

MINUTES
EDUCATION COMMITTEE, BOARD OF REGENTS

July 11, 2013

Committee Actions

Regent Bradley convened the meeting of the Education Committee at 2:40 p.m. Regents Evers, Drew, Hribar, Manydeeds, Petersen and Vasquez were present. Regent Pointer was absent. Regent Bradley invited the Provosts to the table.

Committee Consent Agenda:

Regent Bradley presented the minutes of the June 6, 2013, meeting, along with the following resolutions as consent agenda items:

1. Resolution I.1.a.(2), UW-Oshkosh and UW-Green Bay: Collaborative Bachelor of Science in Environmental Engineering Technology;
2. Resolution I.1.a.(3), UW-Oshkosh and UW-Green Bay: Collaborative Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering Technology; and
3. Resolution I.1.a.(4), UW-Oshkosh and UW-Green Bay: Collaborative Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering Technology.

The consent agenda, moved by Regent Hribar and seconded by Regent Vasquez, passed unanimously.

Doctor of Business Administration at UW-Whitewater

Beverly Kopper, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, told the Regents that the professional doctorate in Business Administration was designed as a terminal degree that would address changing professional expectations in business administration, and at teaching-focused colleges and universities. The increased “focus on business analytics, data-driven decision making, and complex market analysis has intensified the need for more advanced, applied research skills in an increasingly global industry,” argued Provost Kopper. UW-Whitewater, she added, had all of the necessary resources in place to launch and sustain the program, and the D.B.A would contribute important outreach services to local and regional businesses.

UW-Whitewater Dean Christine Clements then addressed the Board and provided a more detailed description of the proposed program. The College of Business and Economics at UW-Whitewater, Clements explained, was the largest business school in the state, serving about 3,300 undergraduate and 800 graduate students. Accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), UW-Whitewater’s business degrees, enrolling over 4,000 students, had achieved the highest level of quality review in national and international

peer evaluations. In addition to UW-Whitewater's expansive program array in business-related fields, there were several unique qualifications applying to the proposed D.B.A., such as combining rigorous academics with applied learning experiences and the integration of outreach units into academic affairs. Further, UW-Whitewater had a long history of providing graduate business education to working professionals, including award-winning online graduate education since 1997.

Clements explained that the proposed D.B.A. would address unmet market needs. Applicants who were currently not adequately served included working professionals in the region who desired a more in-depth set of skills and working professionals who wanted a higher credential. The proposed degree also would serve those who wanted a terminal degree to teach in a university setting with an applied business school environment.

Responding to a call from the AACSB to offer innovative and varied doctoral-level education, which would better address the varying circumstances and career paths of individual students seeking credentials, the proposed degree would focus on applied studies and applied research as distinct from the "theory-creating" research focus typical of Ph.D. programs. UW-Whitewater students enrolled in the D.B.A. would pursue the doctorate in a monthly residence format and remain employed fulltime.

Dean Clements then turned to Rich Meeusen, President and CEO of Badger Meter in Brown Deer, Wisconsin, who is on the Board of the Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce, is a 1976 UW-Whitewater graduate, and also serves as the Chairman of the College of Business and Economics Advisory Board at UW-Whitewater. Mr. Meeusen spoke in strong support of the proposed program and emphasized the value of this proposed degree to employers. He noted a critical need for moving "research and analytical skills out of a purely academic setting into the world of business." Meeusen elaborated on his perception that the volume of data had been steadily increasing in business environments and that there was a great need for workers who would use their research and analytical skills for higher-level strategic decision-making. Meeusen concluded his speech by affirming that he had employees that he would encourage to enroll in this degree program.

In conclusion, Dean Clements reiterated her belief that the D.B.A program would be a distinct program that would meet the critical needs of students and employers in the State, therefore supporting the goals of the UW System Growth Agenda for Wisconsin, and the UW System Office of Economic Development's efforts to connect UW faculty/staff talent and entrepreneurial energy with Wisconsin businesses.

