UW-Madison University Academic Planning Council
Minutes of April 17, 2014 meeting

Members Present: Aldag, Blair, Cadwallader (arrived at 4:00), Chen (arrived at 3:40), Dunek, Eriksson, Fair, Howard, Oakley, Shokler, Thelen, Olson (chair),

Members Excused: Blank, DeLuca (chair), Scholz, Seidenberg,

Others: E. Klein, J. Milner, M. Young, S. Schroeder, J.Hardin, S. Owczarek, P. Gonsiska, E. Wilcots, J. Batzli

1. Welcome, introductions, opening announcements.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Automatic Consent – Minutes of the March 27, 2014, meeting. UAPC Doc 2014.04.17.01

3. Automatic Consent – Revise the admission requirements for the MS-Business: Real Estate and Urban Land Economics, option Global Real Estate Masters, in the School of Business. This program, known as GREM, has had an unconventional admissions process in which it partners with specific international universities. The proposal is to broaden admissions to students from a wide array of universities. This proposal was approved at the April 11, 2014, Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) meeting. Program reviews are up to date. UAPC Doc 2014.04.17.02

4. Automatic Consent – Rename the MS-Conservation Biology and Sustainable Development to MS-Environmental Conservation. The program is housed in the Nelson Institute. This proposal was approved at the April 11, 2014, Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) meeting. Program reviews are up to date; the MS-CBSD was last reviewed in 2008-09. UAPC Doc 2014.04.17.03

5. Automatic Consent - Rename the Certificate in Type 2 Translational Research to the Certificate in Clinical and Community Outcomes Research. The program is housed in the Institute for Clinical and Translational Research (ICTR) in the School of Medicine and Public Health. This name change applies to both the capstone and the graduate/professional version of the certificate. The certificate was established in 2009-10 and is due for review in 2014-15. The certificate is low-enrollment; it has been awarded to only five students in both versions since it was implemented. This proposal was approved at the April 11, 2014, Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) meeting. UAPC Doc 2014.04.17.04

6. Automatic Consent – Establish a new named option in the MS-Statistics program, option: Data Science. The program is housed in the Department of Statistics, College of Letters & Science. Instruction in the program will be predominately face-to-face. This will be a program-revenue program under the Educational Innovations guidelines. Program review is up to date: the Statistics programs were reviewed in 2010-11. This proposal was approved at the April 11, 2014, Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) meeting. UAPC Doc 2014.04.17.05
Motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Approved unanimously.

APPROVAL ITEMS

7. Formally recognize the Biology Core Curriculum course sequence (known as Biocore) as an honors program and establish accompanying transcript text, “Biology Core Curriculum Honors.” Presenters: Sissel Schroeder, director, L&S Honors Program; Jeff Hardin, director, Biocore. This discussions continues consideration of this topic started at the March UAPC meeting. Attachments include the original proposal UAPC Doc 2014.04.17.06, additional summary information from Prof. Schroeder UAPC Doc 2014.04.17.07, and summary information about honors programs taken from the Provost’s Office web site UAPC Doc 2014.04.17.08.

Prof. Schroeder opened her comments with a description of her research in the University Archives to determine if status of an honors program has been approved for Biocore in the past given that Biocore is widely understood to be an honors program. She described to Council a document written by Kelly Clifton, chair of the committee that created the Biocore program recollecting that at the time that Biocore was established in the 1960’s the Biocore courses were designated as honors courses. Additional information was provided about honors programs and the Biocore program.

Scott Owczarek, University Registrar, was invited into the conversation. He explained that establishing Biocore as and honors program raises a number of questions related to implementation that may also have policy considerations. He asked if this action would require that text be added to the transcript on admission to Biocore Honors and program representatives conferred this would be expected. Program representatives also agreed that they would establish a withdrawal process and a process for identifying students who had completed Biocore honors. Biocore representatives noted that completion would occur upon completion of the course sequence and degree completion, not just upon completion of the Biocore sequence. There was also confirmation that Biocore honors is not considered degree honors, and will be only be recorded on the transcript, and not associated with the degree. Questions about how progress to Biocore honors completion would be tracked were raised and program representatives agreed that it would be tracked in the degree audit system (DARS) as are other honors programs, recognizing this will require coordination across every school and college that enrolls undergraduates who take Biocore. Mr. Owczarek explained that there may be other implementation considerations that will need to be addressed and Council generally agreed that standard practices should be applied to this implementation.

Moved: Formally recognize the Biology Core Curriculum course sequence (known as Biocore) as an honors program and establish accompanying transcript text, “Biology Core Curriculum Honors.” (Erickson), Seconded (Blair) Approved unanimously.

Mr. Owczarek added that in preparation for this UAPC meeting he and colleagues had reviewed the Biocore proposal and associated materials for matters related to implementation and any possible unforeseen policy issues. They had considered a range of administrative aspects of honors (entering transcript notations, auditing completion of requirements, course
set up etc.). In the course of this review they had concluded that the existing practices related to tracking students in honors programs are inefficient, confusing, lack clear definitions and consistent procedures, and in some areas involve practices that are not in keeping with sound policies for student record keeping. For example, there is a notation when a student enters an honors program but no notation if a student withdraws from honors. After discussion the sense of Council was to agree that there are enough of these issues that they should be explored in more depth under the direction of Scott Owczarek and Jocelyn Milner. They were directed to bring any policy issues that arise, including any issues related to transcript changes or transcript text, be brought back to the UAPC for consideration.


In 2012 the UAPC approved a new set of guidelines for certificates and they were implemented over the past two years. During implementation it became clear that there was language in the guidelines that didn’t convey the intended meaning. Consequently the administrative revisions attempt to add clarity without changing the intent of the guidelines.

The proposed revisions clarify that the certificate owner is responsible for notifying the Office of the Registrar when students have completed the certificate requirements. There continue to be programs who are unwilling to accept this responsibility and some of the certificates with few or no awards are in this category. The revision attempts to make it clearer that this communication role is a program faculty/staff requirement.

Council members asked questions about automating this process. While that is an intended direction, there are resource constraints currently and this is a definite direction for the future.

Certificates do have infrastructure needs for support and the 2012 guidelines highlight those needs. One time to take a close look at certificates is at the time they are proposed. The other time is at the time of program review, five years after a program is newly implemented and on a 10 year cycle thereafter. Certificates that are awarded fewer than five times in five years also receive a request for review.

Questions were raised about whether enough advising and other resources are being provided to support certificate programs. In discussion Council noted that the number of awards is an indication of whether the proper infrastructure and resources is present. Council also could take the opportunity to ask probing questions at the time a certificate proposal is presented.

Succession planning was noted as a topic that may be a consideration and Council members asked that it be specifically noted in the Governance sections and that proposals should include an explicit succession plan.

In discussion questions were also raised about how faculty and staff who are in charge of certificates know who to contact about students issues. Milner explained that the resources are still being developed but there are more “how-to” materials available for faculty and staff. Both APIR and the Registrar’s Office have developed more support resources over the past few years. This is an ongoing work in progress.
A recommendation was made to duplicate text about international students in Capstone certificates being full-time at points where admission processes were referenced.

Moved to approve the administrative revisions of the certificate guidelines with recommended revisions (Fair), Seconded (Eriksson). Approved unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEMS


Discussion of this topic was postponed until the May meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10pm.