

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Secretary of the Faculty
133 Bascom Hall

**FACULTY SENATE MEETING AGENDA
MATERIALS
for**

3 December 2018

*The University Committee encourages senators to discuss
the agenda with their departmental faculty prior to meeting.*



WISCONSIN
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

**FACULTY SENATE AGENDAS, MINUTES, RECORDINGS,
TRANSCRIPTIONS AND FACULTY DOCUMENTS, INCLUDING FACULTY
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, ARE AVAILABLE:**

secfac.wisc.edu/governance/faculty-senate/

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Monday, December 3 2018 - 3:30 p.m.
272 Bascom Hall

A G E N D A

1. Memorial Resolutions for:
Professor Emeritus Peter Dorner (Faculty Document 2778)
Professor Emeritus Donald Field (Faculty Document 2779)
Professor Emeritus James Nordman (Faculty Document 2780)
Professor Emeritus Melvin Siedband (Faculty Document 2781)
Professor Emeritus Jeffrey Steele (Faculty Document 2782)
2. Announcements/Information Items.
Titling and Total Compensation
Personnel Files and Reference Policies
3. Question Period.
4. Minutes of November 4 (*consent*).
5. Graduate Faculty Executive Committee Annual Report for 2017-2018 (Faculty Document 2784)
6. Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Annual Report for 2016-2018 (Faculty Document 2785)
7. Resolution of Support for Graduate Assistants (Faculty Document 2775) (*vote*)
8. Resolution to Approve Candidate Eligibility for Transitioning UW-Extension Faculty (Faculty Document 2787) (*vote*)
9. Resolution on UW System Draft Policy 102: Section Program Productivity Monitoring (Faculty Document 2788) (*vote*)

Upcoming Faculty Senate Meetings - 3:30 p.m., 272 Bascom Hall
February 4, March 4, April 1, May 6, 2019

**Memorial Resolution of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison
On the Death of Professor Emeritus Peter Paul Dorner**

Professor Emeritus Peter Paul Dorner died on June 4, 2018, at the age of 93. He was born January 13, 1925 and grew up on a small dairy farm near Luxemburg, Wisconsin. After completing elementary school, he continued to work on the family farm instead of attending high school—common for farm boys at that time. In 1944 at age 19, he enlisted in the U.S. Army serving two years as an infantry soldier in the South Pacific. When he returned home after discharge in 1946, he worked again with his parents on the family farm.

The veterans program advisor at the local high school encouraged Pete (as he has always been called by friends and colleagues) to enroll in an On-The-Farm Training Program supported under the GI Bill. While assisting the farm training program, the Luxemburg high school principal discovered Pete's exceptional academic talent and suggested that Pete prepare for the high school equivalency (GED) exams and consider going on to college. While continuing farm work, Pete successfully completed multiple GED correspondence courses and was awarded a high school diploma by Luxemburg Public Schools in May 1948. He was proud that his final English exam was signed by Helen C. White, UW-Madison's well-known professor of English.

In the summer of 1949, Pete traveled to Madison with his high school principal to meet with the dean of the College of Agriculture. The dean agreed to admit Pete under a 'special student' classification. During his first year, Pete earned the highest GPA in the college's freshman class and completed his B.S. degree (majoring in agricultural economics) in three years.

Pete went on to earn a M.S. in agricultural economics in 1953 from the University of Tennessee, where he remained for one year as an assistant professor. He returned to UW-Madison as an assistant professor for two years in the Department of Agricultural Economics teaching farm management to extension agents. That experience, plus his farm background, began to shape his academic thinking reflected in one of his first published papers: *The Farm Problem: A Challenge to Social Invention*. In 1956, he enrolled in the doctoral program in economics at Harvard University under the direction of John Kenneth Galbraith, studying the economic conditions of Native Americans in the American Southwest. He received his Ph.D. in 1959 and returned to the UW-Madison Department of Agricultural Economics as an associate professor. He was promoted to full professor in 1962.

In 1963, Pete was invited by the newly established UW Land Tenure Center (LTC) to organize an LTC research program in Santiago, Chile. He served two years as program director and visiting professor at the University of Chile, directing land tenure and development research and supervising graduate students from Chile and Wisconsin. Upon his return to UW-Madison, he was named LTC director, a post he held from 1965 to 1971, interrupted by a two-year leave of absence (1967-68) to serve as Senior Staff Economist with the President's Council of Economic Advisors. Pete was selected by his colleagues to serve as chair of the Department of Agricultural Economics from 1972-1976.

Pete's primary research and policy focus was on institutional and structural change as part of international economic development. His work began with the Chilean program and later expanded internationally. He fostered a more comprehensive understanding of the structural issues related to land tenure reform, rural employment, land rights of small farm producers, and

the value of collective organization of transportation, marketing and processing. He brought experience from the Wisconsin dairy farm and the study of Native American land rights and applied it to economic development abroad. He published the first book on the role of land reform in economic development titled: *Latin American Land Reforms in Theory and Practice*.

Pete's writing was remarkably clear, comprehensive and easy to understand. His papers and commentaries were in demand by both academics and policy makers. Pete never sold himself as a keynote speaker—he was always modest and humble about his own point of view. But his writing skills and broad experience resulted in regular invitations to serve on international boards and study commissions, often assigned the task of editor.

Pete served for ten years as member of the UN Development Program (UNDP) evaluating land tenure and reform legislation. He was appointed in the 1970s to the FAO Special Committee on Agrarian Reform for which he authored the committee report to the UN General Assembly. He chaired the International Seminar on Resources and Development which resulted in an authored book on natural resources and development. He served as consultant to USAID and the World Bank on projects in Nicaragua, Honduras, Costa Rica, Barbados, the Philippines, Malaysia, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana. He was project director and campus coordinator, 1983-87, of the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities (MUCIA).

In 1980, Pete was named Dean of International Studies and Programs at UW-Madison, reaching the pinnacle of his career. While serving in that capacity for eight years, he expanded his research interests to include the development of new institutions for the advancement of international peace and economic wellbeing.

Pete was a colleague who was fun to be around. He loved life, gardening and music and was a happy gregarious person who cared about others. He loved nothing better than a glass of beer and a songfest. Pete is survived by his wife, Lois (Hartnig) Dorner, and his children: Catherine A. Mathwick (husband, Mark Mathwick), Gregory L. Dorner (wife, Sharon Larson), Paul J. Dorner, Sara J. Lambert (husband, John Becker), and Carolyn R. Dorner.

Professor Dorner retired in 1989 after a long and distinguished record of professional achievements. His research, teaching and writing contributed in many ways to a broader understanding of economic development and greatly expanded the reputation of the University of Wisconsin as a major contributor to international studies. Pete Dorner was a Wisconsin farm boy whose upbringing drove his passion to assist rural people everywhere.

The Memorial Resolution Committee

Richard Barrows
Richard Bishop
Herman Felstehausen
Edward Jesse
Bruce Marion

**Memorial Resolution of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison
On the Death of Professor Emeritus Donald R. Field**

Professor Emeritus Donald Reed Field died on Saturday, April 7th, 2018, at the age of 78. His research and teaching career spanned more than 40 years during which time he founded an interdisciplinary field of study on society and natural resources and focused his research on the social policy and management of parks and protected areas. His work took him to many parts of North America, but his career concluded where it began, in Wisconsin.

