

Agenda

CALS Curriculum Committee Meeting
Tuesday, February 12, 2013, 12:00 p.m.
250 Agricultural Hall

Members:

___ Francisco Pelegri, (2013)

___ Jeri Barak, (2014)

___ Bill Bland, (2014)

___ Amin Fadl, (2013)

___ Randy Jackson, (2013)

___ Maya Hayslett, (2013)

___ Jack Kloppenburg, (2015)

___ Paul Mitchell, (2013)

___ Masarah Van Eyck, (2015)

CALS Ex Officio:

Sarah Pfatteicher ___

CASI Ex Officio:

___ Liv Sandberg (non-voting)

Student Reps: ___ Tim Pearson

UP&S Office: ___ Susan Gisler

___ Dan Statter

MINUTES

1. December 18, 2012 minutes (page 2)
2. January 22, 2013 minutes (page 6)

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

-

NEW BUSINESS

1. Directed Study Policy (page 10)
2. Biology Major (document forthcoming)

ANNOUNCEMENT

1. Update on Assistant Dean search

MINUTES

CALS Curriculum Committee Meeting
Tuesday, December 18, 2012, 12:00PM
250 Agriculture Hall

Present: Pelegri, Hayslett, Kloppenburg, Jackson, Sandberg, Van Eyck, Pfatteicher, Gisler, Statter

Absent: Bland, Fadl, Mitchell

Pelegri calls meeting to order at 12:01PM.

Minutes

Van Eyck motioned to approve minutes, Hayslett seconded the motion. The minutes are unanimously approved.

Course Change Proposals

Nutri. Sci 520:

Kloppenburg acting as lead, summarizes change (change credits from 2 to 3) and rationale for change (accreditation). Course meets credit hours standard. Course will add more case studies.

Does not see any reason to deny. Kloppenburg moves to approve request. Barak second.

Pelegri states proposal looks straight-forward.

Pelegri calls to question. Motion carries unanimously.

Didactic Program in Dietetics

Kloppenburg acting as lead, states they would like to delete two requirements (not whole course) and replace with courses out of the business school.

Explains the department would like to decrease instructional load of instructor and will meet accreditation standards. There is small overlap with other courses, but confident that the course can be adjusted to fit appropriately within other courses.

Support letter from food science and e-mail from business.

Food science and dietetics have large enrollment gains—part of broader conversation to support more students. Reason this came before the committee is due to the effect on other departments and school of business.

Move to approve the request from Nutri. Sci. to alter curriculum as presented. Second from Jackson.

Pelegri calls to question. Motion carries unanimously.

AAE 334:

Tabled by committee until next semester in order to receive more information from the department.

Animal Sci. 101:

Van Eyck acting as lead, states the change is in course title only. Revised title will better reflect existing content. Content is introductory. Department hopes that course title change will be more apt for students looking for introductory foundation. Proposal accompanied by two letters of support.

Learning outcomes will not change. Syllabus did provide assessment, but no grading scale. Van Eyck unsure if objectives are well articulated.

Committee requests grading scale from department

Van Eyck moves to accept title change, pending, inclusion of grading scale in final materials. Seconded by Hayslett.

Does department needs letter from Dairy Sci? Committee informed department will receive notice further down the process. Department did send an e-mail stating support.

Pelegri calls to question. Motion carries unanimously.

Botany/Zoology/Biology 151, 152, 153:

Pfatteicher acting as lead, explains purpose of each course (153 is primarily engineering students)

153 does not have lab component and courses are cross-listed with botany and zoology.

MIU money going to “re-vamp” bio. As part of proposal, the Provost requested Zoology provide a clear plan of how to spend money.

States purpose of this proposal is to align content (151) with new students coming from AP courses.

Academic Services Office received e-mail from Zoology department on pending course changes. After speaking with other departments and colleges, it was determined that Zoology did not reach out to other departments.

Appears that proper shared governance channels were not utilized.

Committee adds new standards in AP Biology does not include study on plants.

