural backgrounds) for research and practice in their chosen field of study.
3. Students will develop critical thinking skills that promote rigorous evaluation of strengths and limitations in existing theory and research.
4. Students will learn the fundamentals of research design, data collection, and data analysis through participating in ongoing research or conducting their own research project(s).
5. Students will be able to identify key features of high-quality research or program implementation/evaluation in their chosen field.
6. Students will develop writing and oral skills needed to effectively communicate results of scientific research to academic, professional/practitioner, and lay audiences.
7. Students will communicate effectively in collaborative work or consultation settings with professional colleagues.
8. Students will become skilled communicators of issues in their research and program area for learners in formal classroom and informal learning settings.
9. Students will uphold the highest standards of ethical conduct.
10. Students will learn how to conduct research or program implementation/evaluation in accordance with ethical standards established in their field of inquiry.
11. Students will know how to prepare materials required for review by boards overseeing the ethical conduct of research and program implementation or evaluation.

Plan for Assessing Each Student Learning Outcome

For each of the degree major/program student learning outcomes, indicate how the program plans to assess whether or not students are meeting the expectation, as well as when each learning outcome will be assessed. Keep in mind that each academic degree program is expected to engage in at least one assessment activity per year and assessment activities, in total, must include one direct assessment method. While programs do not need to assess each learning outcome every year, all learning outcomes must be assessed within a period of three years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Planning (How)</th>
<th>Learning Outcome #1</th>
<th>Learning Outcome #2</th>
<th>Learning Outcome #3</th>
<th>Learning Outcome #4</th>
<th>Learning Outcome #5</th>
<th>Learning Outcome #6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practica (EP 840) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Practica (EP 840) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Practica (EP 840) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culuminating project scored by program faculty</td>
<td>Culuminating project scored by program faculty</td>
<td>Culuminating project scored by program faculty</td>
<td>Culuminating project scored by program faculty</td>
<td>Culuminating project scored by program faculty</td>
<td>Culuminating project scored by program faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method for assessing learning (at least one direct method required)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome #7</th>
<th>Learning Outcome #8</th>
<th>Learning Outcome #9</th>
<th>Learning Outcome #10</th>
<th>Learning Outcome #11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practica (EP 840) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Practica (EP 840) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Culuminating project scored by program faculty</td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culuminating project scored by program faculty</td>
<td>Praxis School Psychology Examination (5402)</td>
<td>Culuminating project scored by program faculty</td>
<td>Praxis School Psychology Examination (5402)</td>
<td>Praxis School Psychology Examination (5402)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have questions, please contact regina.lowery@wisc.edu
All students will be evaluated and rated annually by program faculty on each learning outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable for assessment activity (at least one activity each year; all outcomes reviewed in a 3-year cycle)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All learning goals will be evaluated annually through the following assessment activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded Assignments: Year 1 and Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practica (EP 840) observations and ratings by supervisor: Year 1 and Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship (EP 843) observations and ratings by supervisor: Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating project scored by program faculty: Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praxis School Psychology Examination (5402): Year 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For examples of direct and indirect methods of assessment, see the UW Madison Assessment website
You may elect to copy and paste this table multiple times if your program has more than five learning outcomes.

Also provide answers to the following questions as part of your assessment plan.

1. **Who is responsible for assessment?** (identify an individual or team who will coordinate the implementation of the plan on an annual basis):
   At the beginning of each semester, the program director and faculty will meet to review each student’s progress for the prior semester. The student’s faculty advisor will be responsible for compiling information from the various learning assessments (e.g., assignments in required courses; practica performance, observations, and ratings; internship performance, observations, and ratings (for students in their third year in the program); and the culminating project (for students in their third year in the program). The program director and support staff will compile and summarize the department’s learning goals assessment data on an annual basis.

2. **What is the plan for review of the assessment information?** (typically during an annual meeting of the program faculty and staff; note that at this meeting the program may want to review enrollment information, course progression, degree completion, and other structural features of the student experience in addition to the evidence about student learning):
   The program director and faculty will meet at the end of each spring semester to review students’ annual progress and program information, including learning goals assessment data, course progression and whether content changes are needed, practica and internship settings, enrollment information and projections, ongoing revenue projections, and other program components.
   Program assessment data will then be reported to the School of Education’s Dean’s Office.

3. **What is the plan for production of an annual summary report?** (the annual summary report includes the materials that form the basis of discussion at the annual meeting of the program faculty and staff, along with any recommendations made after considering the student learning assessment information presented):

If you have questions, please contact Regina Lowery at regina.lowery@wisc.edu
The program director will lead a discussion of the annual summary report, consisting of assessment data and recommendations, to the Department of Educational Psychology’s faculty and staff at the July faculty meeting. Once the Department approves the report and identifies actionable recommendations, the report will be sent to the Dean’s Office for review and further dissemination.

4. **How will recommendations be implemented?** (explain the general process by which recommendations will be implemented):

Any actionable items resulting from learning goals assessment data and the corresponding review of the program will be approved by the Department of Educational Psychology’s faculty and staff. Where appropriate, actionable items will go through the appropriate governance steps. Actionable items will be implemented after appropriate approval – when needed – is obtained. Actionable items that do not need to go through additional governance steps will be implemented in time for the following semester. The program director will be responsible for ensuring that actionable items are implemented and monitored.

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

This worksheet, or similar document, must be included with the submission of the program’s assessment plan.

- **Learning Outcomes** – Enter the academic degree program learning outcomes identified in the assessment plan on the top row of the following chart. Feel free to add columns if the academic degree/major program has more than five learning outcomes.
- **Degree/Major Program Courses/Experiences** – List all degree requirements (in some cases co-curricular experiences may also be included). Feel free to add rows as needed.
- Indicate with a check (X) where the course or learning experience contributes to each of the learning outcomes. Courses may contribute to multiple learning outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Map (Where)</th>
<th>Enter program-level learning outcomes and check (X) which course or experience contributes to which learning outcome.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Program Required Courses or Experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction to the Field</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP540: Intro to School Psychology</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP541: Applied Behavior Analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP726: Development of Ethnic and Racial Minority Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP743: Single Case Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP880: Prevention Science</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP844: Psychopathology</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP740: Cognitive Assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP741: Social, Emotional, Behavioral Assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP742: Assessment &amp; Intervention for Academic Skills Problems</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP760: Statistical Methods I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP761: Statistical Methods II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP942: Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP946: Advanced Assessment &amp; Intervention</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP947: Psychotherapy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practicum/Internship</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience – EP840: Beginning Practicum</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience – EP840: Field Practicum</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience – EP843: Internship</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culminating project</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praxis School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination (5402)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Add additional rows as needed to capture all requirements.*

Minimally, all of the courses/experiences required to complete the major degree program should be listed. Optionally, elective courses may be included in addition to the required courses.
APPENDIX A. CORE CRITERIA CHECKLIST
FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS WITH NON-POOLED TUITION

1. **New and Additional Student Enrollments to Support Program Costs**
   - The program must bring in NEW and ADDITIONAL students. Overall enrollment in all other school/college programs must not be eroded. The program cannot compete with or draw students away from existing programs that support the central tuition pool.
   - Faculty/staff must plan for sufficient enrollments to have enough tuition to cover instructional, direct student support costs, and any other fixed or required costs. Experience shows that enrollments of at least 30 students are necessary to have enough tuition to meet direct program costs.
   - School/college Budget Officers must be involved in planning and must approve plans and budgets for these programs before the program is submitted to the school/college APC for academic approval.

2. **Designed for Non-Traditional Students**
   - Has an applied, practice-oriented curriculum, or integrates practice with theory
   - Is offered in a modality that allows non-traditional audiences to attend (evening, weekend, online, intensive, or some combination)
   - Has demonstrated a workforce demand for the program graduates
   - Has defined learning goals that are oriented to market considerations
   - Has a clearly defined curriculum that is “self-contained”, meaning that program students are confined only to courses from the approved, prescribed curriculum
   - Has a clearly defined (often lockstep) curriculum with few options or electives that follows a predictable timeline for offerings and completion

3. **Distinctly Identifiable Program (Code) With Governance Approval**
   - The program must be distinctly identifiable in the student record system, either as a degree/major or as an option of a degree/major, or as a Capstone certificate.
   - The program must develop a proposal for the academic approval process, during which it must demonstrate that the school/college Dean and Budget Officer are aware and supportive of the program being run on a non-pooled tuition model.
APPENDIX B. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS WITH NON-POOLED TUITION

Use this checklist in conjunction with the Core Criteria Checklist

If core criteria are met, the program must adhere to the additional requirements below. 