Don Field earned B.S. (1963) and M.S. (1965) degrees in Rural Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison before completing a Ph.D. in Rural Sociology and Demography at The Pennsylvania State University in 1968. His first academic appointment was as an Assistant Professor of Rural Sociology at South Dakota State University. He subsequently held academic appointments at the University of Washington (where he was promoted through the ranks to Professor, 1970-83) and at Oregon State University (1983-88). Between 1973-1983, he also served as Chief Scientist and Associate Regional Director of the National Park Service's Pacific Northwest Region. In addition, he served as the agency's first Senior Scientist in Sociology.

Don Field returned to Wisconsin in 1988 as Associate Dean of the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences (CALS) and Director of the School of Natural Resources. As Dean, he also provided academic and administrative leadership for all the social science departments in CALS. In 1998, he joined the Departments of Forestry and Rural Sociology to conduct research and teaching in these disciplines. Following 23 years of outstanding teaching, research and administrative leadership, Don Field retired as Professor Emeritus in 2011. However, he remained active in many societies and professional organizations.

Field's research focused on the relationships among people, parks, natural resources, and rural communities. He studied social-biophysical systems in Alaska and along the Pacific Northwest coast, resource dependent communities in the Midwest and West, and agricultural-wildlife problems in the Midwest. His career interests formed the basis of his instructional program, where at the University of Wisconsin he taught "Social Policy and Management of Parks" and "Social Policy and Recreation Resources Management". The latter course drew upon his professional experiences and associations with the National Park Service, U.S. Forest Service, and various state land management agencies. In addition, he taught the introductory course, entitled "Leisure and Recreation in America," for incoming majors in Recreation Resources Management. Many students benefitted enormously from Don's wisdom and guidance as they prepared to enter careers in academia, natural resource management, public service or other professions.

Don Field's pioneering studies in natural resource sociology were reported in many leading journals and, together with numerous books, book chapters and research monographs, form the foundation for much contemporary work in rural sociology related to human demography and natural resource management. The significance of his contributions is well-documented by the numerous awards he received during the course of his career, including a Fulbright Fellowship to Griffith University in Brisbane, Australia, the U. S. Department of Interior's Meritorious Service Award, the George Hartzog Award from the National Park Service, the Lifetime Achievement Award from the International Association for Society and Natural Resources, the Distinguished Rural Sociologist Award from the Rural Sociological Society, an Outstanding Alumnus Award from Pennsylvania

State University, and election as a Fellow of the Academy of Leisure Sciences. His contributions to sociology and to public service were well-known and appreciated by his colleagues and peers.

Don Field was a leader in the Rural Sociological Society where he served as an elected Council member, Secretary, and Vice-President. He served for six years as co-editor of the recreation resource-based journal *Leisure Sciences*. He was the founder of the International Symposium on Society and Resource Management (ISSRM) after organizing the first symposium in 1986. He continued to play a lead role in nurturing and organizing ISSRM symposia for several decades. In 1988, he founded the journal *Society and Natural Resources* and continued as the journal's co-editor until 2003. He also co-founded a new professional association, the International Association for Society and Natural Resources and served as the IASNR's founding executive director from 2002 until 2005.

Don was a beloved mentor for many students and scholars. He was a prolific photographer and traveled extensively with his wife, Nan Field, who developed children's education resources on wildlife and nature. He will be dearly missed. Many are following the footsteps of his intellectual trails and taking them in new directions.

Memorial Resolution Committee

Raymond Guries, Professor Emeritus, Forest and Wildlife Ecology

Thomas Heberlein, Professor Emeritus, Community and Environmental Sociology

Adena Rissman, Associate Professor, Forest and Wildlife Ecology

**Memorial Resolution of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison
On the Death of Professor Emeritus James Emery Nordman**

James Emery Nordman was a soft-spoken and patient teacher, a talented singer and a creative engineer. Jim was born in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan in Quinnesec on April 27, 1934. He and his wife Clare raised six children in Madison, Princeton, N.J. and Grenoble, France. Jim passed away on November 21, 2017.

Jim graduated from Lincoln High School in 1952, then attended Marquette University, where he graduated in 1957. He later received his Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering from the University of Wisconsin in 1962. At that time, Jim joined the faculty of the Electrical Engineering Department, teaching and mentoring many students until his retirement from the department in 1996. Jim and his graduate students contributed to many research advances in both low-temperature and high-temperature superconductivity. Jim's research was deeply emphasized on "fluxonic" devices based on Josephson junctions and other systems using both low-and-hi-T superconductors. He was commended by Richard J Yesensky, Department of Defense, The Pentagon, for his contributions and paper presentation on superconducting electronics using the flux flow phenomena. Jim was also a member of the technical staff at RCA Laboratories from 1967-1968.

In his retirement, Jim was able to focus on pastimes that brought him great joy, including working on his 1941 Lincoln Zephyr convertible. Jim also enjoyed singing with the choirs at Blessed Sacrament Church and the Choral Union at the University of Wisconsin.

**Memorial Resolution of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison
On the Death of Professor Emeritus Melvin P. Siedband**

Dr. Melvin P. Siedband, Emeritus Professor of Medical Physics and Radiology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, passed away at age 89 on February 1, 2018. Dr. Siedband was born on December 17, 1928. He retired in 1991 after a teaching and research career of almost 40 years.

Professor Siedband received his bachelor's degree in Math from University of Washington in 1951, thence studied at University of Maryland. Later he received his M.S. in Math from Johns Hopkins in 1970 while also working as a professional engineer. However, he was especially proud of his Ph.D. in biophysics from Medical College of Wisconsin, awarded in 1995 when he was 67 years old.

Mel spent many years performing and leading industrial research for Westinghouse and CGR Medical Corporation, a division of Westinghouse. These efforts resulted in several dozen patents in the areas of radar systems, x-ray detection, image formation, and diagnostic radiology. He was especially innovative in developing methods for precise control of the energy and output fluence of x-ray tubes and systems.

Following this successful career in industrial engineering, Mel turned to academics, joining the Department of Radiology (Medical Physics section) as an Associate Professor in 1972. Subsequently Mel was appointed as Professor of Medical Physics and Radiology in 1985. His strong engineering interests led to leadership positions in Biomedical Engineering, Graduate Committee Chairmanship, Director of the UW Biomedical Engineering Center and Chairman of the Biomedical Program during the 1980-1990 period. He played an important role in the development of our medical physics curriculum, serving as instructor during initial offerings of a dedicated course on diagnostic x-ray imaging and developing a laboratory course focused on physics tests to assure quality and safety of clinical x-ray systems. Students were especially appreciative of the direct, hands-on experience with clinical imaging equipment that they gained under Mel's tutelage. Altogether Mel was instructor for 11 different courses in medical physics and in the School of Engineering. The list includes organizing and serving as principal instructor for "Radiological Physics for Residents," a must-take course for physicians who are preparing for board examinations in radiology.

Professor Siedband retired and became Emeritus Professor of Medical Physics and Radiology in 1991. Mel was a registered Professional Engineer and was board certified in Medical Physics by the American Board of Medical Physics.

Professor Siedband was an accomplished mentor. He trained and supervised five postdoctoral fellows, eleven M.S. (BME), and five BME/ECE undergraduates.

Amongst Mel's forty patents, many focused on the pragmatic aspects of diagnostic x-ray imaging, such as image quality, portable energy sources for x-ray machines, and device quality control. Of these several are still in use today. Invariably, they include simple solutions to very complex problems, hence the significant impact on society.

