IPiB Steering Committee Meeting
2014-2015
Wednesday, August 20, 2014, 1:00pm
179 Biochemistry Labs

MINUTES
Present: Ivan Rayment, Tom Record, Alessandro Senes, Mike Sheets, Ellen Crummy

Absent: Dave Brow, Jim Keck, Ann Palmenberg

1. Welcome New Committee Members – Rayment
Mr. Rayment welcomed new committee members Tom Record, Alessandro Senes, and Ellen Crummy. He recapped how the minutes are reviewed and approved after each meeting, and stated that meetings typically last no more than one hour.

2. Individual Development Plans (IDPs) – Rayment
A brief review was given on how IPiB is responding to the new requirement by NIH that graduate students and postdocs who are on NIH funding prepare and manage an IDP for themselves. While the IDPs are confidential, students / postdocs and their mentors are required to at least discuss goals and progress on an annual basis, so that the mentors can report aggregate information to NIH with their annual reports.

IPiB’s IDP implementation plan will be rolled out by October 1, including:
   a. Emails to faculty, students, and postdocs
   b. Mention at the IPiB Retreat
   c. Presentation to graduate students by SFLC Career Committee during the week of September 15
   d. Updated thesis committee meeting form
   e. Determination of a mechanism for annual reporting for postdocs

The Graduate School plans to announce its reporting and tracking mechanisms in October

3. Graduate Program Assessment and Learning Goals – Rayment (attachments)
In the past, the University required an annual assessment report from its undergraduate programs. Graduate programs are now being required to submit assessment reports, starting with reporting on the 2013-14 academic year, and to conduct at least one assessment activity per year (copy attached). Mr. Rayment is in the process of drafting an assessment report for IPiB, in conjunction with Rick Amasino’s assessment report for the undergraduate program in biochemistry. [Note: Both of these reports have since been submitted.]

Part of this assessment is identifying and defining learning outcomes for each program degree level (bachelor’s, master’s, doctoral, certificate). The Committee revisited the draft learning outcomes prepared by the Graduate School Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) in April 2014 (copy attached), and Ms. Ryan will draft learning outcomes for IPiB for discussion at the September Steering Committee meeting. The Committee suggested asking the graduate programs in Genetics, Chemistry, and Bacteriology how they are approaching fulfilling this requirement, in addition to looking at what currently exists on the IPiB website that may address
this requirement. The Committee further agreed that it should not create learning outcomes for the master’s degree level, because it does not offer admission into the program with a master’s degree as the terminal degree.

4. **MD/PhD Course Requirements — Rayment (attachment)**
The Committee discussed a request from Jim Keck (absent from this meeting) to grant approval for alternative coursework for a new IPiB student who is an MD/PhD candidate and direct admit into the Keck lab. The Committee determined not to grant the request to substitute Medical History 545 plus an MSTP seminar for Biochemistry 701, because Biochemistry 701 is an NIH and a program requirement. The Committee did, however, agree to grant the request that Biostatistics 541 / 542 (each 3 credits) may fulfill IPiB’s physical sciences breadth requirement (6 credits total).

Mr. Keck also asked if BMC 704 could satisfy the student’s biological sciences breadth requirement. The Committee asked Ms. Ryan to research 1) how the course is graded (Sat/Unsat), and 2) if any other MD/PhD students have asked for this substitution. This request will be discussed at the September IPiB Steering Committee meeting.

5. **2014-15 Schedule of Meetings:**

   September 17, 2014
   October 15, 2014
   November 19, 2014
   Week of December 8 for thesis lab assignments (TBD)
   December 17, 2014
   January 21, 2015
   February 18, 2015
   March 18, 2015
   April 15, 2015
   May 20, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

Kate Ryan
UW-Madison Academic Program Assessment
Annual Reports
Suggested Report Format
2013-14

School/College Assessment Annual Reporting – Reports Due: Friday, September 5, 2014

The UW-Madison Assessment Plan calls for every academic unit, as well as the University general education program, to have an assessment plan and engage in at least one assessment activity each year. These efforts are critical for maintaining academic excellence across our programs as well as at the institutional level. To this end, each school/college as well as the University General Education Committee must submit an annual assessment activity report to the Provost Office. Co-curricular and other student engagement programs also are encouraged to develop assessment plans and report on assessment activities annually.

