University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Graduate Faculty Committee (GFC)
Graduate Program Reviews Subcommittee

Monday, February 22, 2016
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.
Mitchell Hall 245

MEETING MINUTES

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:04 a.m. by Barbara Bales, Chair

Present:

(Committee Members): David Allen, Barbara Bales, Martha Carlin, Sheila Feay-Shaw, Shelleen Greene, Seyed Hosseini, Jennifer Jordan, Mo Zell

(Non-Committee Members): Tracey Heatherington (Ex Officio), Tiffany Nation

Absent: Miren Boehm, Vicky Everson, Marija Gajdardziska-Josifovska (Ex Officio), Jenny Kehl, Hamid Ouali

Guests: Woonsup Choi, Amy Otis-Wilborn, ChangShan Wu

II. Approval Minutes from the January 25, 2016 Meeting

Barbara Bales asked the committee if they had an opportunity to review the meeting minutes and if there were any objections to approval. Maureen Zell requested that going forward she would prefer to be referred to as Mo Zell in the meeting minutes. Tiffany Nation assured Barbara Bales and Mo Zell that the correction would be made to the meeting minutes going forward.

A motion was made and seconded to accept and approve the minutes as recorded. The minutes were approved as distributed and passed unanimously.

III. Exceptional Education MS Program Review Report

Barbara Bales called for the 3rd item on the agenda, the Exceptional Education MS program review report. Barbara Bales introduced Amy Otis-Wilborn, professor and graduate representative of the Department of Exceptional Education. Barbara Bales informed the committee that she and Sheila Feay-Shaw had served as internal reviewers. Barbara Bales then opened the floor to Amy Otis-Wilborn.

Amy Otis-Wilborn first informed the committee that the Exceptional Education MS program review was conducted in the spring of the 2014-2015 academic year. She stated that the external reviewers were “excellent” and were very helpful which has not always been the case in her experience with external reviewers. She informed the committee that the program was covering both sets of recommendations from the internal and external reviewers and that the recommendations were already in motion.

Sheila Feay-Shaw informed the committee that while looking at the responses she looked for cross over from all of the recommendations that were given by the external reviewers. She informed the committee that the only concern she had was the first recommendation of listening to the voices of local persons of color, living in low income and with disabilities made by the external reviewers. She felt like with all of the information the program had provided to the external reviewers reflected partnerships voices. She was discouraged where she thought that it was implied that the program was not using partnership voices. Sheila Feay-Shaw would like to be the first to recommend that the Master Program Certificate be continued.

Barbara Bales recommended the use of voices as a marketing tools. She also stated that the students spoke highly of the program. Amy Otis-Wilborn agreed and informed the committee that the students were very excited about this and working on projects.
Amy Otis-Wilborn informed the committee that the program will target a specific population not in 6 months but sooner than agreed with the external and internal reviewers.

Barbara Bales informed the committee that Exceptional Education MS program review would go under GFC Automatic Consent. It was motioned, seconded, and passed unanimously.

IV. Geography MA/MS/PhD Program Review Report

Barbara Bales called for the 4th item on the agenda the Geography MA/MS/PhD program review report. She introduced Professor ChangShan Wu, the program chair and also invited him to introduce his guest, Professor Woonsup Choi, the graduate program representative. Barbara Bales informed the committee that this program review took place in November of 2015. She asked Professor ChangShan Wu if he would like to share anything with the committee.

Professor ChangShan Wu informed the committee that he was in total agreement with the external reviewer’s report. He stated that the program’s salaries of professors are lower than other programs but due to budget cuts this is an issue that cannot be addressed at the present time. He stated that the placement of graduate students was good. Barbara Bales stated “yes, excellent”. He stated that the program would like to develop and offer online courses to attract more students.

Barbara Bales informed the committee that the external reviewers were very high on the program especially the placement of the large number of graduate students. She also stated that the internal reviewers consolidate recommendations to evaluate the most important vs. cost due to budget cuts.

Mo Zell suggested using clearing house as a way to call out the program. She suggested using the program review report as a guide.

Professor ChangShan Wu stated that professors of the program had collaborate with other programs such as Urban Studies and Africology to share classes. He stated that the program had also invited professors from different departments to give presentations.

Seyed Hosseini stated that quality is important. He asked if there was a problem with offering courses. Professor ChangShan Wu informed the committee that there is probably one cancellation of a course every 2 years due to low enrollment with the exception of this year. There were 2 classes canceled. He explained that there is only a 2 – 3 year window to offer courses to students.

Barbara Bales informed the committee that Geography MA/MS/PhD program review would go under GFC Automatic Consent. It was motioned, seconded, and passed unanimously.

V. Revised Draft: GFC Doc. No. #951

Barbara Bales directed the committee’s attention to the 5th item on the agenda, the revised draft of the GFC Doc. No. 951.

