UW-Madison University Academic Planning Council
Minutes of September 19, 2013 meeting

Members Present: Aldag, Blair, DeLuca (chair), Eriksson, Howard, Oakley, Scholz, Seidenberg, Shokler, Thelen

Members Absent: Blank, Cadwallader, Chen, Fair, Dunek

Others: E. Klein, J. Milner, M. Young

1. Welcome, introductions, opening announcements.

DeLuca introduced the purpose of the committee as a chancellor’s level governance committee where the chancellor has delegated leadership to Provost DeLuca. All of the academic planning for the university eventually comes to through the UAPC. The UAPC is responsible for setting policy, taking action on proposals, and carrying out the governance activities. The membership is designed to include representation of key shared governance groups of the university. Provost DeLuca noted that later in the meeting Council would discuss program review and one consequence of the large number of programs is a substantial effort required to maintain program review and program quality. Even so, it’s a priority to resolve the backlog developing in program reviews.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Minutes of the June 25, 2013, meeting. UAPC Doc 2013.09.19.01

   Approved, Automatic Consent.

3. Discontinuation of the Master Administrator Capstone Certificates. The certificate has had no students since 2008 and the School of Education was asked to consider discontinuing the certificate. Action was approved at the September 13, 2013 Graduate Faculty Executive Committee meeting. UAPC Doc 2013.09.19.02

   Approved, Automatic Consent.

APPROVAL ITEMS

There are no approval items for this meeting.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Jocelyn Milner reviewed the set of documents provided for orientation. She asked Council members to keep the program approval overview table for future reference. She explained that when presenters are invited for action items they are directed to give short presentations, although Council could request longer, more formal presentations if they prefer. Although it’s an open meeting, presenters are asked to leave to allow UAPC to discuss the proposal without them present. Many actions come to UAPC as automatic consent items, especially if they have been approved by the GFEC. Automatic consent items can be moved to the regular agenda by request of UAPC members.

Milner noted that the 2012-13 UAPC annual report was scheduled for presentation at the Faculty Senate meeting in October. UAPC annual reports are a summary of the year’s activities as described in the minutes. Because the minutes have been approved the Council does not take a separate vote on the annual report.

In additional discussion, the topic turned to undergraduate progress to degree. Although UW-Madison’s completion rates are strong, there is room for improvement. Provost DeLuca observed that currently a student decides when they are ready to graduate and the university has no requirement that a student be graduated when they have completed the requirements for their degree. This is a topic for future UAPC discussion.


Jocelyn provided an update on program review. She referred to the program review policy and the need for program reviews to cover student experience and student learning; some reviews continue to focus on faculty, research and resources which is appropriate but not the intended focus. While requirements for program review are based in campus policy, program review is also required by the Board of Regents, federal financial aid regulations, and for accreditation.

In 2012-13, 26 reviews covering 39 programs were completed. Given that UW-Madison has approximately 500 academic programs, we need to complete about 50 reviews a year to meet the requirement that each program be reviewed once in a 10-year period.

Jocelyn reviewed the status of reviews in various schools and colleges and efforts some units are making to streamline program review. Provost DeLuca reinforced the need to clear some of the backlog that is developing. Council discussed various strategies. Provost DeLuca noted that he brings the need to complete program reviews to the attention of the deans individually and at the dean’s council meeting. Jocelyn explained that there are a reminders and requests for information sent to dean’s offices. One extreme action would be to hold back on approving proposals related to new programs until reviews are completed. Some Council members wondered if department/program faculty expected to be penalized for negative findings in a review. Other comments noted that program review may be perceived as too big an undertaking by some program faculty. Provost DeLuca noted the value of program review for helping programs be sure they are putting their resources to the best use.

Provost DeLuca asked that the discussion be continued at the October UAPC meeting with a more detailed look at the list of overdue reviews and a discussion of some ideas for clearing the backlog.

Meeting adjourned, 4:41pm