

BRIEF NOTES – Approved (corrected) 4/21/2015
College of Letters and Science Academic Planning Council
Tuesday, April 7, 2015, 1:30 – 3:00 p.m., 101 South Hall

Chair: Karl Scholz

Members present: Angela Powell, Jan Edwards, Dan Kapust, Anna Gemrich, Brian Hyer, Matt Turner, Jennifer Noyes, Diane Gooding, Clark Johnson

Members absent: Harry Brighthouse

Observers present: Greg Downey, James Montgomery, Nancy Westphal-Johnson, Anne Gunter, Gery Essenmacher, Devon Wilson, Kimbrin Cornelius, Susan Zaeske, Elaine Klein

1. Announcements. KS noted a policy/process has been circulated for comment for a process to automatically delete courses that have not recently been offered (with opportunity for department to submit exceptions). The L&S Curriculum Committee is supportive and has offered advice.

2. Approval of Notes – March 17, 2015. Approved by members present at that meeting.

3. Academic Program Review

a. French and Italian (Second discussion). SZ summarized discussion points from the previous meeting: council members noted the self-study was an opportunity missed for both for self-reflection and for thinking through difficult decisions that will be required in the current budget climate; requesting additional resources at this time is unrealistic; there is a lack of assessment. Also, while some members suggested that the department reflect on how they will manage with fewer resources, others noted most departments have not been asked to do this via the review process, nor has the budget landscape been finalized. SZ outlined some potential ways forward, including asking the department redo the review, or accept the report and send a strong memo requesting future actions. In discussion, members agreed the department did meet the requirements of the charge, but the review was disappointing in its lack of candid reflection. Members wondered how the department would be able to improve without engaging in the reflection process. Aside from the current budget issues, program reviews from other departments typically address issues and identify places for improvements that optimize use of their current resources. It seems especially important in their case to have used this process to think through upcoming resource challenges. Despite the disappointing review, members agreed forcing the department to redo the review may not be helpful. EMK noted that all programs are being asked to submit learning outcomes to the Provost's Office, so this would be a good time for the department to reboot an assessment program. The motion to accept the program review was approved by the council. They also requested SZ to communicate back to the department the council's serious concerns with the review document.

b. Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences (first discussion). Tabled for a future meeting.

4. Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies (CANES): **a. Proposal to Rename Academic Programs (MA, PhD), Major Code 189, from "Classics" to "Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies" ; and b. Proposal to Create New Options in CANES Graduate Programs, "Classics" and "Hebrew Bible" From Classics to Classical and Near Eastern studies.** *Guest, Jeff Beneker, Chair, CANES.* SZ led discussion.

These two proposals are extensions of the merger of Classics and what was Hebrew and Semitic Studies. JB noted the first proposal simply aligns program names with the departmental name and faculty expertise within it; the second is based on the commonalities between the two programs, so they can be combined as one, with two named options proposed to define the distinctions for graduate students who go out on the job market. The ambition of the proposal is the integrate students and faculty studying Hebrew Bible & literature with those studying Greco literature and the Roman world. The two fields of are distinct in many places, and the department wishes to emphasize the studies of their graduate students are doing through Options. At the same time, one program allows the new department to take advantage of overlapping areas. And, it may open the door for future hires to bridge the gap between disciplines. The motion to approve the proposed changes was unanimously approved by members.

5. Request for Comment – UW-Madison Policy on Credit by Examination. DK provided a brief description of the proposed policy, and that feedback given by the L&S Curriculum Committee was been incorporated into the policy document (native language speakers, and modifying a point regarding prerequisite courses). He reiterated departments have the authority to determine what tests are being offered, for what courses, and which students are eligible. Testing courses will need to be approved by curriculum committees. In discussion, members noted a good exam is expensive to make, and some courses may need to remake the exam frequently. For these reasons, setting a flat rate could be problematic. Members wondered, icould some departments charge more? EMK noted having special fees would be difficult. Members asked questions about the policy, the implementation, and its impact on department.

**6. Request for Comment – Submitted a. UW-Whitewater: MS-Computer Science (supported)
b. UW-Eau Claire: MA in Communication and Leadership (supported).**

7. Dean’s Consultation. KS provided the council with updates in terms of budget news and L&S budget plans.

Meeting adjourned 2:30 pm

Notes submitted by Kimbrin Cornelius, L&S Administration