

MINUTES

EDUCATION COMMITTEE, BOARD OF REGENTS

Room 1820, Van Hise Hall, UW-Madison

Madison, Wisconsin

November 7, 2002

Regent Boyle convened the meeting of the Education Committee at 1:00 p.m. Regents Boyle, Axtell, Brandes, Burmaster, Jones, Mohs, and Smith were present. Regents Marcovich and Olivieri joined the meeting in progress.

1. Approval of the minutes of the October 10, 2002, meeting of the Education Committee.

It was moved by Regent Smith, seconded by Regent Jones, that the minutes of the October 10, 2002, meeting of the Education Committee be approved.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

2. United Council Presentation.

In order to accommodate travel needs by one the presenters, the Education Committee departed from its agenda to hear members of United Council speak on the infusion of diversity into the curriculum. Senior Vice President Marrett introduced 5 students from United Council: Genella Taylor, Multicultural Issues Director and a doctoral candidate in Counseling Psychology at UW-Madison; Geoffrey Mburu, Multicultural and Diversity Issues Director for the UW-Stevens Point Student Senate; Michael Moscicke, UW-Waukesha Student Government President; Marion Ecks, Chair of UW-Madison Plan 2008 Student Coalition; and Sarah Schuh, UW-Eau Claire Student Senate President. The United Council students addressed how best to prepare culturally competent graduates who can succeed in an increasingly diverse and global society. They emphasized that, as students, they need confident teachers who can teach comfortably and knowledgeably about sensitive topics. Many UW System students have very limited interaction with diverse groups of people, making it all the more imperative to infuse more information about other cultures into the general classes students take.

The United Council students asked that the Board of Regents continue the support they have shown in the past on this topic by helping the UW System make a more concerted effort to infuse diversity into the curriculum. When asked for specific recommendations, Stephanie Hilton, United Council Academic Affairs Director, proposed that Phase II of Plan 2008 include more emphasis on curricular infusion, and that there should be more sharing among faculty and instructional staff of best practices systemwide. They also made available a handout that included specific initiatives for which they would like to see Regent support. Two of the initiatives ask the Board to direct UW System Administration to develop: 1) a system of surveying students on what they need and want in the way of inclusive curricular materials; and 2) a system of surveying students on their experiences of classroom climate and its impact on their success as students. They also suggested three strategies for campus-level action, including: 1) to develop working groups of UW System faculty, academic staff and students to implement "Campus Climate" initiatives; 2) Develop for-credit programs designed after the "Intergroup Dialogue" model from the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, tailored to each individual campus; and 3) to develop a systematic reporting of curricula across the System that would survey content, materials, and instructional practices as they relate to diversity.

Regent Axtell expressed his appreciation for the presentation, noting that Americans are in general ethnocentric and do not cross cultures easily. Regent Brandes concurred, adding that because Wisconsin is not as diverse as other states, it is imperative that the UW System provide its majority-culture students with diversity in their curricula. Discussion centered on how diversity is or ought to be itself an indicator of quality, and hence a determinant in whether or not we are providing our students with a quality education. Regents Smith and Brandes recommended that System Administration respond to the United Council set of initiatives, and Senior Vice President Marrett assured the Committee that her office would follow through.

3. All-Regent Discussion of the Wisconsin Technical College System Presentation

Dr. Richard Carpenter, President of the Wisconsin Technical College System, and several of his colleagues joined the Education Committee for further discussion of the Technical College System. The discussion covered the following points, among others:

- How the two Systems might better communicate to mutual stakeholders on the fruitful collaborative efforts being undertaken, including through the joint marketing of UW and WTCS programs;
- That improving access early on is crucial to both Systems. The two Systems present choices to students along a continuum; it's not an either/or decision whether to attend one System or the other.

