

## MINUTES

### EDUCATION COMMITTEE, BOARD OF REGENTS

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Madison, Wisconsin

February 9, 2006

Regent Burmaster convened the meeting of the Education Committee at 12:40 p.m. Regents Burmaster, Axtell, Davis, Semenas, and Spector were present.

1. Approval of the minutes of the November 10, and December 8, 2005, meetings of the Education Committee

I.1.a.: It was moved by Regent Spector, seconded by Regent Axtell, that the minutes of the November 10, and December 8, 2005, meetings of the Education Committee be approved.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

2. Follow-up Discussion: the UW Growth Agenda and President Reilly's Vision for the Future

The Committee engaged in follow-up discussion of President Reilly's presentation of the UW Growth Agenda and his vision for the future, focusing in particular on the UW System's role in providing access to higher education for Wisconsin citizens through the Wisconsin Covenant program. The Committee queried how it should best go about making the case to political leadership. The Committee also discussed how challenging but how important it would be to develop clear criteria for students who sign the pledge, especially in that gray area of what the Governor articulated as "staying out of trouble." The Committee explored several ways to articulate this: for example, one could require some kind of community service or more academically connected service learning.

Provost Rebecca Martin from UW-Parkside emphasized that Regents and institutions need to be realistic about the kinds of support services that will be required for those students who are admitted under the Covenant program. She said that forty percent of Parkside students are low-income; closing the gap on tuition is just one piece of the puzzle and if the Wisconsin Covenant is not going to be an empty promise, the UW System will need to invest in success for admitted students once they come through our doors. David Glisch-Sanchez from United Council asked that Regents and the UW System be mindful of making the Covenant program fair to all students, especially those living in poverty and for whom certain requirements would be restrictive or even prohibitive given the reality of their lives. Regent Davis asked that higher education officials from Indiana and Oklahoma, where programs like the Covenant are already in practice, be invited to a forthcoming Regent meeting so that Regents could quickly begin the process of seeking answers to the many questions they have about how such a program could work in Wisconsin. The Committee agreed that the program held out enormous promise to Wisconsin citizens and looked forward to hearing more about it in the near future.

3. Streamlining of Academic Program Planning and Review

The Committee then moved to consider revisions to Regent policy and UW System practice that would streamline the process for how academic programs are approved and reviewed. In introducing the proposed changes, Associate Vice President Ron Singer explained that they were recommended as part of a working group charged by President Reilly to study ways to improve the efficiency of the UW System. Dr. Singer explained that there were two separate components to the proposed changes. The first change was to

Regent policy ACIS 1 (Academic Information Series 1), which outlines the Board's statutory responsibility for program approval and review. The requested revision would result in a change to the Joint Review Process. The Joint Review is the final step in the approval of academic programs and is conducted jointly by the UW System Office of Academic and Student Services and the institution, five years after the program is implemented. That review is designed to determine how well the program has met its goals and objectives, and whether it has achieved these goals with the resources anticipated. After the joint review, programs are cycled into the institutional program review process in which campus reviews are conducted for all academic programs every five-to-ten years, depending on the campus. Dr. Singer commented that the joint review has not necessarily been aligned with the program review schedule of the campus. The recommended revision to ACIS 1 establishes that the first campus review of the new academic program, to be conducted approximately five years after implementation, will serve as the joint review.

The second proposed change described to the Committee concerned the existing practice of having new academic programs come before the Education Committee in a first and a second reading. The recommended change would reduce the number of readings of new academic programs from two to one, unless the Committee raised concerns or questions that would need to be addressed and resolved by a second reading. More often than not, observed Dr. Singer, the Committee is ready to approve a new program based on its first reading. The proposed change would improve the efficiency of the institution proposing the program, the Office of Academic and Student Services, which staffs the program approval process, and the Education Committee.

In response to a question from Regent Spector, Dr. Singer responded that the shared governance process as outlined in Chapter 36 was central to the entire program review and approval process, since faculty have oversight of institutional curricula. In response to a question from Regent Axtell, he noted that the origin of the two-reading practice was not known: there is no policy that mandated the two readings, but the practice had been in place for many years. Dr. Singer also reported on several other, smaller changes that had already been made in the name of efficiency but that did not entail policy revisions or Board action. Regent Davis asked whether one could quantify how much time or money the changes would save but was told that even a rough estimate was difficult. Senior Vice President Marrett indicated that freeing up the Board's time on second readings would allow for more focused attention on the broader issues like systemwide program array and avoidance of duplication. Regent Axtell explained to newer Committee members the extent to which new programs coming before the Board in an era of constrained resources are funded through internal reallocation by the institution; given the reality of scarce resources, campuses are forced to re-prioritize their academic programs and the levels at which they are funded.

The Committee agreed that the proposed changes would indeed result in the elimination of redundant practice and improved efficiency for many of the groups involved in the decision-making process. Before voting on the proposal, Regent Spector requested amendments to the resolution language that he felt would add greater precision to the nature and purpose of the proposed changes, to which the Committee agreed.

I.1.c. Revised: It was moved by Regent Spector, seconded by Regent Davis, that upon the recommendation of the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Board of Regents approves the amendments to the Regent Policy ACIS 1.0 *amended July 2003*, Section 3 (IV), to revise the joint review process to eliminate redundancy, and to reduce the number of readings of a new academic program proposal from two to one, except in cases where additional information is requested by the Board.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

4. Program Authorization: First Reading of the Master of Science in Agroecology, UW-Madison

The Committee next heard a first reading of the Master of Science in Agroecology at UW-Madison. David Hogg, Interim Dean, and Richard Barrows, Associate Dean of the UW-Madison College of Agricultural and Life Sciences (CALS) presented the program to the Committee as cutting-edge and in an emerging discipline at the intersection of agriculture and ecology. Associate Dean Barrows described the need for the program by explaining that society is requiring a lot more from the rural landscape and the people who are stewards of its resources. There are diverse stakeholders who have competing demands on land use issues and policy and the new program would train people to negotiate agriculture's changing relationship to society. The Committee was informed that this was the first new program proposed by Madison's College of Agriculture and Life Sciences in 10 years, and that it would be the first M.S. program of its kind in the country, although because of the need it meets, similar programs would likely follow. The employment outlook for graduates was strong with opportunities in farming, agribusiness, local, state and federal government, and private non-profit organizations.

