Minutes of the meeting of March 14, 2014
67 Bascom Hall

Present: Bohnhoff, Brighouse (departed 2:15), Brown (departed 1:10), Green, Ingham, Marker, Miller, Murphy, Taylor, Wilkerson (arrived at 1:00)

Absent: Seidenberg, Rahko

1. The meeting began at: 12:31 pm
2. The minutes of the February 14, 2014 meeting were approved.
3. Motion by Ingham, second by Miller to approve all course proposals. Votes are recorded following each agenda item.

Summary of actions:
- Proposals in items 1,2,10,11 were deferred
- All other course proposals were approved

General Business

A. Discussion of proposed policy for a graduate course attribute

Guests: Kelly Haslam, Assistant Dean for Academic Assessment and Funding, Graduate School
Wendy Crone, Associate Dean for Graduate Education, Graduate School

- Discuss criteria outlined in memo for courses numbered 300 – 699 that may have the graduate course attribute and count toward the graduate level coursework requirement
- Discuss process for approving courses already in existence that request the attribute.

W. Crone provided background about the graduate program policy changes that were approved in the fall 2014. She and K. Haslam discussed with various administrative units how to define and monitor graduate work in order to operationalize the requirement that 50% of graduate program credits be from courses that are designed for graduate level work. They decided that the best long term solution was creation of a graduate course attribute and they came to present a proposal for its creation. They based the proposal on information and recommendations from UW-Madison departments and administrative units as well as existing policy at Michigan, Penn State and in particular, Illinois.

Graduate programs are currently reviewing courses to determine what they consider to be in line with the criteria established by GFEC. B. Ingham asked a question about courses that have undergraduates and graduate students sitting in the same lecture and receiving the same information. Where does the difference lie? W. Crone explained that this is in line with current policy; the idea is that the instructor may require different work outside the classroom and hold them to different requirements and expectations when assessing their work. G. Green asked if this will all of this be articulated in the syllabus. We don’t know how instructors will choose to
do this in practice. One option might be to have two Learn@UW sites with the different requirements or there could also be separate syllabus.

D. Miller said that often when advising graduate students he bars them from taking courses below the 500-level, why isn’t this the policy? Some programs are more restrictive than others, what we are doing with this policy is setting a minimum requirement. Across campus course numbering has been handled very differently. Renumbering courses is an option but when initially discussed as a solution it was decided that this would be a very time consuming and cumbersome process.

R. Murphy suggested that the UCC may want to consider recommending that new courses use numbers 500 or above for graduate courses. We may want to put an item on the agenda for next month to discuss this idea.

P. Brown said that students take 300 – 699 numbered courses for all kinds of reasons, not expecting to get graduate credit for them – they just need to develop a background in the field. How will this use of sub 700 courses be indicated? Once a grad attribute has been assigned to a course all graduate students taking that course will be assessed at the grad level whether they are taking the course for basic background knowledge vs. as a part of their 50% graduate level coursework requirement. If the regular use of the course is just to provide basic background knowledge for graduate students it might not carry the grad attribute even if graduate students enroll in it regularly.

D. Bohnhoff suggested that something we will want to look at in the future is how the syllabus articulates the different assessment etc. for graduate students.

To close out the discussion W. Crone asked the committee to review the document and make alterations as needed and vote to adopt the policy. The committee must also consider implementation guidelines. The issues will be formally considered and voted on at the April University Curriculum Committee (UCC) meeting.

J. Taylor requested a vote on whether the committee endorses the idea of having a graduate course attribute.
Motion by: Brighouse, Second: Murphy – unanimous approval.

Course Proposals for Review – Old Business

1. Environmental Studies 973 - Environmental Conservation Leadership Seminar I (Green)
   Previous Action: Deferred - The committee seeks additional clarifying information about the length and depth of the assignments and the rigor of the course content in general. It may be helpful to consider, as these are graduate level courses, what knowledge of the field do these
courses assume and build upon? Please provide more detail about the assignments and the basis for evaluation. Beyond attending the field trips to the Leopold Center and the Crane foundation (which any member of the public could do), what type of instruction and acquisition of knowledge or skill will the student acquire by taking this course? The content of the course needs to justify the awarding of two graduate level academic credits.

Update: Cover memo, revised syllabus, and assignments have been uploaded in response to the University Curriculum Committee's concerns.

Action: Deferred

2. Environmental Studies 974 - Environmental Conservation Leadership Seminar II  (Green)

Previous Action: Deferred- he concerns regarding this course are similar to those for ENVIR ST 973, please refer to comments entered for that course as well. The committee questioned level of rigor for these graduate level courses. Environmental Studies may wish to consider, as one piece of the remedy, combining the two courses and offering them as one course for a minimal number of credits. It will still be necessary however to enhance the level of rigor both in content and with assignments/evaluation.

Update: Cover memo, revised syllabus, and assignments have been uploaded in response to the University Curriculum Committee's concerns

Action: Deferred – both ENVIR ST 973 and 974 will be sent back to the course proposer for further revisions. There are no new instructions regarding revisions but G. Green and J. Taylor will consult with the course proposer and others in the Nelson Institute to clarify the committee’s concerns.