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

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

2. Requirements for International Students:
  - √ Programs may not admit students who need ESL services without building sufficient ESL support into their fiscal model, and having an explicit MOU with the ESL provider about funding to support the ESL services.
  - √ Graduate degree/major programs must use Graduate School standards for English Proficiency. Capstone certificates should be designed so that admission requirements ensure that ESL support is not needed.
  - √ If the program is NOT completely online and admits international students, the program is responsible for honoring federal visa regulations related but not limited to: length of stay requirements for visa requests, online
course restrictions for visa holders, and waiting for federal program approval (up to a year) if the program represents a new degree type or capstone certificate previously not offered at UW-Madison.

3. **Requirements for Program/Course Enrollment:**

   - Non-pooled tuition program students can only be enrolled in one program at a time; enrollment in a second major, named option, certificate program, or courses beyond the prescribed program curriculum is not permitted. Non-compliance with this requirement will jeopardize the receipt of tuition for a non-pooled program. Regular audits will be conducted to ensure these requirements are met.
   
   - To ensure full receipt of non-pooled program tuition and to counter challenges from students who want to be dually enrolled, the program must adhere to the following:
     
     - The program must provide information to students about prohibitions on concurrent program enrollment and out-of-program course enrollment. Programs must note this in recruiting materials, in recommendations of admission, on the program website, program handbook, and program orientation.
     
     - Please see Appendix E for links and Appendix F for language for a specific non-pooled program template for a recommendation of admission letter and a general template for a program handbook. The program faculty/staff must provide details on this and any other program policies in the program handbook in at least following areas: satisfactory progress (good standing) requirements, ways to return to good standing, and a program grievance process if one does not already exist.
     
     - The program communicates to students each semester prior to course enrollment the expectation that students can enroll only in program courses and not in courses outside the approved, prescribed curriculum.
     
     - For students who enroll in the non-pooled program and then decide they want to pursue traditional/101 programs that allow dual enrollment, the program must help the student transfer to a different program(s) that allow such activity.
APPENDIX C. IMPLEMENTATION CHECKLIST FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS WITH NON-POOLED TUITION

Review compliance with core criteria and additional criteria outlined for all non-pooled programs before proceeding with this implementation checklist.

All three checklists should accompany the academic proposal when it is submitted to the Provost and Dean of the Graduate School and Provost for approval by GFEC and UAPC respectively.

The checklist will be reviewed again at the implementation meeting.

1. Program description:
   - Program Name: MS Educational Psychology Named Option: Educational Specialist in School Psychology
   - Department/Academic Unit Home: Department of Educational Psychology
   - School/College: School of Education
   - Type of Program (Capstone, Master’s degree, Master’s degree option, Other): MS Degree Named Option
   - Mode of Delivery - Face-to-Face or Online: Face-to-Face
   - Format of Delivery – compressed, evening/weekend, part-time, other: Weekday/evening
   - Start Dates
     a. Accept applications: October 1, 2018
     b. Enroll students: February 1, 2019
     c. Web content is live: October 1, 2018 (or when program is approved)
   - Program handbook is complete
   - Non-pooled program leadership:
     a. Program Faculty Director: Craig A. Albers, PhD
     b. Program Coordinator: Craig A. Albers, PhD
     c. Other key staff who will need to be included in communications: Brad Brown, Department Chair; Heidi Udelhoven, Department Administrator

2. Fiscal Basics
   - If the program is face-to-face, the program charges standard graduate tuition according to the UW-Madison tuition schedule.
   - If the program is on-line, the program has selected ONE of the available tuition tiers for per credit tuition. Selected per credit tuition rate:
   - The program tuition has NO non-standard features? If yes, explain:
   - The program faculty/staff and school/college budget officer have completed the “item type” form.
   - Planned enrollment generates enough paid tuition to cover instructional costs, direct student support costs, and any other fixed or required costs. Although detailed fiscal plans are not required in the academic program proposal, it is helpful to provide the following summary:
Fiscal Annual Summary
Planned enrollment: 15 new students per year; 45 students across cohorts enrolled when at scale
Estimated paid tuition: $640,347/year
Core Instructional costs: $143,038/year
Direct student support costs: $7,500/year
Overhead assessment/allocation: Campus: $64,034/year; School of Education: $117,964/year
Total costs: $468,451/year
Excess tuition available for reinvestment: $171,894/year
Briefly list planned reinvestment uses: Excess tuition will be used to:

- Support the addition of new faculty/staff to enable growth of the named option program;
- Support teaching assistants of enrolled PhD students to assist with named option courses;
- Support Department of Educational Psychology faculty/staff retention offers, salary adjustments, and graduate student support.

3. Administrative Basics – This section will be completed by APIR and Graduate School Staff
   ☑ The program has been approved by the school/college governance process. Date: 4/20/2018
   ☑ The program has been approved by the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee. Date:
   ☑ The program has been approved by the University Academic Planning Council. Date:
   ☑ Program Code/Name Specifics
      ☑ Program Name:
      ☑ Plan Code:
      ☑ Subplan Code (if applicable):
      ☑ Effective date for first enrollment:
      ☑ Nontraditional?
      ☑ Online/Distance?
      ☑ Educational Innovation?
   ☑ Program has provided content for the Guide including details for their “Satisfactory Progress and Program Requirements” chart
   ☑ Program has provided content for the Graduate School website and the campus Career Portal
May 14, 2018

To: William J. Karpus, Dean of the Graduate School
From: Katie Hustad, Chair, Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders
RE: Graduate Faculty Status Extension for Professor Lyn Turkstra

This memo is to request that Professor Lyn Turkstra be awarded an extension of her graduate faculty status for an additional academic year. The Executive Committee of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders voted unanimously in favor of this (6 of 6 votes) on May 14, 2018.

Professor Turkstra retired from her position as Professor of Communication Sciences and Disorders in 7/2017 and accepted an outside offer at the McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario. Professor Turkstra was a valued colleague and contributor in our department for 14 years prior to that. Our request to extend her faculty status is so that she can serve as an internal committee member on the doctoral dissertation committees of a graduate student in our department. She has been closely involved with the student throughout their graduate work at Wisconsin and has remained actively involved since her departure from the university. This student would experience undue hardship if they were required to find a new committee member at this late date. The student intends to defend this summer or early fall.

Thank you for considering this request.
Dear Dean Karpus,

Thank you very much for your summary of the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee’s ten-year review of the Botany MS/PhD and Doctoral Minor dated February 15, 2018. My colleagues and I very much appreciate the positive feedback and helpful suggestions for improving our program. You asked for a response that addresses the primary concerns raised by the committee, which are outlined below:

(1) Inconsistency in types of student funding: for example percentage appointments as well as academic vs. annual appointments for teaching assistants.

- All guarantees of financial support to Botany graduate students are standardized as follows: a minimum of ten semesters of funding for Ph.D. candidates entering without a Master’s degree, eight semesters of funding for a Ph.D. if they enter with an M.S., and five semesters for those seeking a terminal M.S. in the Program. All graduate students are required to serve as a TA for at least one semester. These guarantees of support take the form of internal or external fellowships, RAships, PAships, and/or TAships, which are comparable in monthly salary earned by the students even though, by definition, they vary by duty. There can be an inequity for students who are employed as 12-month RAs verses 9-month TAs, but this is a result of differences in external grant funding secured by faculty who hire RA/PAs. To better assist students who lack summer support via faculty grants, Botany has established several new endowment funds (including one that is exclusively for women scientists) to which students may apply for support. In 2018 seven graduate students will receive summer stipends through this mechanism. Furthermore, Botany is expanding its summer course offerings and can now offer a greater number of summer TAships. In 2018 six students will be supported beyond the academic year in this way. Many students conduct their fieldwork in the summer and prefer not to be employed during these months. To our knowledge all students who requested summer support this year were accommodated.
Inequalities among tracks that included degree requirements, communication and expectations for examinations...expectations regarding dissertation advisory committee membership and responsibilities.

