



## PROGRAMS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

January 20, 2017

Attended: Gaskew, Gerloff (ex-officio, non-voting), Gruben, Hamm (ex-officio, non-voting), McShane-Hellenbrand, D. Miller, Moeller, Smedema, Stauffer, Vlach

Maria Widmer was introduced to committee members. Maria is a new instructional designer, employed by MERIT, to work with School of Education faculty in the development of online courses. She comes to campus from Penn State University, where she recently designed and taught a high-enrollment online course. Maria noted the work already going on around development of online courses in the School and invited faculty and staff to consult with her.

- A. Approval of the minutes: December 16, 2016. Minutes approved without changes.
- B. Adoption of the agenda: January 20, 2017. Agenda approved with modifications.
- C. Consent Agenda
- D. Old Business
- E. Regular Business
  1. New Course: CURRIC 510 Community-Based Practicum. This course and CURRIC 511 below replace Independent Field Study courses that have been used for the last two years by the graduate Secondary Education program. For this course, students are placed in community settings where educational activities are conducted—e.g., the Boys and Girls Club and various community centers. Some issues were raised with program director Joey Anderson Lubasi, who attended and represented the Secondary Education program:
    - a. The prerequisites are not entirely clear. Is the course actually open to any teacher education student? What does it mean to be “sponsored” by a faculty member? The original intent was to allow this course to be used by other programs, apparently, but that seemed at odds with much in the proposal. It was determined that the course prerequisites should be “admission to the graduate Secondary Education program or consent of instructor.”
    - b. Committee members had questions about the variable credits, and especially the statement that Secondary Education students would complete 1-2 credits. It was explained that the 1-2 credit variability accommodated the four different Secondary Education options, some of which required students to take 1 credit of practicum while others required 2 credits. The variability from one to four credits was designed to accommodate possible future changes in the program.
    - c. The syllabus needs full details—e.g., instructor, term, meeting time, UW-Madison identifier. It was strongly suggested that the numbers of hours associated with the credit load be indicated in the syllabus. References to “pass/fail” grading needs to be replaced with “credit/no credit.” There was some lack of consistency in terminology (“pre-service teachers” versus “teacher candidates”) and in the director’s name (“Lubasi” versus “Anderson”).  
With these changes, the course was approved.
  2. New Course: CURRIC 511 School-Based Practicum. Most of the changes noted for 510 above were recommended for this course as well (where appropriate). The course was approved with these revisions.

3. New Course: EPS 220 Human Rights in Education. Committee members recommended that the proposer review the course description (and related description of the course later in the document) and consider whether different faculty might teach the course and choose to ask students to wrestle with somewhat different “fundamental questions.” There was concern expressed about the statement that the courses listed in the “Course Content” section were “The only human rights courses offered by the university at the undergraduate level,” when human rights issues are likely addressed in many more courses. It was recommended that the statement that a course “has no educational content” be revised. The committee also agreed that Curriculum and Instruction should be listed as a “related” or “affected” subject. The syllabus needs the details of instructor, term, meeting time, and UW-Madison identifier. There is no grading scale in the syllabus. The course is approved with these changes.
4. RP&SE Program Change - Requirements for discipline-related electives in Rehabilitation Psychology. The committee raised concerns about the use of topics courses (RP&SE 660) for either the didactic core or as elective courses. The department representative assured the committee that the topics courses were being developed even now as permanent courses. The program changes will apply to those students admitted to the professional program as of summer 2017. The proposed changes were approved.
5. New Course: CURRIC 319 Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching. This is the first course of a planned 8-credit, two-course sequence to replace the long-standing 9-credit Math 130/131/132 course sequence for prospective elementary education teachers. There were several issues raised; unfortunately, neither the Curriculum and Instruction representative nor a course proposer could attend and respond. Issues included the following:
  - a. The prerequisites for the course were not sufficiently explicit. Jeff Hamm noted that one of the proposing faculty had indicated that the prerequisites would be the same as those for the current Math 130 course. But the Math Department has made significant changes in its lower-level courses and the current course prerequisite for Math 130—Math 101—is being discontinued and replaced with another course. Jeff Hamm and Barb Gerloff made their best guess about what the correct prerequisites would be, but these could not be confirmed at the meeting. Further, currently Math 130 is restricted to pre-professional and admitted Elementary Education majors, and this was not included in the course prerequisite.
  - b. Committee members wondered about the use of a 300-level number for a course that seemed to be at the elementary level (a course usually numbered at the 100- or 200-level) and that met the basic Quantitative Reasoning A requirement. What was the rationale for the 300 level?
  - c. Knowing that these were replacing (or at least expected to be equivalent to) current Math courses, the committee agreed that the Mathematics Department should be listed as a related department/subject.
  - d. There were concerns about the course description, which seemed to be unnecessarily wordy. Noting that the description was the first paragraph of the syllabus, one committee member suggested that the paragraph under “Core Instructional Goals” in the syllabus might be a better description of the course.
  - e. The syllabus lacked a grading scale (proposers were aware of this).

Given the large number of issues with the course, the committee voted to table the proposal. It will be taken up as the first regular agenda item at the February meeting.

Submitted by J. Hamm