In the short discussion that followed, Regent Drew inquired about the methodology used for the projected enrollment for the D.B.A.; to which Dean Clements replied that the program planners used benchmarks based on similar programs, and that UW-Whitewater would keep the cohorts at a manageable level despite an expected high volume of applicants. Regent Vasquez then posed a question about plans to insure the recruitment of underrepresented students and about enrollment management plans that would foster student diversity. Dean Clements replied that UW-Whitewater would build on the strengths of their undergraduate McNair Scholars program and would actively pursue a

diverse graduate student body. Asked about the impact of the proposed degree on UW-Milwaukee's programs, Provost Britz confirmed that the implementation of a D.B.A. at UW-Whitewater would serve a different market and that he had no reservations.

The motion to approve the Doctor of Education in Business, moved by Regent Vasquez and seconded by Regent Drew, carried unanimously. Regent Bradley thanked Provost Kopper and Dean Clements for their presentations, and Mr. Meussen for his time and support.

Discussion of Board of Regents Planning Process and Goals

Regent Bradley led a discussion on the Board's planning process, seeking to identify goals and priorities for the Education Committee during the 2013-14 academic year. Regent Bradley recounted that Regent President Falbo had led the Board in systemwide planning by circulating a first draft of proposed priorities and goals for 2013-17, which was distributed to Regents at the June 2013 Board meeting. He then handed out a revision of that preliminary draft of the *Board of Regents Priorities and Goals: 2013-2017*, dated July 10, 2013.

Regent Bradley said he welcomed extensive involvement and input from UW System stakeholders including UW System Administration, Chancellors, Provosts, and others. The goals of this planning process were to ensure alignment among the Board and the System's strategic goals, i.e. that they share a common vision. Regent Bradley then asked for some specific wording changes to the Board's Overarching Goals, in section I, as well as in section IV B. and C. In Section I, in which the BOR's overall strategic goals are articulated, he suggested articulating more clearly that the UW System's goals are one and the same with the Boards goals. In Section B, he asked for adding "and graduate programs" to the phrase "key undergraduate programs." Section C of the draft document should fully reflect visionary planning to meet the needs for broadly educated citizens that society asked the Board and the UW System to produce. Regent Bradley also spoke in favor of considering first and foremost issues of educational quality in the Education Committee's priorities and goals, including a discussion of adequate compensation of faculty and staff.

Regent Petersen commented that local businesses and other stakeholders were in support of the Board's goals and priorities, and that the cited goals reflected recent trends in education. UW-Madison Provost De Luca requested clarification on what the phrase "examination of systemwide programs" meant; to which Senior Vice President Mark Nook responded that it referred in part to the System array of majors, and how they fitted with the needs of the state. Nook shared the connection between the state's workforce needs and adequate program offerings had also been taken up by the Board's REDI committee, as well as in conversations taking place throughout the System. Nook then added that systemwide programs could also include the LEAP and Inclusive Excellence initiatives, as well as others "under the big umbrella of the More Graduates initiatives."

Regent Drew inquired about the placeholder in the phrase "in the past xxx years" in the Board's Priorities and Goals draft, requesting that the Board fill in the exact names and timeframes of each of the initiatives. Regent Drew said he was pleased to see a discussion on inclusive excellence on the list of goals since it had not been discussed for a while.

Asked by Regent Bradley to suggest additional goals for the Education Committee, Nook confirmed that a number of regularly recurring reports would be brought forward during the academic year. A scheduled 5-year review of the Freshman Admissions Policy would also include the review of possible changes necessitated by the recent Supreme Court decision in the University of Texas vs. Fisher case. Further, the Board should expect to see a report on remedial education, a review of the policy implications of the Report on Associate Degree Standards, progress reports and policy review connected to the implementation of the 20-credit core general education transfer legislation, as well as development of new policies. Provost de Luca of UW-Madison emphasized that UW-Madison legal staff had advised him that considerable policy changes, and perhaps a new audit process, were needed in view of complying with the Supreme Court decision in the University of Texas vs. Fisher case.