- We view heterogeneity among research subdisciplines to be a strength of our department, and one that is inherent within the life sciences. In fact, we are recognized internationally for our breadth and depth of focus, and expect our graduate students to leave UW-Madison as well-rounded plant biologists. Botany faculty are specialists in plant biochemistry, cytology, physiology, evolution, ecology, fungi, algae, and even ethnobotany. While there are differences in ‘culture’ among these subdisciplines (e.g., students in a molecular lab typically conduct research that represents a component of their PI’s larger research, whereas a student in systematics is likely be studying a genus unrelated to their advisor’s specialty), all faculty and graduate students in our Program are governed by the same written policies. To clarify these, our faculty recently reviewed and approved an updated version of the Botany Graduate Program Handbook which is freely available on our department’s wiki. In that revision the faculty approved the use of a standardized rubric for preliminary exams and the final defense; this should result in greater clarity of expectations by the professors and students. Also implemented in the past year is the use of an annual report that is completed by the student, and that incorporates comments from their advisor, that is shared with the Botany Graduate Coordinator & Graduate Committee Chair to help identify any issues with students making progress in time to degree.

The GFEC noted that the program does little recruiting of graduate students from institutions in the peer group (e.g. AAU). Therefore, the GFEC recommends the department expand its recruiting efforts in this area.

- We are a bit puzzled by this recommendation since we consider our graduate students to be well educated and of high quality even if many of them attended top tier national liberal arts colleges rather than large state universities. Our department is somewhat unusual for being placed within the College of Letters and Science rather than the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Many of UW-Madison’s peer institutions train undergraduates in applied plant sciences/agriculture rather than botany/plant biology, and so we tend to recruit from institutions that embrace the latter, just as we do. We also reject far more prospective students than we can admit, and feel that our pool of applicants is representative of the nation’s finest students. Furthermore, we have increased our attention on recruiting women and minority students in order to diversify our student body, and are proud to report that 49% of our graduate students are women and 20% are targeted domestic minorities. This level of diversity is almost unheard of in the STEM fields, and we are reluctant to alter what we view as a successful recruitment strategy. However, there are discussions underway across campus to create a new Ecology and Evolution graduate program, and this could result in more students applying from AAU peer institution.
(4) The GFEC recommends that the department institute a Board of Visitors, which can help expand recruiting efforts and support development and implementation of a strategic plan to the benefit of graduate students and graduate education.

- The Botany executive committee will continue to discuss the idea of a Board of Visitors, but our department is relatively small and has limited resources available to organize and pay for formal visitation by outside advisors. Nevertheless, we appreciate the suggestion. Academic Analytics ranked UW-Madison in second place nationally among Botany/Plant Biology departments, and the most recent review of doctoral programs in the USA conducted by the National Research Council (2010) put UW-Madison’s Botany Program in 1st place for diversity, research activity, and 1st place overall for Botany. We are very proud of our reputation and are committed to ensuring that our Program remains strong well into the future.

On behalf of the Department of Botany, and especially our Graduate Program Committee, I would like to thank you and the members of the external review. We sincerely appreciate the feedback and hope that you are satisfied with our responses to the concerns raised in the review. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth Cameron
May 17, 2018

TO: William Karpus, Dean, Graduate School
    Sarah Mangelsdorf, Provost

FROM: James P. Blanchard, Executive Associate Dean

RE: 10-year Review of the Manufacturing Systems Engineering Program

At its May 16, 2018 meeting, the College of Engineering Academic Planning Council (APC) unanimously recommended for approval the attached program review for the Manufacturing Systems Engineering Program.

The review committee found the program to be successful and well-equipped to help meet the increasing demand for an advanced manufacturing workforce in Wisconsin and across the U.S. The committee also offered suggestions for improvement, including increasing the diversity in the program, identifying funding sources and developing a strategic plan to help identify and align priorities.

In view of the positive report from the review committee and on behalf of the College of Engineering, I accept the APC’s recommendation to approve this certificate review.

We now ask for approval from the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee.

cc: Jocelyn Milner, APIR
    Emily Reynolds, APIR
    Sarah Kuba, APIR
    David Noyce, Chair, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering
    Laura Albert, Assistant Dean for Graduate Affairs, College of Engineering
Review Committee Members

- Yu Hen Hu, Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering
- Xiaoping Qian, Professor, Mechanical Engineering (Chair)
- Donald S Stone, Professor, Materials Science and Engineering
- Michael Zinn, Associate Professor, Mechanical Engineering

Review Process

1. The review committee met on February 28th, reviewed the materials sent by the College of Engineering on the MSE program. The committee discussed the review process and asked the MSE director for a self-study report. The MSE program director Frank Pfefferkorn sent the committee a self-study report on March 6th.
2. The review committee studied the self-study report and met on March 14th. The committee discussed and formalized the review process, including the schedule for meetings with key stakeholders to include the MSE director, staff, faculty and students.
3. The review committee met with Pam Patterson and Frank Pfefferkorn on March 21st.
4. The review committee met three MSE students including two alumni (Ms. Elena Foti, now employed at Mercury Marine, Fond du Lac, WI; Mr. Benjamin Reynolds, now employed at Reynolds Transfer, Madison, WI) and one current student (Mr. Pranav S. Khedkar graduating in May 2018) and two MSE faculty (Urban Wemmerlöv from Business School and Neil Duffie from Mechanical Engineering) on April 11th.
5. The review committee met on April 18th to discuss the final report.

Overview of the program

Manufacturing Systems Engineering has offered an interdisciplinary (on-campus) M.S. degree since 1983. The M.S. in Manufacturing Systems Engineering degree provides a solid foundation for individuals seeking to manage advanced manufacturing operations in internationally competitive environments. It allows graduates to build cross-functional expertise required to drive creative product development, efficient production and timely delivery. The highly flexible curriculum that offers a wide selection of engineering and business classes is required because manufacturing cuts across multiple colleges (Engineering, Business) and departments within these colleges: for example, Mechanical
Manufacturing Systems Engineering (MSE) Program Review 2018

Engineering, Industrial & Systems Engineering, Materials Science & Engineering, Operations Management, Accounting. No other M.S. degree in the College of Engineering allows for this. The Manufacturing Systems Engineering program is contributing to the Wisconsin Idea by training a skilled and technology-focused workforce to secure the future strength of manufacturing in Wisconsin and the United States.

The M.S. in Manufacturing Systems Engineering is unique in its focus on Manufacturing and the flexibility of its curriculum. Students must take at least one course on manufacturing processes, one on manufacturing systems, and one on management, as well as a capstone course on the design and analysis of manufacturing systems. The remainder of the curriculum must focus on manufacturing, however, students have the flexibility to take up to half their courses in the Business School, focus on processes-level manufacturing, focus on systems-level manufacturing, or a broad mixture.

The program has had three MSE Program Directors over the past 10 years:
  • Rajan Suri (Industrial & Systems Engineering) 2007  
    ▪ Professor Emeritus Suri retired in 2008
  • Ananth Krishnamurthy (Industrial & Systems Engineering) 2008 – 2012  
    ▪ Professor Krishnamurthy stepped down as Director after the College of Engineering eliminated the MSE Program’s budget and one staff position
  • Frank Pfefferkorn (Mechanical Engineering) 2012–Present

The Manufacturing Systems Engineering Program has an Executive Committee that meets at least once per semester, as necessary, to make decisions on curriculum, student admissions, executive committee membership, and program faculty.

Fall 2007 through Spring 2017, the MSE Program has had 149 graduates, 95% of whom have taken jobs in industry. The majority of these have taken jobs in manufacturing firms or manufacturing-related consulting companies. The remainder of the graduates have been recruited into engineering, managerial, and consulting positions

The MSE program has found at least 132 graduates with LinkedIn profiles out of the 149 who graduated since September 2007, all have been gainfully employed immediately after graduation. Among them, 27% took their first job in Wisconsin, and 60% accepted a job in the Midwest of the United States.
An overview of recruiting, admissions, and enrollment in the MSE Program from Fall 2007 through Spring 2017:

- Applications increased 47%
  - 55 applicants in the 2007-2008 Academic Year
  - 81 applicants in the 2016-2017 Academic Year
- Admissions have fluctuated, but have become more selective in recent years
- 94.6% matriculation rate (% of admitted students who matriculate)
- Enrollment started at 26 in Fall 2007 and was 28 in Fall 2016
  - Peak enrollment was 44 in Fall 2014

An overview of degree completion and time to degree in the MSE Program from Fall 2007 through Spring 2017:

- 85% of matriculated students completed the degree (149 out of 176)
- 2.01 calendar years = average time to degree for all graduates
- 1.90 calendar years = average time to degree for women
- 149 graduates

MSE Strengths

- The MSE Program creates a net influx of manufacturing talent for the State of Wisconsin. While only 17% of the students are domestic, let alone from Wisconsin, 27% of the MSE Program students accept jobs in Wisconsin upon graduation.
- The MSE Program aligns with a national priority area: Manufacturing. Demand for an advanced manufacturing workforce is growing, and this program is well positioned to help meet the need in Wisconsin and the United States.
- The program has 94.6% matriculation rate (percent of admitted students who matriculate).
- The program has a very high placement of its graduates in industry (95%), with the majority taking manufacturing-related jobs with responsibilities that include engineering, management, and consulting which aligns with the goals and objectives of the MSE Program.
- Over 70% of the MSE Program’s graduates have continued to be employed in manufacturing 5 – 10 years after graduation.
• Increasing interest in the MSE Program, evidenced by a 47% increase in applications through 2016. After 2016, growth has been limited due to budgetary and capacity constraints in supporting departments.