Complimenting his academic impact was Mel's wonderful and ever-present sense of humor. Any casual conversation started with "...and you may have heard the story of..." You were promptly regaled by yet another humorous tale expertly told. Mel was a 38-year active member of

Madison West Rotary Club, serving as President in 1990-91. Thru-out these many years of membership, he could be counted on to deliver a weekly dose of good humor!

Most important to Mel was his family, especially Dottie, his wife of many decades. Dottie preceeded Mel's passing by just a few months, March 2017. Mel is survived by his sons Richard (Carol) and Marc (Debbie) as well as grandsons Elan, David, and Michael, granddaughter Kyla and great-grandson Pasha.

Department of Medical Physics Memorial Resolution Committee

Paul M. DeLuca, Jr., DMP Emeritus Professor

James A. Zagzebski, DMP Emeritus Professor

William Zarnstorff, DMP Emeritus Professor

**Memorial Resolution of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison
On the Death of Professor Emeritus Jeffrey Allen Steele**

Jeffrey Allen Steele age 71 passed away on Saturday May 5, 2018, in Madison.

He was born February 15, 1947, in Berkeley, California where his father was in graduate school at UC-Berkeley. Jeff graduated magna cum laude from Carleton College in 1969 and subsequently earned a master's degree in teaching from Harvard Graduate School of Education in 1971. A man of great conscience, Jeff served two years of alternative service at Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston from 1971 to 1973. Jeff married Jocelyn Carol Riley in Northfield, Minnesota, on September 4, 1971. The two of them traveled in Europe for thirteen months from 1973-1974 on a Thomas J. Watson Travelling Fellowship. Subsequently, Jeff earned an M.A. (1977) and Ph.D. (1981) in English from Harvard University.

Jeff was a popular and committed teacher. He began teaching in the English Department of UW-Madison in 1981 and taught there for thirty-seven years. An entertaining lecturer and nimble discussion leader, he taught a wide range of courses in nineteenth-century American literature and culture. His courses focused not only on canonical literary figures such as Herman Melville, Emily Dickinson, and Henry James, but also, in his signature course on American women writers, lesser known authors whose cultural and literary importance Jeff helped to establish in his scholarship. He especially relished teaching the Introduction to Modern Literature course for students outside the English major and was Director of the Introductory Courses Committee for four years. The University of Wisconsin twice honored him with a Distinguished Teaching Award, including the James R. Underkofler Excellence in Teaching Award, given each year to four teachers in the statewide UW System. As a critic and literary historian, Jeff played a significant role in bringing critical attention and appreciation to women writers who had been long neglected. In particular, he became a leading scholar of Margaret Fuller, Ralph Waldo Emerson's friend and co-editor, who had been almost forgotten. Jeff helped found the Margaret Fuller Society and served as its president for many years. He also served on the Advisory Board for the Society for the Study of American Women Writers. His books include *Unfolding the Mind: The Unconscious in American Romanticism and Literary Theory* (1987), *The Representation of the Self in the American Renaissance* (1987), *The Essential Margaret Fuller* (1992)—a Choice "Outstanding Academic Book"—and *Transfiguring America: Myth, Ideology, and Mourning in Margaret Fuller's Writing* (2001). This last book was praised in *The New England Quarterly* as a "landmark book in Fuller Studies." He published numerous articles on Margaret Fuller and her contemporaries, as well as essays on the politics of mourning and on nineteenth-century racial stereotypes. To honor Jeff's memory and his scholarly contributions to Margaret Fuller studies, the Margaret Fuller Society is devoting a special issue of its journal to him.

Jeff was a committed citizen of the English Department. Forthright and thoughtful, his colleagues frequently elected him to the department's most important committee, the Advisory Committee. Jeff was such a knowledgeable and astute interviewer that he was frequently chosen to serve on hiring committees, and top job candidates often cited his penetrating questions as a reason they chose the University of Wisconsin-Madison over other universities. Beyond the department, Jeff served on the Executive Committee of the Teaching Academy for eight years and was a faculty affiliate of the Women's Studies Program from 1988-96. From 1989 to his passing, he was a member of the American Indian Studies Program.

Jeff was a sensitive and affectionate and at times curmudgeonly soul, who was our friend and colleague. Many of us got to know Jeff over spicy food at the Vietnamese restaurant at Gorham and Henry streets. He hosted a Super Bowl Sunday party for many years, where members of the department could share their support for the Packers, or just enjoy the banter and the food. The highlight of the event was always Jeff's chili and the array of hot sauces set beside the simmering pot.

Jeff was a kind of polymath. He saw the depth of interest in everything. Jeff was a Cub Scout and Boy Scout leader for many years and taught dozens of boys how to tie knots, to fish, and set up a sturdy tarp. He was a collector and relished studying, finding, organizing, and cataloguing African masks, fish and frog decoys, lures, American advertising trade cards, coins, and more. To the chagrin of the fire marshal, his office was so packed with books that students had to wedge themselves between stacks of books during office hours. He was a long time member of the Midvale Community Lutheran Church and was active as a Bible study leader and a narrator of many cantatas there. A scholar of the emotions and their literary and musical expression, he was a knowledgeable student of hip hop and rap as well as classical music and jazz. His was an ecumenical imagination.

Jeff did not retire. He expected to recover from congestive heart failure and to continue teaching. "I'll never retire" he insisted, when the subject arose. Few knew of his heart problems; his death seemed sudden and came as a shock to his colleagues and students. Jeff loved his family dearly. He and Jocelyn have two sons, Brendan Riley Steele and Doran Riley Steele, and three precious granddaughters. Those who got to know Jeff and Jocelyn knew that theirs was a special marriage, one of true minds. The two met in their first week at Carleton College. They spent their entire adult lives together.

**FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
05 November 2018**

Chancellor Rebecca Blank called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. with 132 voting members present (110 needed for quorum). Memorial resolutions were offered for Professor Emeritus Edward Buxton ([Faculty Document 2765](#)), Professor Emeritus William Goodger ([Faculty Document 2766](#)), Professor Emeritus Archibald Haller ([Faculty Document 2767](#)), Professor Emerita Marilyn McCubbin ([Faculty Document 2768](#)), Professor Emeritus John Marshall ([Faculty Document 2769](#)), and Professor Emeritus Leonard Stein ([Faculty Document 2770](#)).

Chancellor Blank took advantage of the imminent anniversary of Jamie Thomson's introduction of the first laboratory-derived human embryonic stem cells on 11/6/1998 to announce [campus celebrations of this accomplishment](#). Blank also reported on plans for winter commencement, progress on our campus [civic action plan](#), the campus vigil for the victims of the Tree of Life Synagogue shooting, and the expansion of campus computing and data science efforts. Interim Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education Norman Drinkwater presented the annual [State of the Research Enterprise](#), focusing on grant programs, new initiatives, and reducing administrative burden. There were comments about Foxconn, the campus vigil, and administrative burden. The [minutes of the meeting](#) of October 1, 2018, were approved.

Professor Anja Wanner (English) presented the annual report for the University Academic Planning Council ([Faculty Document 2771](#)). Professor Tim Smeeding (La Follette School of Public Affairs) presented the annual report for the University Lectures Committee ([Faculty Document 2772](#)). Professor Emeritus Bruce Thomadsen (Medical Physics) presented the annual report for the Commission on Faculty Compensation and Economic Benefits ([Faculty Document 2773](#)). Professor Ivy Corfis (Spanish & Portuguese) presented the annual report for the University Curriculum Committee ([Faculty Document 2774](#)). There were no comments or questions on any of these reports.