Committee discusses concern that instruction in Bio. is sub-par because studies show that students that take the AP exams but not 151 do better in 152 than students who took 151. Also concerned that the department of Zoology did not go through proper shared governance channels.

Concerned how the department will identify students. Assistant Dean in L&S shared that concern with department of Zoology. **Pfatteicher makes friendly amendment to have department identify how to connect with potential prospective students.**

Currently, biology is not “owned” by CALS. If we have concerns, we can share them, but cannot approve/deny.

Expresses that L&S committee will also be looking at the proposal. Explains that CALS administration would like seat at the table to develop 151/152.

Concerned about failure to meet shared governance standards. No syllabus included in proposal

Committee proposes, in order to maintain attention on proposal, an ex-officio member from CALS Curriculum Committee to sit on Intro. Bio. Executive Committee developing 151/152.

Member emphasizes that faculty was contacted by Zoology department, does not feel intentional deviance.

Move to support changes made in introductory Sequence and feel it is for the benefit of students, but would like to express concerns over failure to meet shared governance process and expect to be involved in future planning and developing (i.e.; Bio. Exec. Committee).

New Course Proposal

AAE 246:

Barak acting as lead, states course description was detailed enough. Yet to receive response from instructor regarding possible conflict with other courses (334 Ag. Econ.).

Course is not cross-listed. There are no letters of support.

MIU grant focused on providing funding for courses in this topic area.

Since other departments (e.g. Nelson Inst.) are not cross-listed, the department will not see proposal until next step.

Would like to know how they will deal with subject without overlap. **Barak friendly amendment to wait until response from department to explain proposed course similarity to other courses.**

States that overlap in this field is needed. Departments teach subject differently and variety of courses is needed. Committee would like to see explicit statement regarding relationship to other, similar courses.

Barak motion to table.

Other Business

Biology major will likely come before body in January. Will likely determine if major is based in CALS.

Motion to adjourn at 1:09pm. Seconded by Jackson.

Submitted Dan Statter,

MINUTES

CALS Curriculum Committee Meeting
Tuesday, January 22, 2013, 12:00PM
250 Agriculture Hall

Present: Francisco Pelegri, Jeri Barak, Bill Bland, Amin Fadl, Maya Hayslett, Jack Kloppenburg, Sarah Pfatteicher, Tim Pearson, Liv Sandberg, Masarah Van Eyck

Absent: Randy Jackson, Paul Mitchell

Guests: Barbara Forrest (Academic Programs, AAE), Ian Coxhead (Professor and Chair, AAE)

Pelegri calls meeting to order at 12:05PM.

Minutes

December 18, 2012 minutes were not reviewed by committee. Minutes will appear on upcoming committee meeting.

Course Change Proposals

A A E 334: The Environment and the Global Economy (Lead: Van Eyck)

Tabled by committee on December 18, 2012 in order to receive more information from the department.

Committee received "Summary of Pending Course Proposals" document from department.

Course enrollment is estimated to be 100 students. The committee considered enrollment limits.

Van Eyck calls to question. Barak seconds. Motion approved.

Envir. Studies 301: Introduction to Aerial Photo Systems (Lead: Bland)

Proposed course syllabus states: "Undergraduate and graduate students will be graded on separate scales. Cart-GIS Certificate students are graded on the graduate scale."

No grading scale on proposed course syllabus.

Committee recommendation: Look at proposed credit maximum relationship to course requirements.

Pelegri calls to question. Kloppenburg seconds. Motion approved.

Envir. Studies 302: Introduction to Electro-optical and Microwave Remote Sensing Systems

(Lead: Bland)

No grading scale on proposed course syllabus.

Committee states course is with-in 30 minutes of qualifying as a 4 credit course.

Committee recommendation: Look at relationship between proposed credit maximum and course requirements.

Pelegri calls to question. Kloppenburg seconds. Motion approved.

A A E 730: Economics of Development 1 (Lead: Hayslett)

Grading scale on proposed syllabus missing “D” value.

Hayslett calls to question. Van Eyck seconds. Motion approved.