4. Precollege Programming Report

The Education Committee heard a presentation on precollege programming. Assistant Vice President Tess Arenas began by noting that the kind of collective programming offered by the UW System in collaboration with DPI and other agencies and institutions is truly exceptional and does not happen elsewhere at this level. She enumerated eight steps to precollege improvement, some of which have already been taken and some which remain to be implemented. She also emphasized the importance of programs that focus on academic skill-building, a focus shared by DPI.

Associate Vice President Frank Goldberg presented the model of precollege evaluation used by his office, a model borrowed from UW-Extension. He also explained the Conceptual Model included in the Precollege Programming Report, which focuses on student attributes, program objectives, outcomes, and deliverable measures. He emphasized that the programs under discussion are enrichment, not remedial programs, and that they represent a partnership between precollege programs and what happens back in students' high school classrooms.

Dr. Kelly Williams, System Institutional Planner, profiled briefly the kinds of programs included in her pilot assessment. She reviewed the assessment goals, highlighting the importance of the interrelationship between the affective and the academic aspects of the programs, the need to provide more effective feedback to the programs, and the development of a longitudinal model that will best determine student success. Dr. Williams reported some preliminary findings, while also cautioning the Committee not to generalize too much since the assessment performed last summer was just a pilot, focused as much on how best to perform assessment as it was on results and outcomes. She did note, however, that none of the programs produced any evidence of negative impact. All of the impact on precollege students appears positive and some of the early outcomes are especially important as benchmark data with which to influence future program design and implementation.

Associate Vice President Goldberg reiterated that while an immediate positive impact of these programs can already be seen, longitudinal tracking is needed in order to determine long-term benefits and the value of the UW System's investment in such programs. Much of the discussion focused on how to be sure that these programs reach not only students of color, but also rural Wisconsin students from disadvantaged families, areas and school districts.

5. Program Authorization – First Reading: M.S. in Health Care Informatics, UW-Milwaukee

Provost Wanat introduced Randall S. Lambrecht, Dean of the School of Allied Health Professions. Dean Lambrecht described the changes and growth in the health care industry over the last decade, and expressed the critical need for trained professionals both locally and nationally. The M.S. in Health Care Informatics is a response to this growing demand, and will produce graduates prepared to assume positions in health care delivery systems, systems analysis and design, computer networking, and health care computer system procurement and management. The Committee expressed strong support for this program, noting that it is the right program, at the right time, and in the right place. It corresponds to the Milwaukee Idea and to the investment into UW-Milwaukee's future, as well as that of southeastern Wisconsin.

6. Program Authorizations – Second Reading.

I.1.e.(1): It was moved by Regent Boyle, seconded by Regent Jones, that, upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Chancellor be authorized to implement the B.S. in Biochemistry.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

I.1.e.(2): It was moved by Regent Brandes, seconded by Regent Mohs, that, upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Chancellor be authorized to implement the B.S. in Biochemistry.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

I.1.e.(3): It was moved by Regent Mohs, seconded by Regent Jones, that, upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Chancellor be authorized to implement the M.S. in Biotechnology.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

7. Ph.D. in History, UW-Milwaukee – Second Reading.

Senior Vice President Cora B. Marrett provided background for the Ph.D. in History at UW-Milwaukee. The program had been brought before the Education Committee in December, 2001, for a first reading. The deteriorating budgetary climate and numerous questions raised at the time of the initial review delayed the second reading of the program. In fact, questions had been raised over the last decade concerning the need, the demand, the adequacy of resources, and the relation of the

program to UW-Milwaukee's mission. Senior Vice President Marrett reminded the Committee that such questions are addressed by the Office of Academic Affairs for every program it reviews. In the case of the Ph.D. in History, Senior Vice President Marrett asserted that these questions had not been adequately resolved. Given that the responsibility of her office is to assess as thoroughly as possible the programmatic directions likely to advance the well-being of students, the institutions within the UW System, and the people of Wisconsin, the Senior Vice President stated that she would not be able to endorse the program without abdicating that responsibility.