Professor Rick Amasino (University Committee, District 120) moved adoption of [Faculty Document 2764](#), which expresses the Faculty Senate's support of the new UW-Madison policy on consensual relationships. The resolution passed by voice vote with no dissenting votes. Professor Steve Ventura (University Committee, District 120) moved adoption of [Faculty Document 2763](#), which transfers tenure of University of Wisconsin-Extension faculty to University of Wisconsin-Madison. The resolution passed by voice vote. Prof. Amasino moved adoption of [Faculty Document 2775](#), which generally endorses continued support of graduate students and remands the specific issue to the shared governance Budget Committee. Professor Chad Goldberg (Sociology, District 71) moved to postpone the resolution to the December meeting. The motion passed by voice vote.

Professor Irwin Goldman (Horticulture) presented [Faculty Documents 2776](#) and [2777](#), two resolutions regarding the use of the word "professor" in potential future Academic Staff titles. There were several comments, which will be considered and incorporated prior to these items being brought back for a vote.

Chancellor Blank adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.



Steven K. Smith
Secretary of the Faculty

Graduate Faculty Executive Committee Annual Report for 2017-2018

Established

Doctoral Minors

- Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies Doctoral Minor. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC February 2018)

Named Options

- Agricultural and Applied Economics MS Named Option “Agricultural and Applied Economics”. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC December 2017)
- Cartography and Geographic Information Systems MS Named Option “Accelerated/Non-Thesis”. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC November 2017)
- Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis MS Named Option “Wisconsin Idea Principal Preparation”. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC April 2018)
- Engineering Mechanics MS Named Option “Fundamentals of Applied Mechanics”. Effective Summer 2018. (GFEC November 2017)
- Materials Science and Engineering MS Named Option “Nanomaterials and Nanoengineering”. Effective Summer 2018. (GFEC November 2017)
- Mechanical Engineering MS Named Option “Modeling and Simulation in Mechanical Engineering”. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC November 2017)
- Mechanical Engineering MS Named Option “Accelerated Program”. Effective Fall 2019. (GFEC May 2018)
- Physics MS Named Option “Quantum Computing”. Effective Fall 2019. (GFEC May 2018)

Graduate/Professional Certificates

- Business Analytics Graduate/Professional Certificate. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC May 2018)

Capstone Certificates

- Advanced GIS Capstone Certificate. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC November 2017)
- Data Analytics for Decision Making Capstone Certificate. Effective Spring 2019. (GFEC January 2018)
- GIS Fundamentals Capstone Certificate. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC November 2017)

Renamed

Doctoral/Master's Degrees/Doctoral Minors

- “Rehabilitation Psychology” to “Rehabilitation Counseling” MS from the Department of Rehabilitation Psychology and Special Education. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC November 2017)

Restructured

Named Options

- Agricultural and Applied Economics Named Option “Resource and Demand Analysis” moved from the MA to the MS. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC December 2017)

Admitting Status Changed

Doctoral/Master's Degrees/Doctoral Minors

- Philosophy MA changed admitting status to non-admitting. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC March 2018)

Named Options

- Human Ecology MS Named Options “Consumer Behavior & Family Economics” and “Human Development & Family Studies” changed admitting status to non-admitting. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC September 2017)

Admissions Suspended

Doctoral/Master's Degrees/Doctoral Minors

- Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies MA/PhD with Named Options in “Comparative Literature” MA/PhD and “Folklore Studies” MA/PhD and Doctoral Minors “Comparative Literature” and “Folklore”. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC November 2017)

Named Options

- Mechanical Engineering MS Named Option “Controls”. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC May 2018)

Capstone Certificates

- Geographic Information Systems Capstone Certificate. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC January 2018)
- Leadership for Population Health Improvement Capstone Certificate. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC January 2018)

Discontinued

Doctoral/Master's Degrees

- Agricultural and Applied Economics MA. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC December 2017)
- Zoology MA. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC January 2018)

Doctoral Minors

- Biometry Doctoral Minor. Effective Spring 2018. (GFEC February 2018)
- Manufacturing Systems Engineering Doctoral Minor. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC March 2018)

Capstone Certificates

- Geographic Information Systems Capstone Certificate. Effective Spring 2020. (GFEC January 2018)
- Leadership for Population Health Improvement Capstone Certificate. Effective Fall 2019. (GFEC January 2018)
- Geodesign Capstone Certificate. Effective Fall 2018. (GFEC March 2018)

Three-Year Check-Ins and Updates

Doctoral/Master's Degrees/Doctoral Minors

- Environmental Conservation MS. (GFEC November 2017)

Named Options

- Computer Sciences MS Named Option “Professional Program”. (GFEC December 2017)
- Mathematics MA Named Option “Foundations of Advanced Studies”. (GFEC March 2018)

Capstone Certificates

- Clinical Nutrition Capstone Certificate. (GFEC December 2017)
- Computer Sciences for Professionals Capstone Certificate. (GFEC December 2017)
- Infant, Early Childhood and Family Mental Health Capstone Certificate. (GFEC December 2017)

Graduate Faculty Executive Committee Program Reviews
Academic Year 2017–2018

Institutional Reviews

- Actuarial Science Capstone Certificate (Five-Year Review; GFEC May 2018)
- Agricultural and Applied Economics MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC May 2018)
- Agronomy MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC December 2017)
- Biological Systems Engineering MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC November 2017)
- Biomedical Engineering MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC October 2017)
- Botany MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC February 2018)
- Business Graduate Programs (Arts Administration MA/MBA; Finance, Investment, and Banking MS/MBA; Management and Human Resources MS/MBA; Marketing MS/MBA; Operations and Technology Management MS/MBA; Real Estate and Urban Land Economics MS/MBA; Risk Management and Insurance MS/MBA; Supply Chain Management MS/MBA) (Supplemental Accreditation/Ten-Year Review; GFEC September 2017)
- Clinical and Community Outcomes Capstone Certificate and Graduate/Professional Certificate (Ten-Year Review; GFEC October 2017)
- Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies MA/PhD with Named Options in “Comparative Literature” MA/PhD and “Folklore Studies” MA/PhD and Doctoral Minors “Comparative Literature” and “Folklore” (Ten-Year Review; GFEC October 2017)
- Computer Sciences MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC September 2017)
- Counseling MS (Ten-Year Review, GFEC March 2018)
- Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis MA/PhD/Specialist Certificate/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC January 2018)
- Environmental Chemistry and Technology MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC December 2017)
- Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies MA/PhD (Ten-Year Review; GFEC April 2018)
- Life Sciences Communication MS/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC April 2018)
- Mathematics MA/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC February 2018)
- Medical Physics MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC January 2018)
- Molecular and Environmental Toxicology MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC January 2018)
- Molecular and Cellular Pharmacology MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC March 2018)
- Nursing Practice, Doctor of (Five-Year Supplemental Review; GFEC March 2018)
- Physiology PhD/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC October 2017)
- Post-Graduate Psychiatric Nursing Capstone Certificate (Five-Year Supplemental Review; GFEC May 2018)
- Transportation Management and Policy Graduate/Professional Certificate (Ten-Year Review; GFEC December 2017)
- Water Resources Management MS/Doctoral Minor (Ten-Year Review; GFEC February 2018)

Review Updates

- African Languages and Literature MA/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Review Update; GFEC October 2017)
- Agronomy MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Review Update; GFEC April 2018)
- Art MA/MFA/Doctoral Minor and Art Education MA/Doctoral Minor (Review Update; GFEC September 2017)
- Biophysics MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Review Update; GFEC November 2017)
- Chemistry MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Review Update; GFEC September 2017)
- Mathematics MA/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Review Update; GFEC May 2018)
- Physiology MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Review Update; GFEC March 2018)
- Population Health MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Review Update; GFEC December 2017)
- Zoology MA/MS/PhD/Doctoral Minor (Review Update; GFEC September 2017)

Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Annual Report for 2016-2018**I. Functions**

The functions of the committee are to serve as the review committee for nonrenewal appeals pursuant to *Faculty Policies and Procedures (FPP)* 7.10.; to serve as the hearing committee for appeals in discipline and dismissal cases in accordance with the provisions of *FPP* Chapter 9; and to serve as the hearing committee in cases of layoff due to financial emergency pursuant to *FPP* Chapter 10.