• The MSE program is well run and has had strong cohorts of students. Both current students and alumni are enthusiastic about the program.

MSE Program Concerns
• The MSE Program does not have an operating budget with which to conduct recruitment activities and industry outreach, incentivize faculty and fund staff to help with administrative tasks such as student advising, graduate handbook updating and website maintenance, and create student activities that help build a sense of community. For the program to remain strong, it is imperative that dedicated funds be allocated for this program.

• The MSE Program needs to grow diversity among the enrolled students. In the Spring 2017 Term, 83% of the students were foreign nationals, 22% of the students were women, and none of the enrolled students were from other historically underrepresented groups.

• The advising and administrative workload of the MSE Program is still carried out by a small number of the faculty, with the vast majority of the responsibility residing with the Director.

Recommendations
• It is recommended that the MSE Program develop a strategic plan that aligns with the College of Engineering Strategic Plan and describes the MSE Program’s vision, mission, values, goals and its target for future enrolment.

• It is recommended that the MSE Program actively seek funding from diverse sources to support this program. Potential funding sources for consideration include funding from the College of Engineering, creation of a named option for the degree program, industrial support, and federal grants such as the Manufacturing Engineering Education Program supported by the Office of Naval Research on behalf of the Office of the Secretary of Defense (It should be commended that Prof. Pfefferkorn had submitted a white paper on the solicitation N00014-18-S-F005).

• It is recommended that the MSE program develop a plan to increase diversity among enrolled students.
15 June 2018

TO: Hernando Rojas, Director, LACIS

FROM: John Karl Scholz, Dean

RE: Completion of Academic Program Review:

- Undergraduate Major, Latin American, Caribbean, and Iberian Studies (BA, BS, AMAJ 553)
- Master of Arts - Latin American, Caribbean, and Iberian Studies (MA553 L&S)
- Graduate Minor, Latin American, Caribbean, and Iberian Studies (GMIN553)
- Dual degree arrangement for J.D. / M.A. in Law and in Latin American, Caribbean, and Iberian Studies

CC: Cal Bergman, Associate Dean for Student Academic Affairs, L&S
    Greg Downey, Associate Dean for Social Science, L&S
    Rick Keller, Associate Dean, International Division
    Elaine 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, Vice Provost and Director, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
    Jennifer Noyes, Associate Dean for Operations and Staff
    Michael J. Pfieger, Assistant Dean and Director, L&S AIM
    Parmesh Ramanathan, Associate Dean, Graduate School
    Ellen Sapega, Director, Institute for Regional and International Studies
    Csanád Siklós, Assistant Director for Students and Curriculum, Institute for Regional and International Studies
    Eric Wilcots, Deputy Dean, L&S

On April 17, 2018, the L&S Academic Planning Council considered materials submitted for the review of academic programs housed in the Center for Latin American, Caribbean, and Iberian Studies (LACIS) and administered per an academic partnership agreement between the Institute for Regional and International Studies. Per that agreement, L&S retains responsibility for academic oversight of the programs, including approval of curricular change and completion of
program reviews. This review is one of the first completed under the terms of that agreement, and, like other program reviews, involved a comprehensive self-study prepared by the program that served as the foundation for review by a committee of faculty. That committee was convened by IRIS, to whom it submitted its report. LACIS was afforded an opportunity to review the report and offer correction of factual errors, which were noted in further deliberations. IRIS reviewed these materials and unanimously approved the review without further comment, forwarding all materials with its support for consideration by the L&S APC.

Associate Dean Greg Downey led discussion, providing an overview of the reorganization that led to development of the L&S partnership with IRIS, and an explanation of the policy and oversight obligations of the two units. He also reminded council members that IRIS had previously conducted a summary review of the undergraduate major when IRIS’s other undergraduate programs were reviewed. Although the council considered that review to have been incomplete, he and the council agreed that this effort is substantially more comprehensive and useful. Council members noted that the documentation provided for this review thoroughly conveys the program’s mission, attention to student learning, assessment, and commitment to program quality; governance, administrative, and resource structure; successful recruitment of a diverse student body; and its plans for the future. In discussion, the Chair of the L&S Curriculum Committee also reported that graduate program changes recommended in course of review were recently approved, which council members regarded as affirming the utility of the review process and signaling the program’s commitment to following through with recommended changes.

Downey observed that the review committee had concluded that, overall, LACIS is a strong but small program. Like the committee, he shared the sense that the program at both the undergraduate and graduate levels could grow, and that recommendations for change emphasize how to make the program more attractive to both undergraduates and graduate students. We note that LACIS has already embarked upon this work, working to understand the role master’s level study in the program plays in the scholarly and professional aspirations of its students. The recent redesign is intended to better prepare these students for whatever they may wish to do next, by emphasizing thematically organized interdisciplinary tracks designed to enhance their entry into more traditionally focused disciplines. These revisions are recent enough that the impact of change has yet to take root; APC members trust that you and your colleagues will monitor the performance of this curricular model and will intervene quickly to avoid maintaining unpopular or low enrollment tracks.

The self-study suggested several avenues to make interdisciplinary study in LACIS more appealing to undergraduates (enhancing the course array, articulating more standardized tracks through the program). The review committee offered additional suggestions (creating a new certificate program, addressing perceived overlap with the undergraduate major in Spanish & Portuguese, reducing the number of credits required for the program). Colleagues in L&S Administration observe that some changes may make the program easier to administer, too. Colleagues in L&S Student Academic Affairs asked me to call your attention to their concerns about the differences between approved program requirements that are reflected in Degree Audit (DARS), and the published requirements that appear in the Guide. They noted, too, that LACIS publishes lists of courses outside of the Guide environment. LACIS is required to list all approved courses in the Guide, and the published requirements must align with those that are
approved and implemented in DARS. To address these concerns, please work with Assistant Dean Mike Pflieger in L&S Academic Information Management. Please recall that deadlines for updating the June 2019 edition of the Guide will fall in December 2018. This will allow IRIS and the L&S Curriculum Committee to review changes in Lumen Programs in early Spring 2019.

The APC was generally supportive of the self-study and review committee recommendations to pursue changes in curriculum. As you and your colleague engage in that work and undertake the Guide mentioned above, please consult L&S Academic Information Management, which is prepared to provide analyses of your students’ Degree Audits to inform your discussion of requirements, overlap with other majors, and offer counsel about using the Guide to reflect accurately which courses meet requirements.

The L&S Academic Planning Council unanimously approved a motion to accept the L&S portion of this review as complete; the next step will be discussion of the graduate program at a future meeting of the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee. The L&S APC did not request any additional follow-up, though members anticipate that in the next year or two, IRIS, the L&S Curriculum Committee, and the L&S APC will see a number of requests for curricular change. I predict that by the time we undertake the next review, the undergraduate program in LACIS will look different – and I share the council’s hope that it will be even better.
Dear Elaine,

I’m happy to report that IRIS unanimously approved the LACIS review at its governing council meeting this morning. I have attached the original review here. There were no further recommendations from IRIS, although the group did note two corrections:

On p. 3, paragraph 5, "Sarah Riff" should read "Sarah Ripp." Also, on p. 6, Sarah Ripp should be listed as IRIS Assistant Director for Communication.

Please let me know if you require any further information from us!

Thanks, Rick

---------------------------------------
Richard C. Keller
Associate Dean, International Division
Professor of History and Medical History
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Report of Review of LACIS Academic Programs
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Executive Summary

Our Committee commends LACIS for its ambitious and thoughtful restructuring of the MA program to bring it more in line with its aspiration to be both an interdisciplinary and a research-oriented program. While its reforms are still in the pre-implementation stage, faculty view this restructuring with enthusiasm. The elaboration of five distinct “tracks” expresses a hope for program growth (at present, cohort size is about four/year), and the expectation is that graduate fellowship resources will be able to support larger enrollments if partner departments for each track are as enthusiastic about the quality of the MA students as LACIS core faculty seem to be.

