

## MINUTES

EDUCATION COMMITTEE, BOARD OF REGENTS  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Madison, Wisconsin  
December 9, 2004

Regent Olivieri convened the meeting of the Education Committee at 1:40 p.m. Regents Olivieri, Axtell, Davis, and Richlen were present.

1. Approval of the minutes of the November 4, 2004, meeting of the Education Committee.

I.1.a. It was moved by Regent Axtell, seconded by Regent Richlen, that the minutes of the November 4, 2004, meeting of the Education Committee be approved.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

2. Follow-up Discussion of All-Regent Sessions

a. Expanding Baccalaureate Degree Completion in Wisconsin

The Education Committee engaged in further discussion of the full-Board presentation heard earlier on transfer credit and the Committee on Baccalaureate Expansion (COBE). Regent Richlen pointed out that, like students transferring from the WTCS System, students from within UW institutions transferring to other UW institutions also encounter problems in getting all their coursework to transfer. Senior Vice President Marrett reminded the Committee that because the faculty at each UW institution has authority over the curriculum, there is not uniformity in requirements for majors or general education programs from institution to institution.

Regent Olivier commended the interaction among faculty that is taking place between the two Systems, and suggested that such interaction might offer the most effective means to resolve lingering differences between the two Systems in deciding what should be accepted for transfer. Regent Davis expressed her appreciation for the focus in the COBE work on students of color and the economically disadvantaged. The Committee agreed that attention should be focused on some of the Associate Degree holders who do not continue their education, given Wisconsin's 9<sup>th</sup>-place national ranking in the production of Associate degrees. Regent Olivieri requested a follow-up report in the spring, noting that the Board has a responsibility to continue monitoring the progress that has been made.

The Committee observed with satisfaction the bi-partisan support on the issue of transfer and recommended that once the two System Presidents share the COBE report with the Governor, there should be widespread dissemination among the two Systems' other constituents. Senior Vice President Marrett informed the Committee that the 2005-07 biennial budget does include a request for money with which to implement the COBE recommendations. Should that money become available, there will be an implementation committee to carefully review how the money will be distributed and for which of the recommendations. Several programs will be highlighted for the Governor, including the UW-Oshkosh graduation project reported on by Chancellor Wells, and the applied science degree program between UW-Green Bay and Nicolet.

Several Chancellors and Provosts observed that because all UW System institutions are over-enrolled, it will be extremely difficult to enroll the additional students who enter through the

transfer agreements without additional GPR. If the UW System and others really want to develop the COBE recommendations to the point of significantly increasing the number of baccalaureate degree holders in Wisconsin, funding, and not merely cooperation, will be needed.

b. UW System Inclusivity Initiative

The Committee also engaged in follow-up discussion of the Inclusivity Initiative. Regent Richlen offered some suggestions as to what things System could do to make the Inclusivity initiative even stronger, emphasizing that there are natural intersections among the Inclusivity Initiative, Plan 2008, and the Liberal Education Initiative reported on at the November Board meeting. The System, she suggested, needs to examine closely why students go to college and what keeps them there, and also needs to examine what structures still exist that institutionalize discrimination and marginalization of students and staff, however unwittingly.

The Committee agreed that the exclusion of transgendered people and transgender identity from the UW System's anti-discrimination language and policies is discriminatory. As a remedy, the Committee proposed adding language to include transgender identity to the System policy. Regent Davis informed the Committee that Miller Brewing Company recently added the transgender classification to its corporate policy. Expressing her strong support for such an addition, Senior Vice President Marrett agreed to review what the process and implications of such a policy change might be. After consulting with Legal and other necessary offices, she will prepare a resolution for the Committee to act on in February 2005.

3. Report of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Senior Vice President Marrett began her report by pointing to the environment of constrained resources in which the work of the UW System institutions takes place. She characterized the overriding question for all those working in the UW System in this constrained environment of budget and personnel resources as how to be most effective in the work being done? That question formed the backdrop for the various topics comprised in the Senior Vice President's report, each of which is deeply impacted by budget constraints: Plan 2008, the Sabbaticals Program, Accreditation pressures on Allied Health programs, and program array.

Her remarks led to a lengthy discussion on the *Plan 2008 Phase II* institutional plans, focusing on what role System Administration should play, as well as the oversight role that the Board should play. Regent Davis asked that the Committee, the institutions, and System Administration keep the the results from the Best Practices Conference in mind as plans for Phase II moved forward, and as the Board and UW System Administration worked out what their oversight and facilitation roles should be. The Committee heard reports from several institutions on the processes they used to put together their Phase II plans, which in some cases comprised input from the campus teams who attended the conference.