Senior Vice President Marrett described the program as addressing three sub-areas: Urban History, Global History, and Modern Studies, and targeting primarily working teachers and administrators in the PK-12 sector. In presenting the reasons why the Office of Academic Affairs could not endorse the History Ph.D., she focused on three topics of concern: the character of the Ph.D. degree; trends in doctoral education in history; and other options already offered by UW-Milwaukee that would meet the needs of the targeted student population. The Ph.D. degree, she noted, is a research degree; institutions invest in Ph.D. programs for the benefits society accrues from the research, scholarly and analytical skills of persons with doctorates. In the last few years, academic leaders in the discipline of history have questioned what they view as the over-production by graduate programs of individuals with history Ph.D.s. Citing a recent address given by the President of the Organization of American Historians, she described the marketplace as unable to support this production: many people with Ph.D.s in history are unable to find jobs in academia, the area for which they are professionally trained, or even in other historical professions (such as work in museums and libraries).

Senior Vice President Marrett reviewed the Urban 13 institutions, a peer group comprised of 21 institutions to which the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee belongs. She noted that many of those institutions do not offer the Ph.D. in history as a part of their doctoral array, making the point that a doctoral program in history is not a universal feature of urban universities or of research-extensive institutions. Senior Vice President Marrett also outlined other doctoral programs offered by UW-Milwaukee that would appear to better serve the non-traditional population targeted by the Ph.D. program in history, including the Ph.D. in Urban History and the Ph.D. in Urban Education (a vibrant program that already attracts PK-12 teachers and administrators).

In conclusion, Senior Vice President Marrett expressed her unwillingness to support a program that targets students looking for intellectual enrichment and an upgrading of existing credentials, especially given the fact that national board certification, rather than the doctorate, remains the gold standard for advancement in elementary and secondary school education. Based on an extensive probe into Milwaukee's proposed program, her only responsible choice was to advise against the implementation of the program.

Provost John Wanat of UW-Milwaukee introduced Marcia Parsons, Professor of Theatre and Dance and Chair of the University Committee, and Jeffrey Merrick, Chair of the Department of History at UW-Milwaukee, to deliver a response to Senior Vice President Marrett. Professor Parsons asserted that she stood for the whole faculty at UW-Milwaukee in support of the Ph.D. in history. UW-Milwaukee, she reminded the Committee, is part of the UW System's doctoral cluster and shares a core mission with UW-Madison to provide a wide array of degree programs, in both basic and applied areas. The addition of a doctoral program in history continues Milwaukee's effort to develop a balanced array as a major urban doctoral institution. She also referred to the Milwaukee Idea and the institution's commitment to apply instructional capacity and research expertise to the Milwaukee community. She asserted that a Ph.D. program in history could address problems created in the rise of an urban environment like Milwaukee, and that a doctorate in history is designed to deepen the humanizing of all students, undergraduate and graduate alike. She concluded by saying that the

history Ph.D. manifests the select mission given to the institution by the University of Wisconsin System to develop a balanced array of doctoral programs.

Professor Merrick began by expressing his disappointment with UW System's decision not to support UW-Milwaukee's Ph.D. program in history. He then countered the argument put forward by Senior Vice President Marrett on the questions of nature, need, and resources. He described Milwaukee's proposed Ph.D. in history as a non-traditional program for non-traditional students. The program was designed thematically, not chronologically, to address three, interdisciplinary fields: urban history, global history, and modern studies. The targeted students were already employed, mostly as K-12 teachers and administrators. Upon completion of the program they would not join the ranks of unemployed history Ph.D.s because they already had jobs and would be pursuing the degree at night and on weekends, with classes scheduled around their work schedules. The History Department could state with confidence that there was a great demand for this program; the Department had conducted surveys of would-be students, and received many queries and emails over the years, asking for such a program.