The BA program appears to us to need a similarly thoughtful restructuring. Although declining enrollments may represent a general downward trend in humanities departments, we believe the interdisciplinarity of a LACIS major remains an underappreciated resource for UW-Madison undergraduates. Interdisciplinarity is not integral to the current structure of the BA program, leading to high overlap of LACIS with Spanish and Portuguese (S&P) majors. Student engagement in Global Health and International Business could be tapped more actively by LACIS, particularly given the number of pre-med and business majors who also pursue a Spanish major.

Among the opportunities available to LACIS is the addition of an undergraduate certificate. The absence of a certificate option not only makes LACIS unusual among IRIS programs but may reduce the likelihood that undergraduates in STEM and Business majors will take courses in LACIS. Similarly, a lack of structure in the LACIS major, combined with sub-optimal advising (and advertising) in related departments, has obscured its potential value. Since the LACIS major rests on voluntary course offerings by faculty affiliates (of whom there are nominally 130), the challenge is to add structure while keeping the major achievable. We offer suggestions that seem promising, and expressions of support for the restructured MA indicate that a restructured BA could also succeed.

At the PhD level, the minor/certificate and dual Law/LACIS degree both seem to be meeting their modest objectives. In neither case is formal certification itself considered a professional advantage, so these programs exist primarily to help students organize their research interests more effectively.
Report and Recommendations
The committee was charged by Dean Guido Podesta and Associate Dean Richard Keller to review the academic programs provided by Latin American, Caribbean, Iberian Studies (LACIS) and to assess their quality, productivity, and viability for the future. We have interviewed faculty, staff, and students (both graduate and undergraduate); consulted enrollment data and degree-completion records; and drawn on the program’s own self-study to evaluate how well LACIS programs serve their students. A full list of interviews and documents is appended to the end of this report.

The previous reviews of the LACIS academic programs were conducted between 2003 and 2005. Both internal and external reviews emphasized the need to increase the number of students in the program. They also recommended taking steps to: (1) become a more interdisciplinary program with a more coherent curriculum; (2) expand the engagement of junior faculty from the social sciences, natural sciences, and education, as well as the involvement of BA/MA students; and (3) develop additional outreach capacities through strategies like a newsletter, a graduate-student conference, and engagement with the School of Education in addressing the local and regional K-12 community.

The LACIS Self-Study, completed in August 2017, emphasized the following additional goals, each of which has been achieved in some form (1) improve the administrative climate within the unit; (2) expand the engagement of faculty in the natural and social sciences; and (3) re-establish a weekly newsletter (the program has also increased its social-media presence with Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn accounts).

The BA Major
Sadly, enrollments in the BA program have not grown. There were 38 LACIS majors in 2003-4 and 37 in 2016-17, with a notable rise and fall in between (the program appears to have peaked at 65 majors in 2011). Significantly, many LACIS majors are double majors, shared to a great extent with Spanish and Portuguese (21 students) and Chicano/Latinx Studies (13 students). While undergraduate majors in the humanities and social sciences have declined campus-wide (relative to Business and STEM fields), LACIS has several options that might help to increase enrollments. Unlike other regional-studies programs, LACIS does not offer a 15-credit undergraduate certificate option, and unlike many of the social-science majors that encourage interdisciplinarity, the credit load for a LACIS major is high (40 credits compared with 30 in History, Political Science, Sociology, Anthropology, and Geography). Several interviewees suggested that a 15-credit certificate option and/or a lower credit demand (30 credits) would be an easy way to give students a chance to try out LACIS courses and potentially choose to major or double-major in the program.

A redesigned major might begin with a requirement of language competence at some specified level (not just credits accumulated), followed by the introductory course and 9 credits in at least two other departments, followed by an additional 18 credits for the major (with no more than 9 of these credits in one department). Other possibilities involve structuring 6-12 credits in a way that includes study abroad or summer internships in health care, public health, business, or NGO work in appropriate countries. Incentives to do study abroad with a health, science, and/or social-science emphasis could readily contribute to a 30-credit LACIS major or a 15-credit certificate.
The current structure of the major gives an incentive to S&P majors to double major, because they can double-count their language courses and take a fairly small (and scattered) number of “breadth” courses. The committee heard several useful suggestions that might entice students—including S&P students—into the LACIS major, including the creation of two “conversational” Spanish courses, one introductory and one senior capstone, on diverse topics that connect with the LACIS tracks or themes. Also, we agree with the LACIS Self-Study Report that the addition of FIGs could help to draw first-year undergraduates into LACIS, especially those freshmen who are interested in Spanish or Portuguese.

Departmental problems experienced within S&P are not this committee’s concern, but they point to the danger of relying too closely on any single department for advertising the major, recruiting potential students, and constructing compatible course plans. LACIS should work to cultivate more pathways for students to access the major, particularly connections with STEM students and students in the School of Business and the School of Education (e.g., Counseling Psychology as well as the new Education Studies major, which includes a “Global” concentration). Undergraduates noted a strong interest in courses on contemporary issues in Latin America, especially health, business/economics, politics, and education.

Advising staff can help students make these connections. Many departments and regional-studies programs have “MAPS” to help advisors explain how an interdisciplinary major can enhance students’ options for careers and/or graduate study. Combining a targeted but flexibly designed set of “MAPS” for doing a major in LACIS—as well as a convenient directory of courses offered during the current semester as well as those offered regularly—could help students fit a LACIS certificate (or major) into their curricular and career plans. LACIS might also discuss with S&P the possibility of cross-listing more non-language courses between these two units.

LACIS could also consider whether an advanced interdisciplinary capstone (above and beyond the required 30 credits for the major) could be offered as a senior-year course that could count toward meeting some of the requirements for the MA in LACIS. This approach might begin to build a pipeline of students into one of the new MA tracks.

Working with academic advising staff to restructure a BA program that meets student needs—(a) for more structured interdisciplinary choices, and (b) for ways to combine a less credit-heavy program with majors other disciplines—seems a promising direction for development. LACIS has benefited from the restructuring in IRIS in that it has two strong advisors (Sarah Riff and Csanad Siklos) who take students’ needs seriously and offer engaged and supportive counseling. Both identified a lack of information among colleagues in other units about LACIS and its major. One noted, for example, that “while LACIS refers students to S&P, it is rare for S&P to refer students to LACIS,” despite the fact that many S&P students express a desire for courses outside language and literature. Inter-program relationships with S&P, Business, Education, and pre-med students are important for LACIS and merit close attention. In addition, advisors felt that LACIS could do more to market its program at information sessions about study abroad and international internships.

On the subject of study-abroad, advisors noted that the dominance of S&P co-majoring has led the bulk of students to head to Spain or Portugal rather than Latin America or the Caribbean for semesters or summers away from Madison. Exploring more active partnerships with programs in
Mexico, Chile, Argentina, Costa Rica, and Brazil might offer channels to engage students with social- and natural-science interests in combined study-research experiences. An exploration of undergraduate options in Global Health, Education, CALS, and Chicax/Latinx Studies might uncover potential partnerships in study abroad as well as undergraduate research opportunities, service provision, and hands-on-teaching/learning—all of which could be made more accessible through a restructured 30-credit BA or a 15-credit certificate. (The ability of S&P students to double major in LACIS would not be affected if the overall reduction of credits for the major makes double-counting the language courses less necessary.)

Students majoring in LACIS are interested and engaged in its co-curricular offerings, as the survey of these offerings showed. However, LACIS-involved students were likely to praise the language training more than the job-skills contributions of these offerings. More could be done to offer career-related events for LACIS undergraduates.

*The MA Program*

Hernando Rojas and Alberto Vargas have worked hard to introduce a new structure into the LACIS MA Program. By defining five different “tracks” from among which entering students can choose (Growth and Equality; Collective Action and Governance; Habitat; Security; and Culture), the program stops being a “lite” version of a History, Sociology, or Political Science degree focused on training practitioners and redefines itself as inherently interdisciplinary (no track is defined by a specific discipline). The redesign was prompted by recognition that the bulk of students earning MAs were transferring into PhD programs in Latin American Studies or in disciplines most closely related to their research. A degree that advances the students’ research skills will therefore replace a professional degree that assumed the MA was a terminal degree and that student would go into applied work. LACIS has determined that students come to UW-Madison with broader aspirations and that a solid post-BA research experience increases LACIS students’ access to highly ranked PhD programs. This seems to us a wise decision.