Course Proposals for Review – New Business

3. Cell and Regenerative Biology 800 - Intellectual Property, Patents and Licensing  (Murphy)

Type of Proposal: New Course

Action: Unanimously approved


Type of Proposal: New Course

Action: Unanimously approved

5. Cell and Regenerative Biology 804 - Biotechnology Regulation and Ethics  (Taylor)

Type of Proposal: New Course

Action: Unanimously approved

6. Classics 150 - Ancient Greek and Roman Monsters  (Brighouse)

Type of Proposal: New Course

Action: Unanimously approved
7. Classics 330 - Ancient Epic (Miller)  
   Type of Proposal: New Course  
   Action: Unanimously approved

8. Communication Arts 573 - Rhetoric of Globalization and Transnationalism (Wilkerson)  
   Type of Proposal: New Course  
   Action: Unanimously approved

9. Educational Psychology 533 - Thinking, Feeling, & Learning (Seidenberg)  
   Type of Proposal: New Course  
   Action: Unanimously approved

10. Envir St - Gaylord Nelson Inst 602 - Sustainability in Practice: Capstone (Brown)  
    Type of Proposal: New Course  
    Action: Deferred – Proposal looks fine except for the fact that it is a 3 credit course requiring four hours of lecture and 2 hours of discussion and that is a lot of contact hours for 3 credits. Need to provide an explanation the disparity between credits and contact hours.

    Type of Proposal: New Course  
    Action: Deferred - No differentiation between a 3 and a 4 credit version in the syllabus. It is suggested that they clarify in concrete terms what the difference is between the 3 and 4 credit versions. What additional work is required for the 4th credit? Indicate on the syllabus how time is being spent in each class period.

All course proposals on the consent agenda were approved.

Course Proposals - Consent Agenda

12. Cell and Regenerative Biology 814 - Molecular Technologies I  
    Type of Proposal: Change number, credits

13. Cell and Regenerative Biology 830 - Technology Applications in Early Drug Discovery  
    Type of Proposal: Change title, credits

14. Communication Arts 155 - Introduction to Digital Media Production  
    Type of Proposal: Change prerequisite

15. E Asian Languages & Literature 113 - First Semester Heritage Chinese  
    Type of Proposal: Change number, level

16. E Asian Languages & Literature 114 - Second Semester Heritage Chinese  
    Type of Proposal: Change number, level
17. Spanish (Spanish and Portug) 101 - First Year Spanish  
   Type of Proposal: Change title

18. Spanish (Spanish and Portug) 102 - First Year Spanish  
   Type of Proposal: Change title

19. Envir St - Gaylord Nelson Inst 440 - Environmental Decision-Making  
   Type of Proposal: Discontinue

20. Envir St - Gaylord Nelson Inst 765 - Environmental Monitoring Practicum I  
   Type of Proposal: Discontinue

21. Envir St - Gaylord Nelson Inst 766 - Environmental Monitoring Practicum II  
   Type of Proposal: Discontinue

**General Business**

A. Discussion – Review KnowledgeBase documents related to course proposals  
   With limited time remaining the committee began discussion of the KnowledgeBase documents  
   related to course proposals. The goal is to provide, clear and accurate information regarding policies and practices related to course proposals. There were a number of questions, comments and suggestions some of which are briefly reflected below. A thorough, in person discussion of all items would be extremely time consuming. It was decided that M. Young would create a discussion board and committee members would review the various documents and enter comments on the discussion board. At the April meeting the committee can have a more pointed discussion of recommended changes with the goal of completing the review and approving the documents as policy at the May meeting.

**Grading Systems**  
**Variable Credit Courses**  
- Should there be language somewhere that says that the variable course credit should be explained by different versions or sections of the syllabus?  
- Use of variable credit to award fewer credits to graduate students vs. undergraduates (problem with grad students butting up against max credit enrollment).

**Credits**  
- Doesn’t reflect flipped classrooms, distance etc.  
- Service learning – has been defined  
- Laboratory – does not apply accurately to studio work.  
- Could studio be a separate course component type? (answer: Quite possibly, there are a number of technical issues to address but there is no policy against doing so. It likely would come down to a cost-benefit analysis, what would the value of the new component be? How much technical work would be required to incorporate it into our data systems and reports?)
Syllabus
   - Discussed the information provided on the syllabus regarding how students are evaluated. Is the grading scale the critical piece?

Crosslisting
Selecting a Course Number
Prerequisites
Course Description
Topics Courses
Qualified Instructor

B. Discussion – ASM and graduate student concern regarding “difficulty with last minute exams and haphazard scheduling for courses listed 699 above, which conflicts with the courses below 699.” Related to Faculty Legislation II-105, Summary Period for Academic Semester where clause 5 exempts courses numbered 700 and above from having regularly scheduled exam blocks during the summary period.

   J. Taylor provided background information on the issue. It was determined that no additional action is necessary.

The meeting adjourned at 2:33 pm

Minutes submitted by Michelle Young, APIR