Regent Vasquez noted that the draft describing the Board's priorities and goals did not say anything specific about looking at underrepresented and underserved students. It was, however, his understanding, that the Education Committee would continue to review issues affecting Underrepresented Minority students (URMs) under the items already listed in the document. Nook added that the annual report on Minority and Disadvantaged Students would be shared with the committee soon.

Provost Earns observed that throughout the years he had attended the meetings of the Education Committee, he seemed to recall that goals and priorities were discussed in concert with provosts and UW System Administration and "not decided for us." He inquired whether anyone was "unhappy with the goals that we set each year typically in October," or whether there was a problem with the process that precipitated the change in process.

Regent Millner, who attended the meeting of the Education Committee for the duration of the discussion on the priorities and goals, thanked everyone in the room for their helpful comments, and emphasized that there was no intention to prescribe what the Committee was supposed to do. The draft document distributed in June 2013 was intended to jump-start discussion, to get all committee members engaged, and to recognize all areas in which there was an alignment of goals. The document was intended to articulate certain areas of interests, but the committees and their constituents should craft their own priorities and goals while also working together in pursuit of common interests, in a timely and efficient fashion. There was no intention, she emphasized, to impose uniformity or to micromanage, but instead to guide opportunities for alignment and cooperation between committees. Any comments and suggestions should be directed to Board Secretary, Jane Radue, or Regent Bradley. At the September Board meeting, proposed revisions would be discussed in full.

Regents Bradley and Vasquez both expressed their commitment to producing quality graduates, and urged the Committee and the higher education community not to lose focus on students' educational needs as well as the protection of the UW reputation for high quality education, which ultimately aided students in the marketability of their UW degrees in the labor market.

Nook then redirected the discussion to another prominent issue that had come up during a meeting of the REDI committee, relating to an open record request about individual faculty's

workloads received by a number of UW institutions. Nook declared that issues of compensation and quality of education could not be separated because they were linked and inter-related. He asked that the Education Committee take a comprehensive look at faculty workload, specifically at compensation and its impact on the quality of education. While compensation issues were generally handled by other Board committees, such as Business, Finance, and Audit, (because they approve compensation packages) in his view the UW System was in need of a long-term plan to get faculty compensation in line with its peers. Nook reported that he had been informed by numerous UW institutions of difficulties with hiring the best candidates for a position because of non-competitive salaries.

Regent Bradley asked UW-Stevens Point Provost Greg Summers whether it was true that faculty were leaving because other institutions could offer faculty a smaller workload at an equal or higher salary, causing a brain-drain of qualified teachers and researchers. Provost Summers confirmed that both smaller workloads and higher salaries made some UW-Stevens Point faculty accept jobs even at lower-ranked institutions. Not only were faculty earning more money at less competitive institutions, they were also gaining more time and space for professional development, research, service to the community, and more time to work with undergraduates on research. Various levels of institutional support, not just salaries, greatly affected faculty's overall quality of life.

UW-Stout's Provost Joe Bessie remarked that a focus on cost effectiveness, while appropriate, could also lead to unintended consequences, if it restricted hiring. Typically, in any search, one of the applicants would eventually receive an offer of employment, making it look as if there was no problem with hiring, even if the best candidate declined an offer. In response, Regent Bradley remarked that "The issue is how we provide education at a quality level, not just how to provide it less costly, or to get people processed as quickly as possible." It was the role of the Regents to protect the reputation of the System so it could remain competitive.

Provost Summers added to his previous remarks that he was encouraged by planned activities of the REDI committee, seeking to support technology transfer, research-to-jobs and faculty/undergraduate research collaborations, as these often made a difference in whether a faculty member chose to remain at the institution or not.