The five “tracks” encourage students to combine Latin American Studies with other substantive courses not only in language and literature but also in the social and/or natural sciences. The directors are to be commended for reaching out more widely to faculty in the social and natural sciences and to including more departments in LACIS activities (for example, in the choice of Tinker Visiting Professorships, who represent a popular element of the LACIS program). Also, faculty agreed that the creation of LACIS 982 had added coherence to the MA program overall by introducing students to the idea of interdisciplinarity (as well as cohort-building). When it comes to its MA program, LACIS has the resources to recruit and support outstanding students who come to Madison specifically to work in one of its five announced tracks. Although the restructured MA program is just now being implemented, the program directors perceive higher faculty morale and more student engagement with the new program. At the same time, they have some concerns about their ability to offer solid two-year funding packages to incoming students if enrollments increase (as they expect they will). Department-based support will be critical not only for assembling funding packages to supplement LACIS resources but also for assuring the regularity of offering key courses in some of the tracks.

To recruit students into the redesigned MA program, faculty recommended sending brochures to other universities with strong programs. Another suggestion, mentioned above, was to design a research-based capstone course (three extra credits) for UW-Madison seniors who could count these credits toward the MA degree here.
Going forward, the program will need to monitor students’ engagement with the five tracks.

The PhD minor/certificate

The 12-credit PhD minor has been understood as a way of acknowledging the interdisciplinary training and perspective of students whose doctorates are granted by a core discipline such as History, Sociology, or Political Science. Faculty advisors to students who pursue the minor/certificate are strong disciplinary scholars and active members of the LACIS interdisciplinary core. Initially, many students seemed to think a PhD minor/certificate would offer them a better shot at a more diverse range of jobs when their PhD was complete. People we interviewed seem to think, however, that today this extra credential is not particularly valuable in the job market, even as they felt it was good for expanding students’ intellectual horizons and knowledge base. Thus, rather than a career tool, both students and faculty regarded the PhD minor/certificate as a way to access the breadth and depth of LACIS offerings across multiple departments on campus. As such, the minor/certificate represents a program modest in size and scope but welcomed by students and faculty for academic reasons. It appears this program also serves a key community-building function for LACIS, since participants in the PhD minor/certificate program are more likely than BA or MA students to attend LACIS events, such as talks and workshops (suggesting there may be more LACIS interest at the BA and MA levels than has been tapped to date). The Tuesday lecture series was considered a great success, though some recommended a bit more variation in scheduling so that people who could not attend talks at noon could find other talks to attend later in the day. On the “social” side of the program, interviewees were enthusiastic about program gatherings but felt that large events/celebrations might occasionally be supplemented by one or two smaller ones—perhaps thematically organized.

The Joint JD/MA Program

This is by far the smallest of the academic programs LACIS offers. It consists of an extra year of research in addition to the regular Law School course of study for the JD. There are few to no career advantages for pursuing this program (save to be in one’s own eyes “a better lawyer”), since the few academic positions for JD/MA trained scholars are very US-centric. Having one or two students in this “add-on” program does not seem to pose any unwelcome advising load on either Law School or LACIS faculty, since the extra research that the students in this program do seems to be congruent with the interests of one or more of the 130 LACIS affiliated faculty. The program should be more actively marketed, both on the Law and LACIS websites and with a brochure that can be distributed to first-year law students and their new-student orientation.

Conclusions

LACIS is a strong program, blessed with ample resources and skilled leadership, yet virtually everyone we interviewed agreed that its presence on campus was often overlooked. The BA program, with the addition of a 15-credit certificate and a redesigned 30-credit major that limits overlap with S&P language literature courses, could attract more students, particularly among those in STEM, Business, and Education who have an interest in contemporary politics, culture, and society in Latin America. We urge LACIS’s directors to look for advertising, marketing, and outreach opportunities and ways to build collaborative bridges with these programs and their students. The restructured MA program could provide a model for a redesigned BA program (and ways for BA students to continue into the MA program could be built into the redesign process). The new MA program, while not yet known to current students and not yet fully
explained to affiliated faculty, seems to offer a roadmap for LACIS going forward. Its emphasis on thematic tracks not only highlights the interdisciplinary nature of the program but also give students a way to navigate a wide range of course choices. This level of coherence will also help at the BA level. As LACIS continues to diversify its connections on campus, we believe its high-quality academic programs will grow.

Appendix

LACIS Interviews

Hernando Rojas, Faculty Director
Alberto Vargas, Managing Director
Pablo Gomez, Faculty Steering Committee Member
Erica Simmons, Faculty Steering Committee Member
Alexandra Huneeus, Faculty Member, Law-LACIS JD/MA Program
Jim Sweet, Interim Chair, Department of Spanish and Portuguese
Sarah Ripp, Academic Advisor, Cross-College Advising Services
Csanad Siklos, Academic Advisor, Division of International Studies
Graduate Students—three students pursuing the LACIS MA
Undergraduate Students—two students pursuing the LACIS BA

LACIS Documents

LACIS MA Students, 2006-present
LACIS PhD Minor Students, 2006-present
LACIS-Law Dual Degree Students, 2006-present
Self-Study for LACIS Undergraduate and Graduate Programs (August 2017)
Program Review of LACIS (May 2004)
Report of External Review Committee of LACIS (May 2005)
Survey of student and faculty familiarity with area-studies centers
11 June 2018

TO: William Aylward, Professor and Chair, Classical & Ancient Near Eastern Studies

FROM: John Karl Scholz, Dean

RE: Completion of Academic Program Review, Classical & Ancient Near Eastern Studies, M.A., Ph.D. (including named options in “Classics” and “Hebrew Bible”)

CC: Cal Bergman, Associate Dean for Student Academic Affairs, L&S
    Elaine 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, Vice Provost and Director, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
    Jennifer Noyes, Associate Dean for Operations and Staff
    Parmesh Ramanathan, Associate Dean, Graduate School
    Emily Reynolds, Graduate School
    Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean for the Arts and Humanities

On March 20, 2018, the L&S Academic Planning Council considered materials submitted with respect to the review of the academic programs enumerated above. Members were provided with a self-study submitted by the Department of Classical & Ancient Near Eastern Studies as well as the report submitted prepared by a committee of faculty who used that self-study as the foundation for its discussions with faculty, staff, and students. CANES was afforded an opportunity to review the report and offer correction of factual errors, and these corrections were also shared with the APC.

Associate Dean Susan Zaeske led discussion, noting that this review was conducted not only to complete the regularly scheduled review of programs that had been in the Department of Classics, but that it also satisfied the expectation that programs in departments that have recently been restructured must be reviewed. The review was initially scheduled to begin in 2015-16; however, at that time the department petitioned for permission to review the undergraduate and graduate programs separately, beginning with the undergraduate program.
That review was completed in February 2017. This delay afforded the graduate program slightly more time to acclimate to the conditions of the still-new departmental structure, and for faculty engaged in the process to address the APC and Graduate School expectation that students who are working to complete their programs during restructuring transitions are served well, and have access to the support they need to succeed in their studies. Both the review committee and the Academic Planning Council found that the self-study prepared for this review more than adequately addressed those concerns. The self-study provides a historical overview of the merger process, its impact on current programs and programs that were retired as the academic structure was revised to reflect new opportunities that arrived with new faculty, and strategies used to maintain areas where the programs in Classics and in Hebrew Bible are linked but distinct – and that both programs are rigorous, useful, and produce graduates who often go on to hold positions appropriate to their training and career aspirations. The APC thought the review committee offered good advice that can lead to action and improvement. Overall, the consensus was that this review was well-conducted, and members expressed the hope that you and your colleagues found it to be useful.

In short, the review committee and APC found that the CANES masters and doctoral programs are strong. The programs offer rigorous training in languages, literature, and material culture. Applications are strong, admissions are strong, and students progress in a timely way toward completion of their degrees. Procedures for assessing student learning call upon direct measures and the information is used to inform changes to courses and requirements (as indicated by the program changes proposed in the self-study). The committee found graduate student morale to be good, with students reporting that faculty are accessible and students are mentored well. The review committee offered suggestions (already under discussion by the department) regarding how best to strengthen department-wide communications about professional development.

