

Joint L&S and APC Brief Notes, and L&S APC Brief Notes *Approved 10/15/2013*

Meeting Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2013
Meeting Time: 1:00 - 3:30 p.m.
Location: 6201 Microbial Sciences Building
MAP: <http://map.wisc.edu/s/4fwqo8nc>

Chair: Karl Scholz (with Kate Vanden Bosch for joint CALS & LS portion of the meeting)

L&S Members present: Diane Gooding, Jan Edwards, Harry Brighthouse, Jan Edwards, Clark Johnson, Tom Broman, Anna Gemrich, John Hawks, Karl Scholz, Matt Turner, Betty Harwood

L&S Observers present: Eric Wilcots, Sue Zaeske, Kimbrin Cornelius, Anne Gunther, Maria Cancian, Nancy Westphal-Johnson, Elaine Klein, Gary Essenmacher, Devon Wilson.

1. Introductions/Overview/Operating Guidelines. Dean VandenBosch led the joint CALS & L&S portion of the meeting. EW introduced the joint meeting concept: As CALS and L&S continue to work together collaboratively, the APCs will meet together at times to discuss common items. This is not a new committee; it is two separate APCs meeting at the same time; votes will be separate. It's a pilot and feedback is appreciated. After joint business concludes, the meetings will continue separately and each APC will deal with their regular business. EMK: Our joint meetings demonstrate both APCs' commitments to working together to serve students well.

2. Proposal to Create New Option in Undergraduate Biology Major: Plant Sciences (first discussion). EW noted during the Biology program review and restructuring, suggestions were made to create additional tracks in the major; this is the first proposed. Irwin Goldman visited and provided an overview. The Plant Sciences option proposal is the joint work of four departments: Agronomy, Botany, Horticulture, and Plant Pathology. The four departments current have about 125 students, and believe there is capacity for more. Faculty hope to increase enrollments in the plant science areas via the option, and bring students into advanced courses in each department. While it may have consequences in the individual departmental majors, faculty are optimistic the option will attract more students overall to the field. In discussion, committee members asked if students can major in both the Biology option and another plant major. IG clarified students may not major in both. Committee members also asked what students would be better served by Biology -Plant Science, vs. another major. IG: For students wanting additional scientific rigor, Biology may be the better major. Those desiring a smaller 'neighborhood' or community might be better served by a smaller major. Committee members wondered why an additional math course is required for Plant Sciences option versus the overall Biology major. However, with clarifications, it was noted the option has similar requirements to the rest of Biology. The second level of math is what differs across options, Plant Science math will fit within the Biology major as well. Members noted that if the numbers of options increase, having distinct requirements outside of the field of specialization (such as math) will make it more difficult for students to move from one area to another. A member wondered if creating this option might address the shortage of qualified job candidates in agronomy and horticulture employment field. IG said faculty hope to bring more general biology students into the Plant Sciences field, and have more students graduating in this area.

3. Discussion Item: Proposed Neurobiology Major. Steve Johnson, Peter Lipton, and Mary Smith visited and presented the proposal. SP noted discussion will be held in the separate portion of APC meetings. Since the major would be housed in L&S, discussion may be different between the two councils. The proposal requests permission to plan. If approved, the request will be shared throughout the UW System. Then, planning can be done in interest. SJ provided an overview. The Biology – Neurobiology

Option started about 10 years ago. Now, about 300 students are enrollment in the neuro option. Transforming it into its own major will make their work more transparent to professional/graduate schools, and make some courses more easily available to other students. Also, a major housed in L&S and Zoology will help with hiring faculty with generating funds for needed lab classes. The curriculum will be similar to what it is now, with addition of introductory courses that other majors can take. PL noted that having a clear major will attract high quality students to UW; the current biology option is not as prestigious or clear for prospective students. Committee members asked when students currently declare the option. MS: They typically declare as juniors or seniors. Committee members also anticipate students starting in Biology and transferring to Neurobiology. MS said yes, that currently happens as the option and anticipate it will continue to occur with the major.

4. Request for Comment: Undergraduate Sustainability Certificate. Request to comment on a new undergraduate certificate that will be hosted by the Nelson Institute and the Office of Sustainability. Craig Benson, Director Office of Sustainability, and Pat Eagan, Engineering Professional Development, visited and presented an overview. The certificate targets undergraduates across the campus, and will be housed and administered by the Nelson Institute. The 19 credit certificate includes three courses in principles and literacy, a capstone course, a service learning course; the remaining 6 credits selected from a campus-wide course list. In discussion, Committee members' feedback revolved around four themes:

a.) Number of credits. Members noted 19 credits is on the high side, and may affect the number of students that can complete it.

b.) Enrollment management. Members wondered – is there a plan if more space in the capstone course is needed? CB indicated they plan to cap certificate enrollment at 100, first-come, first-serve. Members also wondered about the 3.0 GPA certificate entry requirement. Given the goal of making the certificate widely available to students, will it limit enrollments?

c.) Pedagogy / courses to fill requirements. Members noted that while the principles courses shared a core theme, the list of courses that could be used to meet the interest/Focus requirement were quite dispersed pedagogically. What criteria are used to determine if a course meet a requirement? (this will be also be helpful when courses are added in the future.) Members also suggested allowable courses table be revised to include only staffed courses departments have plans to offer in the future.

d.) Value to students. Members recommended a more explicit description of the certificate's value to students (are employers looking for this kind of training? Other values to the students?) Due to an error, the proposal was not circulated to the CALS APC prior to the meeting. Members approved that action to be tabled until the next meeting, so CALS APC members may review the proposal.

2:05 Joint CALS and L&S portion of the meeting adjourned.

Minutes for L&S-only APC

1. Announcements and Updates. a.) KS announced the L&S Annual Report is now available. See: <http://bit.ly/1ap5tnR>. CJ suggested this be sent to parents of L&S students. b.) Communication to Departments and Programs re: 30-credit minimum for MA/MS degrees; APC to discuss at future meeting c.) Further action on Climate Committee report deferred to next meeting. KS noted he would like to work on clarifying the definition of a healthy working environment. JN noted that we may want to align this language with campus work on language about bullying.

2. Approval of notes from 9/17/13. They are not yet available; action tabled to next meeting.

3. Consultations of the Dean: L&S Comment on Proposal to Reorganize and Expand the Arts Institute. KS asked for advisement on the proposal, especially in regards to intersections of a potential Arts Institute with L&S. Committee member discussion centered around 4 main themes:

a.) Curriculum. Members noted the proposal implies oversight and jurisdiction of L&S arts-related curriculum. Members advised the Arts Institute should not have curriculum authority, and may not have authority for L&S curriculum. A comparison was made to the Institute of Biology Education, where academic authority is being removed.

b.) Funding. In this day of limited resources, members did not believe the proposal adequately justified the amount to fund the Institute. They were also concerned about a negative public reaction towards funding a new Institute in difficult budget times; that kind of reaction would affect the entire campus. If this continues forward, members requested a way to explain to our outside constituency why this level of funding is necessary.

c.) Faculty support. Committee members noted concern that the proposal seems to have limited support of L&S faculty in the arts. Many L&S arts programs strongly value their partnership as part of the liberal arts.

d.) Identified issues. Members expressed some doubt that creation of the Institute alone could solve some of the identified issues. In respect to curricular issues in particular, it was noted that departments have not engaged L&S administration in ways to enhance collaboration across colleges.

3:15 meeting adjourned.

Notes submitted by Kimbrin Cornelius
Curriculum Administration Specialist, L&S