

L&S Academic Planning Council, Brief Notes

Tuesday, May 3, 2016, 1:00 – 2:30 p.m., 101 South Hall – *approved June 7, 2016*

Chair: Karl Scholz

Members: Ivy Corfis, Katherine Bowie, Harry Brighthouse, Steve Kantrowicz, Clark Landis, Anna Gemrich, Charles Fry, Angela Powell, Matt Turner

Absent: Jan Edwards

Observers: Greg Downey, Nancy Westphal-Johnson, Susan Ellis-Weismer, Anne Gunther, James Montgomery, Devon Wilson, Kimbrin Cornelius, Cal Bergman, Elaine Klein, Eric Wilcots, Susan Zaeske

1. Announcements. KS provided updates about the proposed Certificate on Aging, which was previously approved by L&S APC contingent on the authors meeting specific requests that have not been met.

2. Consent Agenda. (a.) Notes from 4/19/2016 (b) Request for Comment: Notice of Intent to Create BA/BS majors in Environmental Studies and in Environmental Sciences, UW-Superior. (Colleagues in L&S and Nelson Institute indicated that this proposal could go forward.) Consent agenda approved.

3. Academic Program Review (a.) German, Nordic, Slavic. SZ noted that the self-studies were completed in 2014. L&S asked a single review committee to consider the three self-studies together, given restructuring plans. The review committee met with the program faculty and discussed the programs and learning goals, but the final report focused primarily on merger issues. To better highlight for the APC information about the programs, SZ interviewed the review committee to elicit observations and recommendations about the program. She provided a brief report on her discussion, reflecting the language and tone of the review committee and self-study. She reported that the committee noted areas in which the programs excelled, and expressed hope that merger would provide the opportunity to call upon these strengths as models for all programs. For example, the superb Russian Flagship is a model for assessment; merger may provide energy for Slavic to revitalize their other undergraduate programs and address issues with time-to-degree. Scandinavian Studies has created excellent large enrollment courses (Hans Christian Anderson course) which is quite large; the department also offers courses with several First Year Interest Groups (FIGS). German was praised for quality of research and outreach, but the review committee had concerns about their usually low enrollments.

In discussion, members reinforced the review committee's comments about the excellence of these three departments and their programs. They discussed the importance of programs maintaining their excellent "brand" during the merger, and SZ noted L&S could help them with this. Much conversation involved the issue of German's low enrollment numbers compared to the number of faculty in the department. Members felt this issue was particularly concerning given the upcoming merger; if German doesn't intentionally shift their teaching and enrollment strategies, the differing expectations about teaching could create tension in the merged department. Members provided the following advice:

- German should reconsider use of course releases and enrollment caps (though with the understanding that certain courses will necessarily remain small).
- German should consider strategically creating a small number of large-lecture courses, and intentionally balance low- and medium- enrollment with a few large enrollment courses. APC members noted that teaching large-enrollment courses requires distinct skills, and L&S may need to work with German to support this shift (i.e. help with workshops for creating or teach large lecture course).

Members strongly urged the dean to set benchmarks for changing practices in order to improve enrollments (fewer course releases, eliminating caps, developing courses to attract students) and to closely review German enrollments over the next five years

Members advised German that they expect to see a significant shift in their teaching (and advised L&S to provide a deadline) to bring enrollment metrics more into alignment with their partner programs. Members accepted the review as complete.

b. Supplemental Review: Social Work. GD led discussion. Social Work is a small department relative to their peers, but also highly rated. Their non-accredited programs benefit from association with the accredited programs, especially in terms of assessment. Accreditation has the potential to drive budgeting, activity, and resource allocations, so the department takes care to ensure that students and outside stakeholders for the non-accredited program are also well-served. Both programs rely on academic staff, and the department manages this carefully; they have procedures for vetting, evaluating, and mentoring instructors to determine whether they should become renewable instructors. In terms of the doctoral program, quantitative and qualitative students can feel divided (to a degree this is expected and can occur in other Social Sciences). Members agreed the review was excellent and unanimously approved the motion to accept the report.

c. Supplemental Review: Library and Information Studies. GD led discussion. He noted that SLIS intentionally cultivates alternative pathways for students outside from academia, which is helpful in the job market. He also noted a change that is happening in the discipline, which is a move to also include a broader range of information fields, not just libraries, reflecting a disciplinary trend. Members discussed program attrition, since students leave the program for employment; though they noted that this should be monitored, the council had no particular advice to offer. Members unanimously approved the motion to accept the report.

4. Request for Comment on Campus-Level Academic Program Policy Changes a. Proposed Revisions to UAPC Program Review Guidelines. EMK led discussion, noting that campus review guidelines must be followed if a school/college does not have its own; because L&S has guidelines, it will continue to be the case that L&S programs will use L&S guidelines. Under the proposed changes, reviews will be convened 8 years after the last review, so they can be complete within the mandated 10 years. APIR also provides data that programs may need to complete their review. In discussion, members noted that it seemed odd that the UAPC defers to school/college review guidelines, but the Graduate School does not. Members asked that this observation be shared with the UAPC, and wondered whether the Graduate School might also defer to school/college guidelines to prevent confusion about the self-study. **b.**

Proposed Revisions to UAPC Policy on Low-Award Producing Academic Programs. EMK led discussion of the proposed changes (shifting to awards from enrollments, changing low-enrollment certificate cut-offs, and automatic discontinuance). In discussion, members wondered if it makes sense for both graduate and undergraduate programs to have same cut-off, given that graduate programs are likely always to be much smaller. Members suggested that the UAPC may wish to consider having different cut-off points for undergraduate and graduate low-award programs.

Members approved a motion supporting revisions to both policy documents (KB abstained).

5. Consultations of the Dean a. Update: Department of Linguistics Restructuring. SZ noted that the Linguistics Department restructuring is under way, and that more details will be provided at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30

Notes submitted by Kimbrin Cornelius, L&S