II. Committee Activities**2016-2017 Committee Activities**

The 2016-17 Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (CFRR) met eight times to consider three appeals of nonrenewal decisions. In the first of these, the CFRR found that the nonrenewal decision was based to a significant degree upon impermissible factors and/or improper procedure with material prejudice to the assistant professor and requested that the University Committee appoint a de novo review committee per FPP 7.10.C. (The University Committee appointed an ad hoc de novo review committee for this case in March 2017. In May 2017, the de novo committee decided unanimously that the assistant professor had not met the standard for tenure and promotion and did not recommend that the dean consider the case for tenure. The appellant requested reconsideration of the ad hoc committee's decision in June 2017. The ad hoc committee was dismissed in September 2017 when the appellant reached a separation agreement with the provost.)

In the second case of this term, the CFRR found no evidence that proper and accepted procedures were not followed or that the nonrenewal decision was unfounded or arbitrary. By a vote of 8-0, the CFRR thus found the appellant had not met the burdens of presentation and proof to substantiate their claims and dismissed the appeal without prejudice.

In the final case of this term, the CFRR found that the nonrenewal decision was based to a significant degree upon impermissible factors and/or improper procedures with material prejudice to the assistant professor and requested that the University Committee appoint a de novo review committee. (The University Committee appointed an ad hoc de novo review committee for this case in August 2017. In December 2017, despite serious reservations about the department itself, the de novo committee voted 5-0 not to recommend promotion, based on a consideration of the dossier itself. The appellant requested reconsideration of the ad hoc committee's decision in February 2018 and in March 2018, the committee voted 3-2 to uphold its earlier decision.)

2017-2018 Committee Activities

The 2017-18 Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (CFRR) met three times to consider two cases. The first of these was the appeal of a departmental nonrenewal decision. In this case, the CFRR found that the nonrenewal decision was based to a significant degree upon impermissible factors and/or improper procedure with material prejudice to the assistant professor and requested that the University Committee appoint an ad hoc de novo review committee. (The University Committee appointed an ad hoc de novo review committee for this case in November 2017. In February 2018, the committee voted 5-0 to advance the case to the dean for divisional committee

consideration. Later that semester, the divisional committee recommended tenure and promotion and the dean agreed.)

The second case this term was the appeal of the decision of an ad hoc de novo review committee from the previous year. In April 2018, the CFRR voted 7-0, in light of procedural irregularities, to grant the remedy requested by the appellant and, per FPP 7.10.C., requested that the University Committee appoint an ad hoc de novo review committee. This committee was charged in June 2018 and is ongoing.)

III. Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Membership

2016-17 Committee Membership

Howard Schweber (Political Science) *Chair*
Corinna Burger (Neurology)
J. Michal Collins (SOHE)
Irwin Goldman (Horticulture)
Susan Lederer (History of Medicine)
Gloria Mari-Beffa (Mathematics)
Steven Nadler (Philosophy)
Pilar Ossorio (Law)
Jennifer Reed (Chemical & Biological Eng)

2017-18 Committee Membership

Irwin Goldman (Horticulture) *Chair*
Corinna Burger (Neurology)
Mary Halloran (Zoology)
Susan Lederer (History of Medicine)
Gloria Mari-Beffa (Mathematics)
Steven Nadler (Philosophy)
Adam Nelson (Educational Policy Studies)
Pilar Ossorio (Law)
Jennifer Reed (Chemical & Biological Eng)

Resolution of Support for Graduate Assistants

WHEREAS the faculty have the primary responsibility for advising the Chancellor regarding academic and educational activities (Act 55, 36.09[4]);

WHEREAS equitable working conditions attract and retain talented and experienced graduate assistants and enable them to fulfill their professional responsibilities more effectively, thereby promoting the quality of undergraduate education;

WHEREAS the faculty depend on the contributions of graduate assistants to fulfill effectively our own professional responsibilities;

WHEREAS in the past six years, graduate assistant stipends have increased substantially (including an increase of over 27% for 101-funded TA and PA stipends during that period) through an effort to bring our campus to a competitive level with our peers;

WHEREAS current segregated fee policies place a financial burden on graduate assistants;

WHEREAS some peer Big 10 institutions provide some non-salary support for at least a portion of segregated fee remission for their graduate assistants;

WHEREAS the Teaching Assistants' Association and the Associated Students of Madison have called for the University to fully cover segregated fees for all graduate assistants; and

WHEREAS the segregated fee charge currently in place covers a wide variety of services, including some which other employees also pay to use and some which are exclusively student-related, and would cost approximately \$5.6 million to cover directly;

THEREFORE, be it RESOLVED that the UW–Madison Faculty Senate commends and encourages the ongoing efforts by the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, and the Graduate School to increase overall support for graduate assistants;

Be it further RESOLVED that the UW–Madison Faculty Senate respectfully recommends that such efforts to support graduate students be continued and expanded;

And be it further RESOLVED that the UW-Madison Faculty Senate, in the belief that the interlocking and complex budgetary impacts of segregated fee remission merit further study and that the appropriate body for such analysis is the formal shared governance Budget Committee, calls on the Budget Committee to explore options regarding the issue of segregated fees for graduate assistants that do not adversely affect student services or place undue burden on other students and to report back to the University Committee and the Faculty Senate in time for consideration at the April 2019 Senate meeting.

Resolution to Approve Candidate Eligibility for Transitioning UW-Extension Faculty

Whereas, current faculty in UW Cooperative Extension will be members of the UW-Madison faculty as of July 1, 2019, and will be represented in the Faculty Senate as of that time;

Whereas, the following will take place in Spring 2019, before Extension employees fully transition to Madison:

- Standing committee elections for 2019-2020 terms, and
- Consideration by the Committee on Committees, the University Committee, and the divisional committees for appointments to committees for terms beginning on or after July 1, 2019;

Whereas, the Faculty Senate voted in November 2018 to support the transfer of faculty from UW-Extension to UW-Madison with tenure, thus making them eligible for appointment and/or election to shared governance committees as faculty representatives;

Whereas, making Extension employees eligible to be elected or appointed to committees would ensure greater participation in shared governance;

Whereas, if Extension employees are made eligible, they will be able to participate in faculty governance immediately upon finalization of their transfer;

Therefore, be it resolved that the UW-Madison Faculty Senate approves UW-Extension faculty who are transitioning to UW-Madison on July 1 to be eligible candidates in the Spring 2019 committee elections and to be eligible candidates considered for appointments to campus-wide committees in the spring for terms starting on or after July 1, 2019.

