JOINT L&S and CALS portion of the meeting:
1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Action and Discussion Items  a. Zoology Name Change (1st review). EW led discussion. He noted the name Zoology is obsolete and confusing to students. It also does not align with the teaching and research missions of the current department, which is far beyond animal biology. In addition to fielding the Zoology major, the department serves as the departmental home and works with the program committees for the Neurobiology, Molecular Biology and Biology majors. If the proposed name “Integrative Biology” is approved, the department would be known colloquially as “iBio.” KVB noted that CALS departments would be consulted prior to the next joint L&S and CALS APC meeting. In response to a question of whether the proposal is a precursor to a potential merger of Zoology and Botany, KS responded that the departments are not currently discussing a merger. Members discussed the structure and naming conventions of biology departments at peer institutions; one member asked whether the size of the department is large enough for such a broad name. EW observed that many L&S departments are significantly smaller than their peers; however, those peer campuses may not have a separate CALS unit. He added that it has been a challenge to identify a better label for the department, given the broad curricular and research mission of the department – and that such broad names are not uncommon in L&S. Narrower labels, or more descriptive labels that enumerate subsections and research interests, may omit important areas of study. Finally, members wondered about curricular implications for students, and were informed that at this time, no curricular changes (including changes to program names) are being considered for the Zoology programs. In the future, there is a potential for the Zoology undergraduate major to more narrowly focus on animal
biology, given its current overlap with the Biology major. Further discussion of this topic was deferred to the individual sessions following this joint discussion.

b. LA/URPL Merger Proposal (1st review) – Guests: Ken Genskow, John Harrington, Sam Dennis Representatives from Urban and Regional Planning and Landscape Architecture provided information about their work to date planning a potential merger. Their goal has been to create long term opportunities for the future department, and develop a stronger program overall. The proposal to create a new “Department of Planning and Landscape Architecture,” to be housed in L&S, has unanimous approval of both departments. They noted that this change echoes a trend for these disciplines to merge, and reflects the synergies between them. In conversation, council members inquired about: L&S experience working with UW Extension staff (URPL already has such staff, so this would not be new to the college); if the proposed name is appropriate (though modifiers like “regional,” “urban,” or “environmental are often used, it is not unusual to see the more general term); and curricular implications (as with other departmental mergers, academic planning will follow the administrative changes, so there will be no immediate changes). KG and JH noted that both departments have accredited programs that must continue to align with accreditation guidelines; however, there will be new opportunities to collaborate and share courses. EMK noted this proposed merger will be more complex than most, because an undergraduate major and accredited degrees will move; and faculty will move tenure lines across colleges. If approved, L&S and CALS administration will work together and with the departments to ensure that the merger is carefully implemented.

c. Development PhD Review (2nd review for CALS, 1st review for L&S) – Guests: Michel Wattiaux, Jeremy Foltz. JF noted the program is both interdisciplinary and intercollege, with 8-10 students at any given time, and 1-2 students graduating per year. Ten faculty from across 4 colleges are involved with the program. SP summarized some questions from the CALS first review, including concerns that the program is being referred to as “Development Studies,” when the approved name is “Development.” CALS members asked about the current state of resources and administrative home of the program. JF noted that the program is administered in AAE, which has been very successful, though future program chairs program could be from any departments and the home could shift, there is no compelling reason to change. EMK noted that from the L&S perspective,
interdisciplinary programs are best situated when they have a permanent administrative home. JF also spoke of the unique nature of the program and its students: there are no academic jobs in this field in the U.S.; students are primarily international students who are preparing for academic or administrative positions in their home country. In response to members’ questions about funding, JF noted that, due to changes in funding sources (which once supported these students quite well), current funding is often piecemeal. Nevertheless, students’ advisors are committed to and successful in helping students find funding.

The L&S APC approved the motion to accept the program review as complete, and advised the chair to undergo the process for a formal name change. (The CALS APC approved an identical motion.)

3. Informational Items a. Biocore Honors Designation on Transcripts. EMK reminded the councils that Biocore is an approved Honors Program, and students in L&S and CALS who complete specific requirements may have an Honors designation appear on their transcripts. Since students outside L&S and CALS also enroll in Biocore, the program has asked other schools to signal whether or not they wish to allow their students formally to participate and earn the designation. This item may need to come before the APCs for action.

Joint meeting adjourned 2:35 pm.

L&S APC SESSION (1220AB DeLuca Biochemical Sciences)

Further L&S discussion: Zoology name change. Members agreed that Zoology urgently needs a new name. They discussed the structure of biological science departments on this campus, and whether the proposed name aligns with that structure. Members expressed some concern that the proposed name might encroach on other departments’ specialties; however, they acknowledged that only a broad label could adequately capture the current breadth of study in which the Zoology faculty are engaged. They also noted that many biological science departments on campus are narrowly focused, whereas Zoology has always been a broadly conceived field – and this structure has a very long history at UW-Madison. Members agreed that structure of our campus’ biological sciences is
unlikely to change in the foreseeable future; consideration of this proposal should not be postponed until it does.

1. Announcements and Informational Items
   a. Updates on Prior APC Action JKS noted that several L&S items had been approved at the October UAPC meeting, and others are scheduled for the December meeting. b. L&S Senate meeting held on November 14 went well, and with all reports accepted.

2. Consent Agenda
   a. Approval of notes – October 18, 2016 b. Request for Comment on New Programs – UW System: Bachelor of Science in Applied Computing, UW-Extension et al. c. Request to Discontinue Low/No Enrollment Program: Social Work PhD Minor (GMIN 918) . The consent agenda was approved.

3. Academic Program Review
   a. Background: Policy on Five-Year Review of New Programs. EMK provided an overview of UW-Madison policy on program review, which mandates review 5 years after new programs are implemented. These reviews focus on whether the program is meeting its goals and whether it needs to make improvements. The UAPC convenes the faculty review committee, which submits a report with a recommendation about continuation of the program to the UAPC. b. Five-Year Review: BA/BS Environmental Studies EW led discussion. This program is unique in that it was created to be a ‘second major’ that students complete with a major in another discipline. The review monitors its student demographics closely, and should be commended for success in recruiting underrepresented students. Learning outcomes are well defined, and seem to be serving students well. Committee members were impressed by strengths articulated in the program review, in particular of the coherence and the commitment of faculty to the program across departments. Members strongly endorsed continuation of the program. They spent some time discussing the budget concerns presented in the review, but made no recommendations, though they were quite sympathetic to the challenges inherent in the current budget climate. Members unanimously approved the motion to accept the report as complete.

Meeting adjourned at 3:25 pm
Notes submitted by Kimbrin Cornelius, L&S Administration