A A E 731: Economics of Development 2 (Lead: Hayslett)

Committee discusses “meets with” aspect of proposal and course relationship to Economics 296.

Hayslett calls to question. Fadl seconds. Motion approved.

A A E 747: Economics of the Food Industry (Lead: Hayslett)

Committee discusses relationship to courses outside of subject area.

Course is cross-listed.

Hayslett calls to question. Barak seconds. Motion approved.

A A E 760: Dynamic Natural Resource Economics (Lead: Hayslett)

Committee discusses course title and course description.

Hayslett calls to question. Van Eyck seconds. Motion approved.

A A E 762: Environmental Economics (Lead: Hayslett)

Discussion of course proposal.

Hayslett calls to question. Kloppenburg seconds. Motion approved.

Biochem. 704: Chemical Biology (Lead: Fadl)

TABLED

Life Sciences Comm. 251: Science, Media and Society (Lead: Kloppenburg)

Committee discusses breadth designation to General Education.

Motion approved.

New Course Proposal

A A E 246: Economic and Environmental Dimensions of Climate Change (Lead: Barak)

Grading scale may be unclear to students.

Friendly recommendation by committee: provide language to explain extent proposed course content overlaps with existing courses addressing climate change, and clarify grading scale.

Barak calls to question. Bland seconds. Motion approved.

A A E 642: Foundations of Development Economics (Lead: Jackson)

Comments from Committee: “This seems to have been a very healthy process resulting in re-assignment of some faculty to teach their new “foundations” and “frontiers” courses. In short,

all 3 course proposals [AAE 642, AAE 643, AAE 746] appear to be in good shape with no glaring omissions or problems.”

Pelegri calls to question. Van Eyck seconds. Motion approved.

A A E 643: Foundations of Environmental Economics (Lead: Jackson)

Correct course title: Foundations of Environmental and Resources Economics

Committee discusses relationship to frontier courses.

Pelegri calls to question. Fadl seconds. Motion approved.

A A E 746: Frontiers in Agricultural Economics 1 (Lead: Jackson)

Committee discusses relationship to frontier courses. Reviews relationship of course structure to foundation courses.

Pelegri calls to question. Kloppenburg seconds. Motion approved.

A A E 641:

Committee discusses learning objectives, language outcomes and assessment of students. Committee suggests revisions of learning outcomes and will follow-up with department.

Van Eyck calls to question. Bland seconds. Motion approved.

Other Business

Motion to adjourn at _____pm. Seconded by _____

Submitted Dan Statter,

-Madison Policy on Directed/Independent Study for Undergraduates

JLM/ADP, Jan 9, 2013, Draft V.8.

Context and Motivation for This Policy Discussion

Undergraduates have the opportunity to take directed/independent study (subsequently referred to as directed study) with UW-Madison faculty as part of a range of learning experiences available to them. These experiences are high-value learning experiences and contribute to the Wisconsin Experience. They are an important part of the educational experience at a major research university in which faculty mentor students in scholarly activity, provide individual-level feedback, and model the behavior and norms of academia and professional life. In these one-on-one learning experiences, student learning is “directed” by an instructor; the student is learning “independently” of other students under the direction of the faculty member. A clear policy context assures a common understanding and protects the value and integrity of that learning experience and what it signals to others.

This document seeks to update existing policies and guidelines that govern the terms of directed study. Issues of what constitutes course credit is a matter for internal and external scrutiny given that course credit is the “currency” linked to federal financial aid and that the United States Congress has legislated a definition of the student credit hour.

Recent misunderstandings about the use of directed study and cases of misuse demonstrate the need for a campus-wide policy.

Student and Instructor Participation in Directed/Independent Study

Approximately 40 percent of those who graduate with a bachelor’s degree in recent years participated in directed study during their time as an undergraduate. A February 2012 analysis of directed study showed that on average 12% of undergraduates enroll in 2.6 credits of directed study each semester. On average 41% of instructors enroll one or more student in directed study each semester: the average enrollments per instructor were 3.8 students in 8.9 credits. The majority of instructors (87%) enroll five or fewer directed study students. Overall, 97% of directed study instructors enrolled 15 or fewer students. Two percent of instructors enrolled between 16 and 30 students. About 1% of instructors committed to mentoring more than 30 students, with a small number of outlier cases of enrollments over 100. Thus, for a small number of cases, directed study courses appear to be a substitute for group instruction or there are cases for which the expectations for individual supervision of students could not possibly be met.