In response to criticism that had been expressed by student groups and others, Regent Olivieri clarified that Senior Vice President Marrett was not alone responsible for changing the reporting deadline for the Phase II plans to the Board. In consultation with her earlier in the fall, he had suggested changing the month and Board meeting at which the institutional Phase II plans would be presented, in order not to rush the reports, nor the process. Only later did he realize that changing the date would constitute a policy reversal since the Board had approved last June a resolution asking for the reports to be presented in December. Because the deadline ultimately given to the institutions was December 15, it would have been impossible to report on the Phase II

plans at the December Board meeting. The plans will be presented instead at the February 2005 meeting.

Senior Vice President Marrett explained the review process for the incoming plans. Her office will review all the plans and provide feedback to the institutions. Regent Olivieri requested that, time permitting, Committee members receive the written report scheduled for the February Board meeting early so that they would have time to process the report and formulate responses. He expressed his hope that a reasonably transparent process could be developed with which to evaluate the reports and monitor the Phase II plans. Over time, that process should involve representation from all the appropriate groups, students in particular, but also Regents, Chancellors, Provosts, and others.

David Glisch-Sanchez, Director of Academic Affairs at United Council, informed the Committee that students do not always share the conclusion of the institutions that widespread input from student groups is sought and adhered to in determining how institutions should move forward in improving the diversity of their students, faculty, and staff. He asked for the Committee's support in conveying to Chancellors and Provosts that they find more effective ways to include more students of color in their Plan 2008 development and implementation. Regent Davis pressed the Committee to delineate in coming months an appropriate oversight role for the Board as Phase II unfolds. The Committee agreed that clarification of the Board's role was essential.

a. Overview of Accreditation Requirements for Allied Health Professions

The Committee moved out of order to take up the issue of accreditation requirements for allied health professions. At its October meeting, the Education Committee asked for an overview of the allied health professional degree programs offered by UW System institutions. In recent months, the Committee had been asked to approve several programs that required degree and programmatic changes caused by fluctuations in accreditation requirements. At Regent Burmaster's prompting, the Committee decided it needed more information on the extent of the problem of "degree or accreditation creep," and some ideas for what action it might take to address it.

In response, Senior Vice President Marrett's Office prepared a report which included a survey of the UW System's programs in allied health professions and nursing, as well as the accreditation pressures and issues at stake for those degree programs. The Committee was joined by two experts on the issue: Dr. Greg Frazer, Dean of the School of Health Sciences at Duquesne University; and Dean Randall Lambrecht of the UW-Milwaukee School of Allied Health. Dr. Frazer enumerated for the Committee the complex and competing set of factors that contribute to changes in degree requirements, including: expanding scopes of practice in certain fields; specialized accreditation agencies; reimbursement practices; questions of professional prestige and recognition; and market pressures on colleges and universities.

The Committee also heard about the various licensure requirements set by governmental agencies, which can differ from state to state and field to field, and are not necessarily aligned with accreditation requirements. Dean Lambrecht helped the Committee understand that, in some cases, the changes dictating the entry-level degree at which a profession can be practiced are arbitrary and driven by factors that have nothing to do with student access and success. He listed as examples Physical Therapy, which now requires a doctorate for entry-level practice, and Occupational Therapy, which will soon require a master's degree for entry-level practice.

Regent Olivieri observed that, despite the fact that huge demand exists for practitioners in these fields, the entire landscape of allied health professions has made it more difficult for students to enter professional degree programs and graduate in a timely fashion. The costs and the number of required credits for some of these degrees are exorbitant and the students are the ones who suffer. Dr. Frazer and Dean Lambrecht acknowledged that the complexity of health care delivery and practice do, in some legitimate ways, require changes in how student and practitioners are trained. In many allied health professions, existing practitioners will soon need additional training and education in order to continue practicing in a field where they have been working already for years.

The Committee discussed what might be done in response to the situation. The two Deans recommended several concrete steps the UW System could take, both internally and externally. Internally, Senior Vice President Marrett's Office could conduct an evaluation of UW System allied health programs and their required credits-to-degree, to determine whether they align with Board policy on credits-to-degree. The Board could further encourage collaboration among institutions in offering allied health programs, which Dean Lambrecht acknowledged was difficult but would, in the end, benefit students.

Externally, the UW System could choose a particular professional degree offered at its institutions and convene the relevant groups to discuss how such a degree program should be organized and maintained at an appropriate level of entry. Dean Frazer noted that nobody has ever convened the different groups who all contribute to this situation. Relevant groups might include peer institutions beyond the UW System, the specialized accrediting agency whose recognition is required, the licensing group, the U.S. Department of Education, and other groups who monitor (not always effectively, added Dean Frazer) these issues. Dean Frazer recommended to the Committee that it narrow the focus of its efforts, and not try to take on all the allied health professions but choose one where it might still be possible to have some impact (for some, it would be too late for intervention). The Board might also generate a dialogue between public and private institutions on the issue of access. It is the private institutions, the Committee was informed, who seem more ready to adopt higher entry-level degree requirements because they do not have access as a part of their mission. Regent Richlen concluded the discussion by remarking that there does not seem to be any advocate for students in this complicated process. The Committee agreed that, ultimately, that might be the best role and position for the Board to adopt.