UW-Oshkosh Provost Lane Earns observed that a related problem were the investments in start-up and lab packages, as junior faculty often leave for better jobs within the first three years. Citing Interim Chancellor David Ward's estimate of a \$2-3 million opportunity cost per faculty hire at a major research university, Regent Bradley noted that other universities were poaching UW faculty, and by-and-large successful in hiring freshly tenured faculty along with their grants away. In conclusion, Regent Bradley expressed his view that the Regents must make an argument for how UW institutions can get a quality pool of applicants, and engage in a broader Regent-led discussion of recruitment, retention and compensation.

Report of the Associate Degree Standards Working Group

In 2011, Senior Vice President Rebecca Martin had appointed a systemwide working group charged with examining the existing UW System associate degree standards contained in

Regent Policy 4-4, and with providing recommendations for updating them. Senior Vice President Nook thanked Provost Lampe and Provost Faith Hensrud of UW-Superior for their leadership and service as co-chairs of the working group. The main goal of the discussion with the Regents on this day was for the members of the Education Committee and others to provide feedback on the recommendations before policy revisions may be developed. Nook then asked UW Colleges Provost Greg Lampe to report on the findings.

Provost Lampe explained that the systemwide associate degree standards had not been revised since the 1980's and that a new transfer policy (affecting associate degree regulations) had been approved by the Board in 2011. Represented on the group were experienced faculty and academic and student affairs staff from nearly every UW System institution, as well as UW System administration staff who contributed much of the research. The Working Group was asked to examine the relationship between Breadth requirements and General Education requirements as part of the delivery of an associate degree, as well as other institutions' requirements for associate degrees. The goal was to find an alternative to the outdated "20th century approach to a 21st century student body."

Provost Lampe continued with explaining that the working group was charged with assessing the alignment of current standards with the UW System undergraduate Shared Learning Outcomes adopted in 2009. The group was also encouraged to think about more opportunities for students to earn associate degrees, and thus to contribute to the goals of the *Growth Agenda for Wisconsin*. Lampe then elaborated on the guiding principles adopted by the working group in their deliberations and in their recommendations. The overall principle used in making recommendations for systemwide associate degree standards was to increase flexibility in associate degree standards. Therefore, the group recommended establishing minimum standards rather than prescriptive standards. Because some of the original content of RPD 4-4, containing the existing associate degree standards continued to be relevant quality, the group recommended keeping the 60-credit minimum, the 40-hour minimum general education and the 2.0 G.P.A requirements.

One of the main goals of that emerged during group discussions, reported Provost Lampe, was to align minimum standards and requirements with systemwide principles and learning outcomes, and to maintain a focus on serving students' needs by making transferability of credits a high priority. Associate degrees can function as step-out and as milestone degrees for returning adults. The group did a lot of research on how other states dealt with associate degree standards and closely studied the Lumina Foundation's recommendations.

The working group further recommended the adoption of a new framework in which to examine degree requirements and quality standards that respected the autonomy of individual System institutions. Whereas the existing UW System associate degree standards model emphasized breadth as well as competency requirements, the proposed revision would emphasize learning goals and outcomes, not merely a distribution of credits. This new way of establishing and enforcing systemwide standards would allow institutions to be more flexible. Further, it would allow institutions to establish broader ranges in electives and in the total number of general education credits required of students.

UW-Stout Provost Joe Bessie inquired about the rationale behind recommending certain standards and certain associate degree types. He remarked that the Minnesota University system

offers a number of associate degrees, including an applied associate degree typically offered by technical and community colleges; since the working group studied the Minnesota offerings, why did it not “carbon-copy” the Minnesota model? Provost Lampe responded that the intent was to be more inclusive than existing models and to fully accommodate new trends in higher education, rather than to make arbitrary decisions as to which associate degrees should be supported. Regent Evers then posed the following question: Given that 96% of the associate degrees are conferred by the UW Colleges, how would these recommendations affect this two-year institution? Provost Lampe responded that the UW Colleges were currently engaged in a strategic planning process, in which the institution sought to reframe its standards for all its outcome-based degrees, including the 4-year B.A.A.S. degree. Provost Evers said he strongly supported the general recommendations of the working group’s reports. Regent Drew complemented the working group for its diligent work, and added that it would take some time to fully digest the implications of the recommendations.