Much of the review committee report focuses on the integration of the two options within the broader vision of the CANES graduate program. We suspect this attention was due to the relatively recent merger, and to the department’s ongoing (and diligent) efforts to chart new territory and new scholarly opportunities presented by bringing together Classics with ancient biblical studies. It is evident that the department has been working to integrate the two options in terms of curriculum, culture, and faculty hiring; however, differences are also found in curriculum, timelines for completion, and professional aspirations of students. Both committee and APC counsel that such differences are not unreasonable: the department may find that you need to balance the desire to weave the two programs together against students’ desires to affiliate with those who share their professional aspirations. There will undoubtedly be some benefit to cross-fertilization of ideas, but there is likely no need to force complete conformity as long as students and programs are treated equitably. The review committee also offered a number of specific recommendations, with which the APC agreed.

Finally, I will note that in the time since this review was conducted, the number of faculty in the Hebrew Bible area has declined, and CANES may be at a crossroads, deciding whether to seek permission to replace faculty to support a distinct option in Hebrew Bible, or work to develop a more integrated program, investing limited resources in areas that bridge the traditional Classics programs and the study of the broader region. Dean Zaeske and I have
encouraged you and your colleagues to have thoughtful discussions about whether to invest in areas of current strength, to rebuild in Hebrew Bible (and if so, to seek external consultation to build an excellent, cutting-edge Hebrew Bible graduate program), while at the same time, strengthen CANES, which is a central part of the liberal arts at UW-Madison.

The L&S APC approved a motion to consider the review of the master’s and doctoral program complete, though more work will be done with respect to planning for the future (including, if necessary, pausing admission to the Hebrew Bible programs) and further developing program revisions (as noted in the Self-Study, attachment 9).

Finally, we are reminded that CANES also stewards a number of doctoral minors in Classics, Greek, Hebrew Bible, and Latin. Of these, the minor in Hebrew Bible has not been conferred since 2011-12, and its continuation as a program bears scrutiny. Please submit a report on these programs, with an evaluation of whether they are serving a useful purpose and recommendations related to their future, to Associate Deans Zaeske and Klein by October 1, 2018.
Review of the Graduate Programs in Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies (CANES)

Review Committee: Profs. Paula Gottlieb (Chair); Christa Olson; and Jordan D. Rosenblum

Introduction
The study of Classics is central to Western universities, from the structure of colleges to the very nomenclature they employ (we are, after all, *alumni* of our *alma mater*). Academic structures and nomenclature also draw from the biblical corpus. For example, every seventh year faculty may apply for a sabbatical (from the Hebrew *shabbat*, and based on the biblical notion of a seventh year agricultural rest). The study of these languages, literature, and cultures would therefore seem vital to a reflexive and engaged university.

With the recent merger, the newly formed Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies (CANES) has just begun to find its footing. A result of various administrative and intellectual convergences, the graduate program has finally reached the point where more overlap between Classics and Hebrew Bible amongst both faculty and graduate students is beginning to occur. While our committee was tasked with reviewing the graduate program, we often found that it was difficult to evaluate a program that has only existed for a few years. Therefore, our review is based on our impression on where things stand and, more importantly, on raising some resolvable issues that came up on several of our meetings.

Process
The committee read the CANES Self Study and then met in order to formulate a plan. We identified areas of interest and discussed how best to conduct our review. We decided to meet with the chair of CANES, Prof. William Aylward, at the end of the interview process, so as to allow for follow-up questions and immediate reflections to pass in both directions (between the committee and the department, and vice versa). We were fortunate to meet with most of the CANES faculty, including two previous department chairs and the Directors of Graduate Study for both the Classics and Hebrew Bible options (Profs. Alex Dressler and Jeremy Hutton, respectively). In addition, we conducted a one-hour listening session with graduate students, which was attended by fourteen graduate students (11 in the Classics option and 3 in Hebrew Bible, together representing over half of the approximately twenty-four graduate students currently enrolled). We also met with Toni Landis, the Academic Advisor for CANES. The committee then divided up the writing responsibilities and edited the report as a team.

Meeting Schedule
Tuesday, January 30
10:00am Prof. Jim McKeown
10:30am Prof. Nandini Pandey
11:00am Graduate Student listening session
2:00pm Prof. Jeremy Hutton, DGS for Hebrew Bible option
2:30pm Prof. Will Brockliss
3:00pm Toni Landis, Advisor
3:30pm Prof. Grant Nelsestuen

Thursday, February 1
12:00pm Prof. Alice Mandell
12:30pm Prof. Alex Dressler, DGS for Classics option
Sections
Over the course of our interviews, three main themes emerged: (1) issues related to the ongoing integration of the department; (2) issues related to communication; and (3) issues related to the curriculum. Therefore, we devote the bulk of this review to discussing these three important themes.

Integration
The ongoing project of integrating what were once completely separate graduate programs in Classics and Hebrew Bible was a major topic of conversation during the review. While during the Fall 2016 review of the undergraduate program plans for integration were largely aspirational and abstract (reasonable, given how recent the merger was at that point), this review found the CANES graduate programs in the midst of implementation. There are still many questions remaining and logistical challenges to untangle, but the committee found that the department is taking concrete steps to coordinate their two named options while also increasingly aware of where such integration will be effective and where it would be counter-productive. Graduate students, faculty, and staff agreed that the CANES graduate seminar, offered for the first time in Spring 2017, was a definite success and represented the sort of integration that was both desirable and necessary. All groups also agreed that some amount of greater coordination in the curricula of the two programs—especially in terms of labor expectations and timeline—would be ideal. At the same time, they asserted that the content of the two curricula likely should not be substantially more integrated given the different expertise, training, and professional expectations of the two fields they serve. The review committee felt that this position was reasonable and realistic. Faculty and students also expressed both concern and realism about social integration and shared professional development between the two programs. Both groups likewise raised concerns about how the integration related to and complicated the department’s TA needs. All expressed excitement about the possibility of a “CANES” faculty hire that would bridge the two programs. We treat each of the foregoing (bolded) points in more detail below.

The CANES seminar:
The CANES advanced seminar in theory and methodology is required of all third-year graduate students. The seminar provides an opportunity for classicists and those studying Near Eastern Studies to work together. According to the graduate students themselves, the inaugural seminar which was led by Prof. Jeremy Hutton of Hebrew Bible was a great success. Theory and methodology are important in both Classical and Near Eastern Studies, and the students appreciated learning more about the theory and methodology suited to their own studies as well as to others. We highly recommend that this seminar continue.

Curricular Coordination:
The Directors of Graduate Study for Hebrew Bible and Classics have prepared a plan (see Attachment 9 of the self-study) for coordinating the two graduate named options without collapsing their significant disciplinary differences. The goal of this plan is to simplify logistical oversight and provide clarity for students and faculty, and the committee believes it is a reasonable plan. It recognizes—appropriately, the committee believes—that the two named options need to maintain their distinct identities in terms of most coursework (with the CANES seminar being a key exception), preliminary exams, and dissertation. However, closer coordination in terms of
coursework timelines and course numbers/types will improve clarity and efficiency. The committee urges implementation of the plan.

Social Integration and Shared Professional Development
Graduate students and faculty all acknowledged that it has been difficult to create full social integration between students in the two named options. Despite desire and significant effort on the part of some members of the faculty (who have even spent their own money to host events), the Hebrew Bible and Classics programs typically draw different populations whose life circumstances make it difficult for them to socialize. Especially given that the department seems increasingly likely to recruit graduate students whose interests cross the Classical and Ancient Near Eastern areas, the committee applauds the effort to provide students with opportunities to engage with their peers and recommends that the department make reasonable investments in it (so that faculty are not funding these events themselves). The committee also recognizes, however, that complete social integration of students in the two named options is unlikely and that having some social distinction between the two groups of students does not necessarily stand in the way of having a healthy department climate. Graduate students seemed to feel happy with the social opportunities available to them and did not express any tension between students in the two named options (n.b. the Hebrew Bible program tends to be predominantly male and we did not meet with any of the female students in the program, so cannot speak to their experiences in this regard).

Integrating professional development poses a more complex problem for the department. As the Self Study notes, before the merger, the Hebrew Bible and Classics programs had distinct approaches to professional development, with Classics offering periodic professional development workshops and Hebrew Bible holding a weekly ‘tea’ in which professional development matters were frequently discussed. In the past year, the department has initiated regular, semi-mandatory, cross-program professional development meetings which sometimes feature career/professionalism topics, sometimes student presentations, and sometimes outside speakers. Graduate students raised three concerns about the series: that its nature as semi-mandatory was ambiguous but enforced strictly (students who missed had been called to account by their mentors), that it was a significant burden on their already heavily scheduled days, and it was hard to offer topics and guidance equally appropriate to students in both of the named options. Faculty acknowledged that the professional development series needed revision, recognizing that having made it mandatory had increased student resistance. We encourage the faculty to continue looking for effective approaches to graduate student professional development and to engage graduate students in the process of determining what will serve them best.