Resolution on UW System Draft Policy 102: Section Program Productivity Monitoring

WHEREAS the UW-Madison Faculty Senate recognizes the importance of regular program review to evaluate the deployment of resources to ensure their most effective use to ensure program quality and achievement of campus mission and strategic goals;

WHEREAS the expenditure of resources for programs of little value to students takes away resources from programs serving large segments of the student population;

WHEREAS students may consider some programs valuable for certificates and coursework while not necessarily wanting to major in them;

WHEREAS we recognize that UW System plays a role in ensuring institutions are offering the appropriate array of programs and has the authority to approve certain actions, at the same time curricular control lies with the faculty of the institution, not System administration;

WHEREAS UW System has appointed a task force to review SYS Policy 102, Sec. 6.3, “Monitoring Low-Degree-Producing Academic Degree Programs,” the charge for which includes “Create a new policy for monitoring low-degree-producing academic degree programs that has clearly defined criteria, monitoring thresholds, and a means to eliminate programs that do not meet expectations.”;

WHEREAS UW System has requested comment on the proposed modifications to SYS 102 by December 21, 2018;

WHEREAS the proposed new SYS 102 Program Productivity Monitoring Policy establishes a single metric (number of graduates over a five-year period) as the sole determiner of a program’s value without regard (except in the appeal process) to campus mission, campus size, strategic goals, interrelations of programs, importance of programs for recruiting and retention, or actual program costs;

WHEREAS the faculty representatives to UW System and others have proposed alternative measurements of program productivity, including but not limited to FTE/major and majors/total students;

WHEREAS Master’s programs partnered with a PhD program cost very little to maintain, are for the purpose of serving the rare student who seeks only a master’s degree in the field or a student who chooses not to finish the PhD, and should thus be considered as a single program for the purposes of this policy;

WHEREAS each campus has better data on its own programs than are available to System and, more specifically, System relies on CDR data, which may identify programs as low-degree when they are not;

WHEREAS UW-Madison has a robust and efficient program monitoring and review process and a longstanding degree policy already in place;

WHEREAS the proposed new SYS 102 Policy mandates closure of programs rather than flexibility for local campuses to determine the best ways to deploy resources for meeting local needs;

WHEREAS identified programs in the proposed policy are given only three years to address program deficiencies, which is not enough time to meet the metric based on changes made in response to having been identified as a low-production program, and other timelines indicated in the proposed policy do not conform to the standard academic calendar or program review process; and

WHEREAS the proposed policy removes final decision-making over programs from institutions and established shared governance processes;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the UW-Madison Faculty Senate requests that this draft policy not be approved in its present form;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we only accept the proposed metric as a way to identify programs for further evaluation and consideration and not as a valid index for determining a program's value;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the final decision to keep or cut a program must be made at the institutional level where mission, strategic goals, interrelations with other programs, student needs, and other factors can be considered through shared governance processes;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that appeals regarding program decisions should be heard and evaluated by existing governance procedures; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that UW System should not substitute itself for existing shared governance processes in local curriculum or programmatic decisions.

Supporting documents:

- [Existing UWS Sys 102](http://www.wisconsin.edu/uw-policies/uw-system-administrative-policies/policy-on-university-of-wisconsin-system-array-management-program-planning-delivery-review-and-reporting/#6.Review), section 6.3. www.wisconsin.edu/uw-policies/uw-system-administrative-policies/policy-on-university-of-wisconsin-system-array-management-program-planning-delivery-review-and-reporting/#6.Review
 - [Draft SYS 102](http://www.wisconsin.edu/uw-policies/uw-system-administrative-policies/draft-policy-section-6-3-program-productivity-monitoring/) [wisconsin.edu/uw-policies/uw-system-administrative-policies/draft-policy-section-6-3-program-productivity-monitoring/](http://www.wisconsin.edu/uw-policies/uw-system-administrative-policies/draft-policy-section-6-3-program-productivity-monitoring/)
 - [UW-Madison \(Admin\) Comments](#) on Program Productivity Monitoring Policy
-

Existing UWS Sys 102, section 6.3.

6.3 Monitoring Low-Degree-Producing Academic Degree Programs

6.3.1 BACKGROUND

Undergraduate programs offered by more than 50% of all UW institutions are those that are reviewed for degree productivity. The degree productivity expectation is no less than 25 graduates over a five-year period, excluding all world language programs and individually designed programs. The review period for new programs in this category begins six years after the program's implementation.

6.3.2 PROCESS FOR LOW PRODUCING PROGRAMS

6.3.2.1 Institutional Review

UW institutions review and address low-degree-producing programs, based on mission and resources.

For all low-degree-producing programs, institutions may establish and follow more stringent policies or guidelines than those outlined in this section.

6.3.2.2 UW System Review

APEI conducts a review of all undergraduate majors in the UW System for degree productivity at least every five years as part of its responsibility for systemwide academic degree program array management. This review may be conducted separately or in conjunction with other UW System reviews of programs.

Programs that do not meet the degree productivity minimum expectations as described above are provided to UW institutions. Institutional responses are due to APEI via apei@uwsa.edu within 20 working days upon receipt of the information.

If an institution wants to retain a low-degree-producing program, the Provost provides a brief justification for continuing the program. The justification should include plans to increase enrollment, combine the program with another program, or offer the program in partnership with another institution. In addition, low-degree-producing programs that were previously identified as low-degree-producing and continue to be low-degree-producing must also provide a description of the strategies that were employed to increase enrollment and provide a document for the most recent academic year.

APEI will respond after a review of the information. The response will be included in the University of Wisconsin System Annual Program Planning, Review, and Array Management Report to the BOR (see Section 7.1).

If the institutional response is to suspend or eliminate a low-degree-producing program, no justification is necessary (see Section 3.3 and Section 3.4 for information on suspension and elimination).

102: *Draft Policy Section Program Productivity Monitoring*

1. POLICY PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to establish protocols for monitoring degree program productivity by UW System institutions as permitted by Wis. Stats. 36 and in accordance with Regent Policy Document (RPD) 4-12, <http://wisconsin.edu/regents/policies/academic-program-planning-review-and-approval-in-the-university-of-wisconsin-system/>. This policy also delegates authority for program reviews to UW System institutions and provides the parameters under which this delegation may be used. The policy outlined in this section is intended to define a process for academic degree program productivity monitoring as determined by the University of Wisconsin System Administration (UWSA) and the Board of Regents (BOR).

2. RESPONSIBLE UW SYSTEM OFFICER

Associate Vice President for Academic Programs and Educational Innovation

3. SCOPE

By statute, the responsibility to review and monitor academic programs rests with the UW System Administration and UW System institutions. This policy sets parameters for all UW System institutions for monitoring the productivity of degree programs. This policy applies to UW System institutions for monitoring all undergraduate and graduate degree programs according to established criteria. New programs will be monitored under this policy after the sixth year of implementation. Non-admitting graduate programs are exempt from this policy. All collaborative programs will be identified and monitored as one program for reviews related to this policy.

Chapter 36, Wis. Stats., codifies responsibilities for system-wide array management, such as monitoring academic quality, and establishing and maintaining access to educational programs. Regent Policy Document (RPD) 4-12, Academic Program Planning, Review, and Approval in the UW System, delineates the program-planning framework. UW System Policy 102 elaborates on RPD 4-12 and represents the principal policy guiding the UWSA and the UW institutions in operationalizing all activities related to system-wide array.