Nook concluded that based on the input received at the meeting, he would ask the Committee to review and develop new associate degree policies in the near future.

Report of the Senior Vice President

In his update on Academic and Student Affairs, Nook reported on the Higher Learning Commission’s (HLC) approval of the UW FLEX Option. UW-Milwaukee and the UW Colleges were each separately accredited to offer their first competency-based programs in fall 2013. Nook called this a “monumental step,” as the two institutions would now be among the very first institutions in the nation granted accreditation for these types of innovative degrees by HLC.

This accreditation, elaborated Nook, would be crucial in paving the way for students to receive financial aid and to meet Department of Education requirements and rules. Phase I of the UW FLEX Option would be rolled out in the fall, with Phase 2 starting with a 2nd cohort in 2014-15. Program faculty and UW-Extension staff were in the process of designing even more signature features, and adding more degree and major options. Provost Lampe added that he was impressed with how well the institutions worked together in their joint effort to implement the FLEX option, including putting together a substantive change request to the HLC in just a few weeks. UW Extension, UW-Milwaukee, and the UW colleges staff worked extra hard to meet deadlines. Lampe also highlighted that HLC did not voice any reservations and expressed its full support for the next steps required for the implementation of the FLEX Option. A remaining critical component was to clarify how students enrolled in the FLEX option would receive their financial aid. Some progress on that question was under way.

UW-Extension Interim Provost Aaron Brower, who spoke next, also confirmed that the key markers of success were the strong partnerships among institutions. There would be two distinct phases in the implementation of the FLEX option: During fall 2013, the hybrid model was going to be used, which also included a limited number of short term solutions for Year 1 of operations. In the start-up phase, institutions would use existing degree programs and deliver them in the FLEX format. The FLEX degrees would appear on a student’s transcript in the same manner as a standard degree would (without any special markings, such as asterisks, etc.). A second cohort would be started in about 18months, using both the phase 1 and phase 2

approaches. Comparing the work on the FLEX Option to a Lewis and Clark expedition into the unknown, Provost Brower described the accomplishments of the FLEX Option planners as equivalent to Lewis and Clark charting “that first mountain.” Brower concluded that there would still be lots of pieces to put together, but that it was clear that the result of further improvements would be the production of high-quality UW degrees.

Turning to the UW System Growth Agenda for Wisconsin Grants, Nook then provided a progress report on the second year of its operation. The consolidation of smaller grant programs into larger grants that would have the potential for a broader impact had been recommended by the President’s Advisory Committee in 2011. The grants typically supported institutions in pooling their efforts to increase the number of Wisconsin graduates, to help to create more well-paying jobs, and to build stronger communities locally and across the regions they serve. Forty proposals asking for a total of \$11.8 million over three years were submitted by UW System universities, UW Colleges, and UW-Extension. Decisions on funding were made after a thorough review of proposals by two committees comprised of representatives from all UW System institutions. Seven Institutional Change grants totaling \$2,053,024 over three years and three Conference and Professional Development grants totaling \$227,000 over three years, were funded. Funded projects included projects focused on student retention, undergraduate research, and entrepreneurship. The progress reports submitted by the grant recipients showed that institutions were on track with their goals and had received positive feedback. In conclusion, Nook advocated for increasing the funding for the Growth Agenda Grants, as the current \$ 2 million per year provided generous funding, but that there were many more deserving proposals that could not be funded.

Regent Vasquez moved to adjourn and Regent Evers seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.