TA needs in a Changing Department:
Faculty noted that because most TA position are in language teaching, there can be a disconnect between existing TA positions and the language capacities of the available TAs. At the moment, only one of the graduate students is equipped to TA courses, especially language courses, outside their main field of study. This is likely to change as more students apply to the program who fit the “CANES” profile and so might be qualified to teach language classes across Classical and Near Eastern Studies. We encourage the admissions committee in their endeavors to recruit such applicants.

“CANES” Faculty Hire:
Several faculty mentioned that the department is in conversation with the Dean about the possibility of hiring a new faculty member who would be able to bridge the two graduate options and provide
support to the thinly stretched faculty in Hebrew Bible. The members of the review committee feel that the plan has significant merit, shows the department’s commitment to both the merger and the success of their graduate students, and is a smart move for the future of the department. We wholeheartedly support it.

Communication

When the review committee met with graduate students, the students expressed significant appreciation for program faculty and for the training they received. They identified the program as collegial and noted that when they ask for advice or mentoring from the faculty it is generously given. The primary concerns that they raised were about proactive mentoring and overall communication, which the committee found to be related concerns.

Students, especially but not exclusively students in Classics, felt that they were often responsible for seeking out the information they needed to make progress in their degree programs and develop professional skills. They noted that in the early years of coursework they did not receive consistent, proactive mentoring and often did not know who to approach with their questions (both administrative and professional). Because of that, they frequently only received guidance on matters they knew to ask about and only discovered belatedly when there were questions they should have been asking. With regard to the Classics option’s rather substantial and intricate exams process, students suggested that they often felt they were finding out requirements and gathering resources on the fly rather than knowing expectations in advance. In addition, graduate students acknowledged the difficult academic job market facing them and requested more guidance and resources related to alt-ac and non-academic positions. They felt that the department provided some support in this regard but that it often felt like an after-thought or like a non-preferred option, which made it difficult for them to feel comfortable pursuing those options. Finally, graduate students expressed confusion about the process for assigning TA-ships. Because the faculty meet as a large group to determine assignments and there are so many varied types and levels of TA positions, students were unsure who to approach with questions about their assignments and how to prepare themselves to receive the assignments they hoped for. They felt that the initial request process was clear but that the assignment process sometimes seemed arbitrary. For the most part, the faculty we spoke with subsequently recognized the concerns that had been raised and expressed interest in solving them.

The committee feels that the planned revisions to the curriculum and the coordination plan for the graduate programs outlined in Attachment 9 of the Self Study will aid in addressing graduate student concerns about communication related to the curriculum and exams process. Likewise, Prof. Aylward’s plans for moving all department TA positions to 50% will eliminate the concern graduate students raised about varying levels of TA-ships. However, the committee also recommends three changes to improve communication in the department and address graduate student concerns about limited information. First, we recommend that the department institute a mentoring system for incoming graduate students, such that they are each matched with a specific faculty member from their first days on campus. Such a system will encourage more proactive mentoring and will provide early-career students with a point person to contact about concerns. Second, based on conversations with Toni Landis, we recommend that the department establish a pattern of department-wide communication—perhaps a weekly e-mail or other newsletter—that will announce upcoming deadlines, link to campus resources, and (at the beginning of each year) remind students of which faculty and staff are responsible for different areas of the program and department. Third, we recommend that faculty continue their conversations about how best to prepare their graduate students for a changing (and contracting) job market, make concrete changes in curriculum,
professional development, and mentoring to respond to those market realities, and engage graduate students in the conversation in ways that value academic, alt-ac, and non-ac trajectories.

Curriculum
The two options of Classics and Near Eastern Studies give rise to two curricula for the Ph.D. with separate timelines. Graduate students taking the Classics option take 4 years to complete coursework, while those taking the Near Eastern Studies option take 3 years. Both options provide rigorous training in the appropriate languages, literature, and material culture so that the students are well prepared for an academic career in either discipline, whether or not they decide to continue along that track. The students are also trained to be accomplished teachers. The Classics program is particularly demanding. We were impressed that those accepted for the Classics Ph.D. program all managed to complete their Ph.D.s on time, given the requirements of their program.

In our discussions with graduate students and faculty, concerns were expressed on the Classics side about the lack of coordination between coursework and prelim exams, and the fact that the lists of reading for prelims may be outdated, especially when the secondary literature in Classics is increasing exponentially by the day. Many faculty and graduate students were unhappy about the present situation, where there is only one Classics graduate seminar a year and other courses have both undergraduate and graduate students, which is unsatisfactory for both, as well as for their professors. Concerns were also expressed about the role of the present history requirement.

Until now, professors have been expected to meet with students about prelims and other matters outside courses, as an overload. This work outside courses has also been a burden on the students. We therefore recommend that work for prelims be integrated with coursework and that a new process for creating lists of readings be instituted. This would in no way dilute the rigor and high standards of the Classics option, but would make the program more streamlined. Again, we agree with members of the department who think that the present organization of graduate seminars and other courses should be reassessed. Finally, while faculty often expressed the view that there should be more cooperation between the CANES and History Departments, there was a consensus, with which we agree, that whatever history is required of Classics graduate students should be relevant to their main studies, for example a general course covering the main events in Greek and Roman history, or a seminar in the History Department related to their particular interests.

Classical and Near Eastern Studies have a pivotal role in the Humanities. The department has various levels of affiliation with Jewish Studies, Religious Studies, History, Art History, Philosophy and Political Science. Graduate students take seminars and may be supervised by affiliated faculty in these departments. More flexibility in the Ph.D. program might enable further interaction between these departments to the benefit of the Graduate students.

We are pleased to see that the two Directors of Graduate Studies, Prof. Alex Dressler in Classics and Prof. Jeremy Hutton in Hebrew Bible, have already been working together on a plan to streamline the program and faculty duties, to increase flexibility, and to synchronize the timelines of the two options in CANES. See attachment 9 of the CANES self-study. The ideas presented there look very promising, and, from our discussions with faculty and graduates, we see that there is definitely the will to implement them.
Master of Arts in Biblical Languages:
CANES has proposed the creation of the Master of Arts in Biblical Languages (MABL). In their self-assessment, they framed this degree as differentiating itself from the Master of Divinity (MDiv) degrees offered at divinity schools. However, several of the top divinity schools (e.g., Harvard, Yale, and Chicago Divinity Schools) already offer degrees that fulfill this role (e.g., the Master of Arts in Religion, the Mater of Theological Studies, or the Master of Arts). In our conversation with relevant faculty, however, it became apparent that they had imagined a slightly different niche market than they included in their report. They felt that there was a need for a rigorous MA program for those students who either were not (yet) competitive for these top programs or who attended small, confessional schools and wanted a secular degree to increase chances of admission to top PhD programs. We suggest that they work to better articulate this focus, as we found their verbal description far more compelling than their written description. The committee agrees that the vision the faculty described in our meetings has potential for bringing in students, increasing Biblical Hebrew enrollment, and offering a degree that provides real value to graduate students.

Conclusion
All stakeholders expressed a willingness to work together and an excitement about the future. Everyone with whom we spoke felt that the integration is generally going well and that excellent progress is being made to improve the newly-formed unit. There were some specific comments about areas of concern, but none were grave. Indeed, what emerged is a picture of a unit that has many strengths, and has clear plans to reinforce strengths and address areas of concern.

In this report, we offer some observations and concrete suggestions. The committee believes that CANES has a plan to chart a successful path towards fuller integration and increased efficiency. As they continue to work together, the graduate program will go from strength to strength.

Committee Recommendations:

Integration:
The review committee acknowledges the good work and future plans for integrating the two named options within the CANES graduate program and recommends that the department commit the time and resources necessary to implement the changes already on the table and establish buy-in across the faculty.

Communication:
As noted above, the review committee recommends,
1) That the department institute a mentoring system for incoming graduate students to encourage more proactive mentoring
2) That the department establish a pattern of department-wide communication to share important program information clearly and consistently.
3) That the program continue to discuss, make concrete changes regarding, and engage graduate students in conversation regarding academic, alt-ac, and non-ac career trajectories.

Curriculum:
The review committee recommends,
1) That coursework and exams in the Classics named option be more closely coordinated to improve learning reduce uncompensated demands on faculty and students
2) That the history exam be replaced with a more intellectually generative means of ensuring Classics students’ historical knowledge that does not rely on faculty overloads or cede responsibility for program evaluation to another department.