Professor Merrick acknowledged Senior Vice President Marrett's referencing of statistics from the Organization of American Historians, reporting the over-saturation of the market with history Ph.D.s. However, he continued, those statistics don't apply to the non-traditional students who would enroll in Milwaukee's proposed program. He also countered that people who want to study history are not going to pursue a Ph.D. in Urban Studies, nor in Urban Education, at UW-Milwaukee. They want a Ph.D. in history but because they are full-time working people, they cannot pursue the degree in the traditional programs offered by UW-Madison or Marquette University. Professor Merrick cited an editorial by President Lyall in which she articulated the importance of allowing tax-paying citizens of Wisconsin to enroll in degree programs of their choice.

He ended by emphasizing that the proposed Ph.D. program in history required no new resources: all the faculty are in place; there will be no undermining of existing resources from other programs as feared by the Office of Academic Affairs; and there is adequate classroom space, instructional academic staff, existing courses, advising, etc. The History Department, he concluded, "knows how to make this program work and to manage its time and resources to offer a Ph.D. to real people who have expressed the need for it."

After hearing a reminder from Regent Boyle about who was eligible to vote on any resolution brought before the Committee, the Education Committee spent time deliberating on how best to proceed. Regent Axtell questioned whether it made sense to debate the issue twice and whether it wouldn't make more sense to delay the discussion and the vote until the next day's meeting before the full Board. Regent Jones, however, expressed the need to allow questions for the faculty members from Milwaukee who were present. As Chair of the Committee, Regent Boyle noted that there was no reason why a vote could not be delayed until the full Board meeting the next day.

Regent Burmaster inquired as to whether Resolution I.1.f., recommending that the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee not be authorized to implement the Ph.D. in History, could be amended to make it a positive recommendation. Senior System Legal Counsel Ed Alschuler replied that the motion could be amended and moved for a vote, if the Committee so chose. Resolution I.1.f. was then amended to recommend that the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee be authorized to implement the Ph.D. in History, moved by Regent Burmaster and seconded by Regent Jones (although no vote was taken at that time).

Regent Brandes expressed her strong support for the program, reiterating the apparent student demand, the overwhelming support by the faculty, and the fact that no new resources were required.

She pointed to the letters of support from the Milwaukee business community, and also noted that all of the Regents from Southeastern Wisconsin, who best know the Milwaukee area, were in support of the program. Regent Jones replied that they are Regents for the whole state, not just for the particular area in which they reside and work.

After further discussion, the Education Committee agreed to postpone the vote and additional debate until the next day. Regent Axtell made the motion to “postpone consideration of Resolution I.1.f. to the Full Board, on Friday, November 8.” Regent Smith seconded the resolution. Regents Axtell, Barry, Brandes, Burmaster, Jones, Smith and Marcovich voted in favor of the postponement. Regents Boyle and Mohs voted not to postpone. The motion carried. It was agreed that the presentations by Senior Vice President Marrett and the UW-Milwaukee representatives would be repeated before the full Board the next day at 9:30 a.m.

8. Revised Mission Statements: Second Reading – UW-Platteville and UW-Eau Claire

In October, 2002, the University of Wisconsin-Platteville presented to the Board of Regents its revised mission for a first reading. Following Regent policy, UW-Platteville held a public hearing on October 24, 2002, in order to discuss the revisions, presided over by Regent Randall.

I.1.g.(1): It was moved by Regent Brandes, seconded by Regent Jones, that, upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Platteville, the Board of Regents approves the University of Wisconsin-Platteville’s revised mission.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

In April, 2002, the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire presented to the Board of Regents its revised mission for a first reading. Following Regent policy, UW-Eau Claire held a public hearing on October 31, 2002, in order to discuss the revisions, presided over by Regent Marcovich.

I.1.g.(2): It was moved by Regent Brandes, seconded by Regent Mohs, that, upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, the Board of Regents approves the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire’s revised mission.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

Resolutions I.1.e.(1), I.1.e.(2), I.1.e.(3), I.1.g.(1) and I.1.g.(2) were referred as consent agenda items to the full session of the Board of Regents at its Friday, November 8, 2002 meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.