Directed/Independent Study Courses – Current Policy Context

The Undergraduate Catalog describes directed study as follows: “Directed Study offers the student an opportunity to work with a faculty member on an individual study program. A student who is stimulated by a particular concept or problem encountered in a course can pursue and develop that interest in depth through a Directed Study project. Such individualized study can make a valuable contribution to a student’s educational experience. Directed Study courses are made available by departments on the basis of a student’s preparation and motivation and a faculty member’s willingness to accept the student in such an endeavor”.

Policy, guidelines and requirements associated with directed study are found in the Undergraduate Catalog, embedded in the course approval policy, noted in language on the Registrar's Office web site, and included in Registrar's Office communications to the departmental curricular representatives. Additionally, there is information in the L&S Administrative Gateway and on websites for other schools and colleges. In the next section, these relevant policies and guidelines are assembled into a single document. The L&S documents form the basis of several sections. Some additional language has been added to clarify and make the guidelines better fit the current academic context.

Recommended Policy and Guidelines for Directed/Independent Study

This policy is intended to be a guide to the conduct of directed/independent study. It is intended to recognize a range of accepted norms across the disciplines. It will be most useful in its application at the time that new independent/directed study courses are proposed and in circumstances when there is some evidence of misuse or abuse of these shared standards.

A. Common values and expectations

As a fundamental value, directed study is to be a high-quality mentored learning experience that includes regular instructional contact between the instructor and the student. Students become more self-directed learners while they work closely with faculty mentors who guide their research, provide feedback, and model scholarly and professional behavior. By their nature, these experiences are highly variable. Common expectations as defined in these guidelines ensure the integrity of the student experience across the breadth of the university offerings.

B. Who may be an instructor for directed study?

Individual departments determine who may be a directed study instructor in their subject area. Directed study instructors must have the appropriate academic credentials to teach the specific course and they must hold a UW-Madison instructor appointment. Some departments may limit this role to tenured/tenure track faculty. Others may extend this role to appropriately credentialed instructional academic staff and emeritus faculty. Each department should establish criteria and maintain a list of instructors who may oversee directed study in their subject area.

C. Responsibilities of the directed study instructor

The instructor oversees the student's learning experience. The instructor ensures that credit awarded is linked to instructional activity and to projects appropriate to the UW-Madison learning experience. Any instructor who is approached by a student with a request to mentor a directed study course may accept or decline the request. If (s)he accepts, the instructor is expected to establish the instructional criteria for the credit awarded, define the instructional contact, and approve the student projects and student learning experience. The instructor is responsible for evaluation of student work and determines the appropriate grade. These instructor responsibilities are not to be delegated to others.

D. Enrollment timing and limits

Students are responsible for initiating and developing arrangements with the instructor. Students make the request to the instructor, who may accept or decline. The arrangements should be made by the end of the course add deadline, usually the end of the second week for fall and spring semesters. The student and the instructor prepare a written study plan (see section E.) and determine the time and place for regular meetings, the number of credits to be earned, and how to enroll in the course.

Students who enroll late need additional approvals. Enrollments after the course add deadline (the end of the second week of class in fall and spring semesters; consult appropriate sources for summer sessions) but within the first half of the semester require approval from the instructor and departmental administration. Students who enroll after the semester is more than half completed must have the approval from the instructor, the departmental administrator, *and* an academic dean. The written study plan is one document used as a basis for approval. Approval should only be given if the study plan is appropriate for the amount of work that can be accomplished at the late date in the semester, recognizing that the work for the specified number of credits must now fit into a compressed time frame.