4. BACKGROUND

Reviews of academic programs are guided by accreditation standards from the Higher Learning Commission as well as RPD 4-12 <https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/policies/academic-program-planning-review-and-approval-in-the-university-of-wisconsin-system/>. These policies require the institutions in the UW System to regularly review programs. Guidelines for monitoring low producing degree programs were incorporated into UW System Administrative Policy SYS 102, Section 6.3 on July 1, 2016. Criteria for elimination of programs are also outlined in SYS 102 3.4 Eliminating an Academic Degree Program. The revised policy identifies program productivity expectations, sets the frequency to monitor productivity every year, outlines action plans to remediate programs, identifies a process and criteria for appeals, and accelerates the timeline in which institutions are encouraged to consider alternative solutions to delivering low-degree producing programs.

4. [sic] DEFINITIONS

Academic program-academic major program approved by the Board of Regents. This does not include certificate programs, minors, or licensure only programs.

Program monitoring-system and institution level processes to examine academic programs guided by a set of criteria related to institution and UW System policy.

Criteria-indicators of expectations and standards for monitoring and reviewing programs.

Eliminate-discontinue an academic program that has been authorized by the Board of Regents.

Suspend-discontinue admission to an academic program until a decision is made to eliminate or continue the program.

Low productivity program-academic program that do not meet the criteria for program productivity.

Non-admitting graduate program-program that awards a master's degree in route to the doctorate when a student does not continue to the doctoral program.

Collaborative program-An academic partnership in which one or more institutions is independently authorized to grant the degree. Two or more institutions or organizations establish a collaborative agreement to provide a proportion of the educational program

6. POLICY STATEMENT

The program monitoring process will:

1. Identify programs that have low numbers of graduates.
2. Bring attention to low productivity degree programs more quickly than through an institution's program review cycle.
3. Allow timely actions to strengthen a program.
4. Initiate processes to suspend, eliminate, or appeal elimination of low productivity programs.
5. Ensure the efficient use of the institution's resources in support of its mission, vision and priorities.

Criteria:

The UW System Administration has the responsibility to monitor productivity for all academic programs annually in order to bring attention to those academic programs that do not meet the following criteria as indicators of program productivity.

Criterion: Number of graduates awarded degrees in a given period of time.

Bachelor's degree programs

An average of 5 degrees awarded each year over the last five years. Note that collaborative program graduates are monitored as part of one program.

Master's degree programs

An average of 3 degrees awarded each year over the last five years. Note that collaborative program graduates are monitored as part of one program. Non-admitting master's programs are exempt from this policy review.

Doctoral degree programs

All doctoral programs will be monitored annually for specific criteria established by the doctoral granting institutions. Doctoral granting institutions will notify UW System about their monitoring processes and outcomes every three years through the UW System Annual Program Planning, Review, and Array Management Report.

Program Productivity Monitoring Process:

UWSA RESPONSIBILITIES

In order to facilitate the UW System program productivity monitoring policy, UW System will:

1. Establish and publish policies and criteria related to program vitality to be used across the System.
2. Provide data to institutions each year for all academic programs.
3. Notify institutions about suspension and elimination deadlines.
4. Track institutions' responses about institution action plan related to program productivity.
5. Track institutions' appeals for programs to continue offering the program.
6. Facilitate program review workshops.

PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESSPROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

The Office of Academic Programs and Educational Innovation (APEI) and the Office of Policy Analysis and Research (OPAR) will monitor all programs in the UW System program inventory based on the number of graduates each academic year.

1. APEI will submit data about low producing programs to each institution by August 31st each year.

2. The institution will identify their programs on the list from System. After the review, and in collaboration with governance, the institution may take one of three steps outlined below.
 - a. After receiving the data from System, the institution may decide to eliminate the program by the end of the current academic year following UW SYS 102 3.4 Eliminating an Academic Degree Program.
 - b. Alternatively, the institution may decide to suspend admissions to the program following SYS 102 3.3., Suspending Admissions to an Academic Degree Program, and may create an action plan to remediate the program.
 - c. An institution may also decide to appeal to keep the program despite low graduation numbers following the procedures outlined in this policy for an appeal.
3. If the institution decided to suspend a program in the hope of remediating the program, the institution will submit a plan of action to either remediate the low producing program or to suspend, eliminate, or appeal to keep the program by December 31st of the same year.
4. If an institution does not report an action plan for a low producing program within the specified time frame, UW System will communicate with the institution to engage its governance processes for program elimination with the institution per SYS 102 3.4 Eliminating an Academic Degree Program.
5. If the institution decides to continue the program and make changes to the program, the institution will implement its plan of action and report to APEI at the end of three academic years after the implementation of the revised program about the effectiveness of the changes and results. The institution will communicate with APEI about the program status as a part of the UW System Annual Program Planning, Review, and Array Management Report. If an institution significantly redirects a program or combines a program with another program, this new program will be reviewed a new review cycle both at an institution and with UW System.
6. If at the end of three years of implementation, the program still does not meet the criterion, UW system will communicate with the institution to engage its governance processes to eliminate the program using criteria provided by this policy and SYS 102 3.4 Eliminating an Academic Degree Program.
 - a. The institution will submit written notification via <https://www.wisconsin.edu/program-planning/ppram-form/> to Academic Programs and Educational Innovation with the intention of eliminating the program indicating the description of the program to be eliminated, potential impact on students and faculty, confirmation that the appropriate governance bodies have completed their review processes, and the effect date.
 - b. In the event that there are students currently enrolled in the program, the institution will be responsible for developing a teach-out plan for the current students.

Institutional Actions to Be Taken After Program Is Identified as Not Meeting Criteria”

After UWSA provides the institution with relevant data, the institution will conduct a program continuance review to identify one or more of the following possible action steps (from Aug. 31st to Dec. 31st). The institution will have one semester to submit a plan of action to UWSA after notification by the UW System of a low productivity program (due Dec. 31st). Possible action plans to increase program productivity include the following.

1. Retain the curriculum with specific strategies to increase enrollment with additional resources.
2. Redesign the curriculum to make it more responsive to market demand and more appealing to students.
3. Convert the program to a minor.
4. Change the delivery model.
5. Redesign curriculum by combining it with another program/department within the institution.
6. Collaborate with another institution to offer the program.
7. Appeal the program status as outlined below.

The institution will have three years to implement this planned action after the program revision approval at the institution, at which time the institution will report on its progress through the APEI UW System Annual Program Planning, Review, and Array Management Report in June of each year. If after three years, the productivity of the program does not improve, UW System will communicate with the

institution to engage its governance processes to eliminate the program guided by the criteria outlined in SYS 102 3.4 Eliminating an Academic Degree Program.

APPEAL PROCESS

There are two types of appeals for the degree monitoring process.