She directed the committee to page 8 of the GFC Doc No. 951 and brought to their attention the revisions that had been made in Section IX under C. GFC Actions and in Section X Develop Action Plan and Assess Implementation. She noted that the revisions were in italic font.

C. GFC Actions

If an Executive Summary recommends Provisional Status or Discontinuance the GFC will consider a full discussion.

The Graduate Faculty Committee will consider the report and recommendations of the GPR and refer its recommendations on the graduate program(s) to the Dean of the Graduate School. The Dean then transmits the document to the Provost (with copies to unit dean, chair, grad director, GFC and GPR chairs), which will be based on the site visit, executive summary and recommendations, GPR report and GFC approval.

Develop action plan and assess implementation.

A. Dean of individual unit meets department chair and graduate program director, and other key personnel at discretion of program; they prepare proposed action plan.
B. Provost meets with DGS and deans of newly reviewed programs to discuss reviewer recommendations with proposed and prioritized action plans including resources. The funding contributions from all relevant administrators and the timeline for implementation should be specified in the final action plan. The provost approves the final action and resource plan.

C. On an annual basis the provost and DGS review progress on implementation of action plans from previous years.

There were no comments or recommendations from the committee on these revisions.

Barbara Bales proceeded on to direct the committee’s attention on to page 5 Section VIII. Consultants’ Report and Model Format [formerly GFC Doc. 45], A. Report items A – E. She noted that the revisions were in italic font.

She informed the committee of the 4 categories that the program reviews would fall under. She read though each category and gave a brief summary of the definitions. She started with explaining D and E. Barbara Bales explained that D. Provisional Status would have the definition of critical issues within the program and suspending admissions until the issues have been resolved and E. Discontinuance would have the definition of shutting down the program immediately.

Before she could continue with the definitions Martha Carlin recommended changing the wording in A. from Exemplar to Exemplary.

Sheila Feay-Shaw requested an explanation of the different between A and B. Barbara Bales’ definition was of the two program reviews that committee observed previously at the start of the meeting.

Barbara Bales suggested that the listing of categories could go back to 3 categories instead of 4 categories. She also suggested that in B. the wording could just be “Continuance” or in A. the wording “Recommendations” could be removed.

Mo Zell questioned the need to come up with titles for the categories. Barbara Bales informed the committee that 3 categories are needed to show, Continuance, With Conditions, and Discontinuance when reviewing a program.

Barbara Bales informed the committee that she had met with Marija Gajardziska-Josifovska to develop and discuss the categories. She informed the committee that during the development of the categories it was align the same as the Milwaukee Public Schools.

Seyed Hosseini recommended deficiency reviews.

Tracey Heatherington informed the committee that hopefully the program reviews will be used and be available to Deans in decision making and ranking of programs when needed in reviewing programs due to budget cuts and merging of units.

There was a committee discussion on the categories. After some discussion among committee members, Barbara Bales announced that the problem categories seem to be categories B, C, and D. Barbara Bales recommended that the committee concentrate on those categories.

Below are the results of the committee’s discussion and decision on revisions for categories B, C, and D. Committee revisions are in italic font, underlines, and strikethrough.

A. **Exemplary Continuance without Conditions**: The program will continue operations taking into account recommendations changes from reviewers. The next full review will be scheduled in ten years.

B. **Continuance with Conditions Considerations**: The program’s response will address the reviewer’s recommendations need to make substantial changes to its operations in response to the reviewer recommendations. The next full review would be scheduled in ten years.

C. **Continuance with Show Cause**: The program has one year to submit an action plan to the Unit Dean provide an action plan to showing cause for continuing as described in Section 10. If acceptable, the program will continue on the usual ten-year review cycle. If progress is evident, the
program will continue but the next review will be scheduled in five years unless the Unit Dean certifies progress. If show cause for continuing progress is unacceptable, program will be moved to Provisional Status.

Barbara Bales thanked the committee for getting through decisions on categories A – C. She informed the committee that the discussion on revisions will continue at the next meeting.

VI. Update on GPR Discussion Asking GFC to Take up Looking into the Possibility of Creating Some Type of Clearing House for Graduate Level Courses That Would Cross Disciplines (e.g., Research Methods, Theory Courses, Research Design, etc.) Maybe Similar to the GER Structure at the Undergraduate Level.

Barbara Bales asked the committee who would be attending the GFC meeting that would be taking place at 3:00 p.m. today. Seyed Hosseini informed the committee that he would be in attendance.

Barbara Bales informed the committee that she would be discussing cross research courses when speaking to Craig Guilbault. Barbara Bales asked the committee if they had any comments they would like her to bring up at the GFC meeting. Shelleen Greene informed Barbara Bales that she did not have any comments. David Allen would like the issue of sharing and not taking courses from other programs.

Barbara Bales opened the floor to the committee for any other business. There was no response.

VII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 10:34 a.m.