A student may not enroll for directed study for a prior semester once the semester has ended. Exceptions may be made for students who were enrolled in other directed/independent study courses or group instruction courses in the prior semester that were converted to directed/independent study courses; requires dean's office approval.

E. Plan of study

Students are responsible for preparing a written study plan, in collaboration and agreement of the instructor, consistent with the responsibilities of the instructor. The study plan will include expectations for learning and student work, the time and place for regular meetings, the number of credits to be earned, and any other issues related to the learning experience. The student and the instructor should keep a copy of the agreement; the instructor may be asked to make the agreement available, especially if the instructor is advising a large number of directed study students (section I) or if the student seeks to add the directed study course late in the semester (section D).

F. Assigning appropriate levels of credits

According to the Federal Credit Definition (Appendix 1), the amount of credit for group instruction is such that each credit should be equivalent to one hour of classroom instruction and a minimum of two hours of additional student work per week over 15 weeks, or the equivalent effort over a different time frame, or an amount of academic work equivalent to what would be expected in other for-credit activity.

For directed study and other forms of independent study and one-on-one instruction, the amount of work and learning must be consistent with that required in a group instruction course of the same number of credits. *Determining appropriate equivalent effort to group instruction requires judgment.*

Directed study encompasses a broad range of student learning experiences (examples include laboratory work, research projects, creative productions, and academically supervised internships). No single standard can apply to all of the possible experiences. Credit levels should be justified in the plan of study and should be consistent with the standards of the discipline. Students should register for credits appropriate to the plan for the directed study, consistent with the required amount of direct faculty instruction time, work expected of the student, graded papers or projects or other activities, and the learning expectations.

Examples of reasonable standards for credit include:

- Reading literary works related to a specific topic, 3 credits: The student read a short novel every week, discussed the reading with the professor in a weekly face-to-face meeting, and submitted a long paper at the end of the semester. Learning progress was evaluated based on weekly meetings with the professor and the final paper. Estimated amount of student work was 8-10 hours per week, including independent work and meetings with the professor.
- Acting in a minor role for a full-scale theater production, 1 credit. In addition to regular rehearsal (approximately 50 hours over the course of the semester), the student met individually with the professor several times throughout the semester. Learning progress was evaluated based on the student's progression and performance in rehearsals and the student's demonstration of learning in meetings with the professor.
- Lab research, 3 credits. The student conducted a lab-based experimental research project, which was defined in consultation with a professor. The student met periodically (at least once every three weeks) in a scheduled face-to-face meeting with the professor and also in unscheduled lab conversations. The student was also mentored by graduate students and post-docs who were lab collaborators. The student spent a significant number of hours reading independently and in the lab collecting data. Initially the lab work was closely supervised by the professor, with less supervision as the student gained competence. The student's learning was evaluated by demonstrated development of competence in the lab setting and in one-on-one meetings with the instructor, and was also based on written reports submitted by the student.

[Note to reviewers – this section is still under development. We invite reviewers to provide examples to help better formulate language to describe the appropriate work for a credit of directed study.]

Note that a research paper on its own is not considered the equivalent of a credit's worth of work if it is not accompanied by instructor contact and supervision.

G. Appropriate use of course numbers for directed study courses

Directed/independent study courses are identified by their number. Course numbers in which the middle digit is 9 are reserved for individual instruction (i.e., directed study, independent study, research and thesis) and are not to be used for group instruction. Directed study courses with a

number X98 (e.g., 198 or 698) are offered on a Credit/No Credit basis. Courses numbered X99 are graded. An exception to the use of the middle digit of 9 for individual instruction is made for honors courses; honors individual instruction courses should have a middle digit of 8. The “X” in these examples signifies the appropriate level of the course. For directed study courses, 199 and 299 numbers are appropriate for lower-level undergraduates. Courses numbered 399 are useful at the intermediate level and are used by some units for special purposes (e.g., internships in CALS). Courses numbered 699 are intended for upper-level undergraduates. This distinction is important to maintain because courses numbered at the 600-level signal to those outside the university that the student is pursuing advanced undergraduate work. For example, such credits may be used in some instance to waive graduate-level requirements if a student enters a graduate program. (By campus policy, courses numbered above 699 are reserved for graduate students.)