1. UWSA will evaluate an institution's appeal for one or two-year extensions for elimination of low productivity programs by examining the probability that a program will meet its graduation goals.
2. UWSA will also evaluate an institution's appeal to keep an academic program that is considered critical to the institution's mission. The institution should address the following components in an appeal process:
 - 1) The quality of the program in the areas of teaching and learning, and the contributions of its faculty in research, creative activity, and service;
 - 2) The contribution of the program to the mission and strategic plan of the institution, the overall quality of academic offerings, and the strategic plan of the institution;
 - 3) The resource implications of retaining or eliminating the program;
 - 4) The total enrollment of a program and its contribution to other institution programs such as general education or the program's role in relation to other majors;
 - 5) The uniqueness/redundancy of the program within the institution and across the UW System;
 - 6) The impact of program elimination on system-wide array and student access to programs.
3. An appeal committee consisting of faculty representatives, academic planners, Provosts, and the Associate Vice President of Academic Programs and Educational Innovation will review the appeals and make a recommendation to the Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs.
4. The final decision will be made by the Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs.

7. RELATED DOCUMENTS

Within the scope of Chapter 36, Wis. Stats., the BOR, the UWSA, and the UW institutions have specific roles in program planning, approval, delivery, implementation, reporting, and review. Chapter 36, Wis. Stats., gives the BOR the authority to "ensure the diversity of quality undergraduate programs." In fulfilling this statutory role, the BOR has oversight over the UWSA and the UW institutions "to ensure that these entities meet their respective roles and 9 responsibilities." As a steward of the UW System's overall resources, the BOR is also responsible for ensuring a balance between access to education and cost-effectiveness in the development and maintenance of programs. The BOR requires the UWSA and the UW institutions to follow the specific principles, guidelines, and practices described in RPD 4-12. SYS 102 operationalizes these principles, guidelines, and practices.

8. POLICY HISTORY

SYS 102 Section 6.3

SYS 102 Section 3.3

SYS 102 Section 3.4

ACIS 1.1 and ACIS 4 ACPS 1 and 1.1

Guidelines for Academic Program Suspension, November 2009

Monitoring Low-Degree-Producing Programs, July 2010

Principles for Academic Program Consolidation and Elimination, April 2003

9. SCHEDULED REVIEW

January 2021

UW-Madison (Admin) Comments on Program Productivity Monitoring Policy
Submitted Nov 21 2018

Introduction to Section 6. Policy Introduction

The program monitoring process will:

1. Identify programs that have low numbers of graduates.
2. Bring attention to low productivity degree programs more quickly than through an institution's program review cycle.
3. Allow timely actions to strengthen a program.
4. Initiate processes to suspend, eliminate, or appeal elimination of low productivity programs.
5. Ensure the efficient use of the institution's resources in support of its mission, vision and priorities.

Comment

Statement 1 is limited by the data in the CDR, which includes only two of students' degree majors, so while this is an accurate statement it may identify programs as low-degree when they are not. Statement 2 is debatable given that at least UW-Madison runs a report like this on our graduates annually, in keeping with our long-standing low degree policy, a section of our program review policy. Statements 3, 4 and 5 suggest that institutions are not bringing timely actions or assuring strong programs, or evaluate the cost of low degree programs. Given some of us have longstanding and effective policies perhaps a rephrasing to signal more of a partnership would be in order.

Criteria Section

Bachelor's degree programs

An average of 5 degrees awarded each year over the last five years. Note that collaborative program graduates are monitored as part of one program.

Comment

The data used for the low-degree analysis is the CDR. The CDR only collects up to two majors per degree. Especially for bachelor's programs where a substantial share of students have more than two majors, the CDR is not sufficient to determine this metric. We will be evaluating the degree to which this is relevant in an analysis of the low-degree file against our census degree file and will update you when we have completed that analysis.

Master's degree programs

An average of 3 degrees awarded each year over the last five years. Note that collaborative program graduates are monitored as part of one program. Non-admitting master's programs are exempt from this policy review.

Comment

Thank you for being responsive to UW-Madison concerns and adding the exemption for non-admitting master's programs. We have also had some discussion and considered how we handle our local policy. There many Master's programs that do not meet the 15 degrees in 5 years standard but are admitting. When they are a partner to a robust PhD program we have exempted them because again their main purpose is to serve students, either the rare student who seeks only a master's degree in the field or a student who chooses not to finish the PhD. There is little cost to maintaining these master's programs compared to the value to students to keeping them. In general, for research graduate programs the masters and PhD are treated as a single program. Thus we propose the addition of language to exempt masters programs that are partnered with an active PhD program in the same area of study (same name).

Doctoral degree programs

Comment

We very much appreciate the current policy that recognizes our ability to monitor our PhD programs.

Program Review Process Item 3 - If the institution decided to suspend a program in the hope of remediating the program, the institution will submit a plan of action to either remediate the low producing program or to suspend, eliminate, or appeal to keep the program by December 31st of the same year.

Comment

We would ask that the timeframe for a response be moved to March 1 or to the annual program array report. To accomplish the discussion and planning you seek in just a couple of months in the fall semester when so much else is going on will result in a pattern of a routine appeal because we can't realistically meet this deadline. Item 3 and 4 together create stress and frustration when what you want is a thoughtful and careful consideration of a way forward. Success in these endeavors comes from persistence and patience and clear messaging. A report by March 1 or in the next program array report cycle makes for time to develop a serious and considered plan.

Program Review Process Item 5 – If the institution decides to continue the program and make changes to the program, the institution will implement its plan of action and report to APEI at the end of three academic years after the implementation of the revised program about the effectiveness of the changes and results. The institution will communicate with APEI about the program status as a part of the UW System Annual Program Planning, Review, and Array Management Report. If an institution significantly redirects a program or combines a program with another program, this new program will be reviewed a new review cycle both at an institution and with UW System.

Comment

We would ask that the requirement to report specifically on a program be removed if the program degrees go above the low-degree threshold. A report should only be required for a program still at the sub-threshold level after 3 years. Communication as much as possible should only be at the annual report time and not at other times. In the last sentence there is a reference to UW System engaged with UWs in program review. Some may recall that we stopped the joint review practice several years ago because it was ineffective, expensive and time-consuming. Please do not return to a joint reviews. The review should be conducted on the UW side with reports, but no joint reviews please.

Program Review Process Item 6

Comment

It would be helpful to note in item 6 an appeal process. Certainly unilateral action is appropriate in a non-response situation, but if a UW is working in good faith with program faculty gentle pressure would be more useful at getting to a happy resolution than threatening language.

Actions taken when a program is not meeting criteria: After UWSA provides the institution with relevant data, the institution will conduct a program continuance review to identify one or more of the following possible action steps (from Aug. 31st to Dec. 31st).

Comment

For reasons noted above, four months is not enough time for an academic discussion of any substance to happen at the department and school/college level and have provost office review. A March 1 timeframe would produce more thoughtful consideration. Even better would be reporting at the time of the annual program array report.

Actions taken when a program is not meeting criteria: List of possible actions.

Comment

For item 3 in the list we suggest adding "or certificate". UW-Madison does not use minors in the traditional way.

About staffing and expense, and lost effectiveness in relation to other quality processes

Comment

Overall, I would urge a review of the policy to remove components that add an onerous burden to either UW or UWSA staff. There are many steps here that will require considerable effort and

will take us away from other work on program quality (assessment, program review, program change process, improving time to degree). The costs of implementing this policy could become more than the savings generated by forcing program closures. As written it seems it will require new staff at System Admin and will divert staff in the provost's office and school/college dean's offices. This proposed process puts provost office staff in a very tough position to be heavily handed with our colleagues in a way that may be counter-productive to overall program quality goals we are working on collectively. Adjusting expectations of reports would be a big help with that.

Thank you System colleagues for work on this policy and for providing this opportunity to comment.