In response to a question from Regent Burmaster on Madison's program of cluster hiring, Associate Dean Barrows explained that cluster hiring allowed for the hiring of small, multi-disciplinary groups of faculty in cutting edge areas, like agroecology. In response to questions from Regents Axtell and Davis, Dr. Barrows described growing collaborations with Uganda and with historically black and tribal colleges. He also explained the College's efforts to diversify its faculty through focused recruiting. Progress has been made, he acknowledged, but the College still has work to do in this area.

The Committee agreed that this program was a good example of why amendments were needed to the program review practice. The Committee expressed its satisfaction that this was a solid program, for which there was societal need, student and employer demand, and which was an innovative and natural fit with the mission of the institution. The Committee informed the program presenters that it was ready to approve its implementation on the spot but could not do so because the full Board had not yet voted on revising the policy. The program would therefore have to return to the Committee at its next meeting for a second reading.

5. Authorization to Recruit: Provost and Vice Chancellor, UW-River Falls

Before acting on the authorization to recruit a new Provost at UW-River Falls, Regent Burmaster introduced the UW System's newest Provost, Christopher Markwood, newly installed at UW-Superior.

I.1.e.: It was moved by Regent Axtell, seconded by Regent Semenas, that the President of the University of Wisconsin System be authorized to recruit for a Provost and Vice Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls, at a salary within the Board of Regents salary range for university senior executive salary group one.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

6. Report of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Senior Vice President Marrett began her report by observing that, as the UW System works to improve access for middle- and low-income students through the Wisconsin Covenant Program, the Education Committee plays a special role in focusing on what, exactly, students have access to. She emphasized that it was not enough to simply open the doors of UW institutions but that the System must be

able to deliver high quality teaching and learning to the students who are admitted. Further, she stated, the UW System must provide accountability that it offers quality teaching and learning. One of the ways it does that is through the work of Lisa Kornetsky, Director of the UW System Office of Professional and Instructional Development, and Bill Cerbin, Professor of Psychology and Assistant to the Provost at UW-La Crosse, whom she introduced to the Committee. Their efforts, and the programs they direct, focus on enhancing teaching and learning in ways that are sustained, systematic, research-based, collaborative and innovative. Senior Vice President Marrett reminded the Committee that the UW System is a national leader in the scholarship of teaching and learning. One of the reasons for that is the excellent work of the UW System Office of Professional and Instructional Development and its partnership with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Another of those reasons, she continued, is because of projects like Lesson Study, developed by UW-La Crosse Professor Bill Cerbin.

In making her remarks, Ms. Kornetsky defined the scholarship of teaching and learning as scholarship requiring a “research” component that goes beyond effective teaching by asking faculty to question and investigate their students’ learning, to submit their findings to peer review, and to make those results public so that others can learn from, and build upon them. She described several scholarship of teaching and learning initiatives taking place throughout the System with the support of the Office of Professional and Instructional Development and introduced the “Lesson Study Project” as one of those having the greatest impact. Ms. Kornetsky observed that there are currently 150 UW System faculty, divided into over 40 teams, and from 10 UW institutions collaborating on Lesson Study. These faculty members are probing deeply—and collecting evidence that will then be shared as usable products—into how their students learn and how their teaching can facilitate that learning.

Professor Cerbin then described “Lesson Study” as a teaching improvement process in which teachers jointly plan, observe, analyze, evaluate and refine actual classroom lessons called “research lessons.” Like other forms of the scholarship of teaching and learning, it is research-based and an effort to make the practice of teaching public, instead of a solitary endeavor practiced behind closed doors. Professor Cerbin recounted to the Committee his early days as a faculty member and how little he knew about how students learn. Over time, he devoted his work as a teacher and a scholar to facilitating the learning and development of students, and to sharing his research with other teachers on how students do and do not learn. In describing the process of Lesson Study, he acknowledged that it sounded like the simplest process in the world but that it was, in fact, very complex in its systematic attention to the most difficult issue for classroom teachers: how students learn.

In response to a question from Regent Axtell, Professor Cerbin explained that Lesson Study originated in Japan, where a real transformation has been demonstrated in pedagogy and student learning. In response to other questions, he also commented on the small stipends (\$300) faculty receive for participating in the year-long program, adding that most faculty members remain in the program beyond their year-long commitment and that they do so for the intrinsic rewards and the benefits provided to their classroom teaching and their students’ learning. At the end of their participation, faculty members have a “product,” which might be composed of a lesson plan, video clips of their teaching, and commentary on what has transpired in their classrooms. These products are examples of scholarship and they are usable, and already in demand, by other teachers. The Committee commended Ms. Kornetsky and Dr. Cerbin for their presentation and Lesson Study for its rigor and attention to improving student learning. Regent Burmaster emphasized her belief in the tremendous value in providing teachers—at all levels—with opportunities for reflection on and refinement of the teaching and learning process.

Resolutions I.1.c. Revised and I.1.e. were referred as consent agenda items to the full session of the Board of Regents at its Friday, February 10, 2006, meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.