Students should enroll in the level of directed study that is appropriate for their level in school and prior preparation. Departments who wish to provide directed study opportunities for undergraduates should make a range of numbers available (e.g., 299 for elementary level, 399 for intermediate level, 699 for advanced level) so that they may appropriately serve new students, non-majors, and majors with a range of prior academic experience.

H. Directed study courses may not be used for group instruction

Directed/independent study courses must not to be used for group instruction. Directed study courses should only be used in cases where students are pursuing individually mentored learning experiences, working one-on-one with an instructor, and with no group instruction taking place. Observation of the distinction between directed/independent study and group instruction will ensure that students receive appropriate documentation of their learning experience in their formal record and on their transcript. If instructors are meeting with groups of students on a regularly scheduled basis, the instructor should arrange for the students to be enrolled in a group instruction course (lecture, seminar, discussion, lab) instead of directed/independent study.

I. Limits on Enrollment for Instructors

Because of the expected amount of faculty effort to teach directed study students, the number of undergraduates enrolled in directed study with an instructor will be limited. The limit will be set to 40 credits of undergraduate instruction in directed study per instructor per semester (for example, 40 students at one credit each; 20 students at two credits each, and so on). Directed study enrollments of more than 40 credits for a single instructor may signal that students are not receiving sufficient levels of individual attention or that directed study is being used for group instruction. Annual audits will be conducted by the Academic Planning and Institutional Research (Provost’s Office). If audits identify instructors who exceed this threshold, the school/college and home department will be contacted to confirm that the instructor is meeting all of the academic standards outlined in this policy and that the high levels of directed study have been approved.

J. Policy Hierarchy

In the event that this policy conflicts with state or federal statutes or UW System Board of Regent policy, the policy established at the higher level will take priority.

Appendix 1. Federal Credit Definition

UW-Madison follows the federal credit hour definition, established by Congress in 2010.

The federal credit hour definition is defined as:

“A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally-established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than:

- (1) one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of class student work each week for approximately 15 weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or 10 to 12 weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or
- (2) at least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other activities as established by an institution, including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading toward to the award of credit hours.”

Reference Material

1. Report: UW-Madison Undergraduates Enrolled in Independent Study Courses, Clare Huhn, Academic Planning and Institutional Research, February 2012
2. L&S Administrative Gateway Entry: "Who may teach directed/independent study",
<https://kb.wisc.edu/ls/page.php?id=23745>
3. L&S Administrative Gateway Entry: "L&S Directed/Independent Study Guidelines",
<https://kb.wisc.edu/ls/page.php?id=20133>
4. Courses and Academic Programs Knowledge Base: Course Proposal – Credits,
<https://kb.wisc.edu/vesta/page.php?id=24558>
5. Courses and Academic Programs Knowledge Base: Course Proposal – Selecting a Course Number, <https://kb.wisc.edu/vesta/page.php?id=24556>
6. Undergraduate Catalog Entry: “School of Education Academic Policies and Procedures: Directed Study”, http://pubs.wisc.edu/ug/education_policy.htm#Directedstudy
7. School of Business Form: “Undergraduate Programs Readings and Research (Independent Study) Authorization”,
<http://bus.wisc.edu/~media/Bus/BBA/myBiz/Academic%20forms/rrauth.ashx>
8. School of Nursing
Form for student enrollment
http://academic.son.wisc.edu/studentnet/forms/n699_enroll_auth_form.pdf
Form to outline the contract (what is to be accomplished, by when)
http://academic.son.wisc.edu/studentnet/forms/n699_contract.pdf
9. School of Pharmacy form for 699 courses:
http://pharmacy.wisc.edu/sites/default/files/content/student-resources/current-pharmtox-resources/forms/699form_pharmtox.pdf
- 10.
11. *ADDITIONAL SCHOOL/COLLEGE POLICY INFORMATION, TO BE ADDED AS COLLECTED*