b. Announcement of 2005-06 Sabbatical Assignments

Each December the institutions report to the Education Committee their proposed sabbatical assignments. Senior Vice President Marrett reminded the Committee how critical this program is to maintaining the vibrancy of faculty in their areas of teaching and research. Senior Vice President Marrett highlighted for the Committee several examples of such work, singling out one professor from Eau Claire, whose work in chemistry is funded by NSF, and another from UW-Madison, who is one of the country's most prominent T.S. Eliot scholars as well as a Regents Teaching Excellence Award winner from a few years ago. Regent Olivieri called the sabbaticals program a limited but highly valuable resource and expressed his satisfaction that many of the sabbatical proposals contained in the report seemed to adhere to the guidelines and priorities the Regents have established in recent years. In response to a question from Regent Davis, Senior Vice President Marrett told the Committee that the sabbaticals program is routinely opposed by legislators and others who do not understand that it does not take additional money but is funded by salary savings. Regent Olivieri reminded the Committee that virtually every university and college in the country offers sabbaticals: they result in the creation of new knowledge in both teaching and research, and yield invaluable and often unrecognized benefits to students and the public.

c. Annual Program Planning and Review Report

Associate Vice President Ron Singer reviewed for the Committee the Annual Program Planning and Review Report. He emphasized key points of the report, including the fact that the size of the UW System major program array has been relatively steady over the past ten years. The UW System offers approximately 1,110 bachelor's, master's, doctoral and professional degree programs. Dr. Singer observed that that number has changed very little in ten years, resulting in a net decline of six programs. By contrast, he continued, the array itself is quite dynamic: the mix of majors and programs has changed over time to allow for the development of new programs to meet emerging state and student needs. In most cases, this has been done without additional resources. Dr. Singer reported that, through reallocation, the System is able to maintain a balance in the number of programs it offers, even in an environment of declining state resources. Dr. Singer gave the Education Committee credit for raising the profile of certain priorities in the process of program approval and review, including diversity, international education, instructional technology offerings, and collaboration. Regent Richlen asked that careful attention be paid to explaining the real costs of programs as they are presented to the Committee, including the portion that will be covered through student tuition.

4. Program Authorization – First Reading

The Committee heard a first reading of the B.A./B.S. in International Studies at UW-River Falls. Professor Wes Chapin, Director of the International Studies Program, and Gorden Hedahl, Dean of Arts and Sciences at River Falls, described the proposal to elevate what had been a minor in International Studies to a major. The Committee heard that the proposed major is a multi-disciplinary program with strong student demand: International Studies currently has over 100 minors, many of whom have expressed their intention to pursue International Studies as a major. The program not only is a strong expression of the institution's mission and priorities, but also addresses Regent priorities in the area of study abroad and internationalizing of the curriculum. The program has a study abroad requirement for all its majors and, the Committee was informed, UW-River Falls has the infrastructure in place to support such a requirement. The program will help bring the institution much closer to the UW System goal of 25 percent participation in study abroad for its students. Regent Richlen noted her appreciation for the fact that students can choose to receive either a B.A. or a B.S. degree with the major. The Committee was told that no other UW institution in that quadrant of the state offers a major in International Studies. Committee members commended the presenters for what seems to be a high quality program with quality faculty, and which meets real student demand and Wisconsin's need for students prepared to function in a global society. The program will return to the Committee for a second reading in February 2005.

5. Program Authorizations – Second Readings

The Committee then approved the three programs presented at its November meeting: the B.A. in Actuarial Science at UW-Milwaukee; the B.S. in Special Education at UW-Stout; and the Master of Public Health at UW-Madison.

I.1.e.(1): It was moved by Regent Davis, seconded by Regent Axtell, 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.A. in Actuarial Science, UW-Milwaukee

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

I.1.e.(2): It was moved by Regent Davis, seconded by Regent Axtell, that, upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Stout and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Chancellor be authorized to implement the B.S. in Special Education, UW-Stout.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

I.1.e.(3): It was moved by Regent Davis, seconded by Regent Axtell, 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 Master of Public Health, UW-Madison

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

6. Authorization to Recruit: Chancellor, UW-Whitewater

The Education Committee approved the authorization to recruit a new Chancellor at UW-Whitewater. Members of the Committee reiterated their concern that because the UW System is not able to pay competitive salaries in comparison to its higher education peers, more Chancellors and Provosts will leave the System.

I.1.f. It was moved by Regent Davis, seconded by Regent Axtell, that the President of the University of Wisconsin System be authorized to recruit for a Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, at a salary range within the Board of Regents salary range for university senior executive salary group three.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

Resolutions I.1.e.(1), I.1.e.(2), I.1.e.(3), and I.1.f. were referred as consent agenda items to the full session of the Board of Regents at its Friday, December 10, 2004, meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.