The annual report should include the following sections:

1. A description of any assessment activities in the school/college carried out as part of a program review or other initiative (e.g., assessment planning, assessment of learning outcomes, curricular review, etc.).

2. Learning Outcomes: In order to better understand each department’s activities around the assessment of student learning, and to meet the requirements outlined by the Higher Learning Commission, it is important that student learning outcomes for each program degree level (bachelor’s, master’s, doctoral, certificate) are articulated.
   - Student learning outcomes should be identified in terms of what students know and are able to do at the end of the degree program. These should be observable, measurable, and student/learner specific (rather than standards focused on content delivery or faculty) and should also make clear the difference in expectations across degree levels (e.g., B.S., M.S, Ph.D. degrees within the same program would not all have the same student learning outcomes).
   
   If the department has not crafted student learning outcomes for degree programs, please note this and outline the action steps the department is taking to identify and define learning outcomes in the coming year.

3. Describe the assessment strategies, methods, and analyses used to assess the learning goal(s) (e.g., graduating student surveys, embedded questioning, alumni surveys, capstone assignments, etc.). If the department has not conducted assessment activities in the past year, please note this.

4. Summarize the key findings (evidence/results) and how the department or program plans to use this information (e.g., program enhancements, program redesign, etc.).

5. Briefly outline your planned assessment activities for the coming year.
Assessing student learning provides valuable information that can inform curricular planning and development as well as teaching and pedagogical practices. Further, evidence-based assessments help foster collaboration within and across programs and provide clarity about learning expectations.

Further assistance and questions: Please contact Regina A. Lowery, Assessment Coordinator, (lowery3@wisc.edu, 608.890.2973) or Mo Noonan Bischof, Associate Vice Provost, Provost Office (mabischof@wisc.edu, 608.265.4413).

Cc: Paul M. DeLuca Jr., Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
    Christopher Olsen, Interim Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning
    Academic Deans and Department Chairs
    Eden Inoway-Ronnie, Chief of Staff to the Provost
Date: April 9th, 2014

To: School/College Academic Planners, Department Chairs, Directors of Graduate Study, Graduate Studies Committee Chairs

CC: Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC), Steve Ackerman, Lea Jacobs, Daniel Kleinman, Donna Paulnock, Wendy Crone, Eileen Callahan, Kelly Haslam, Jocelyn Milner

From: Graduate School Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) Subcommittee on Learning Goals. Duncan Carlsmith (chair), Mary Louise Gomez, Fernando Tejedo-Herrero, Susan Thibeault

RE: Graduate Learning Goals Related to the Higher Learning Commission's (HLC) Criteria for Institutional Accreditation

As a continuation of work begun last year, the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) is responding to changes in the criteria for accreditation adopted by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). The HLC is the federally recognized accrediting agency of degree-granting higher education organizations for the North Central region of the U.S. Compliance with federal requirements by both institutions and the HLC is necessary to ensure that institutions accredited by the HLC are eligible for federal financial aid.

The new criteria of the HLC includes several changes that will affect our campus and these changes have implications for several policies. Although prompted by the HLC’s criteria, these efforts are seen as one of the many ways in which our campus ensures the integrity of its degrees and the quality of the student experience. A Core Component in the Criteria for Accreditation is “The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for its undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.” The campus previously adopted Essential Learning Outcomes for undergraduates, but a similar overarching framework for post-baccalaureate learning goals has not yet been developed.

In 2016 we will be seeking an articulation of learning goals from each individual graduate program for inclusion in the Graduate Catalog (campus efforts at the undergraduate level are being planned for 2015). To facilitate these future efforts and provide an overarching framework for campus, GFEC has launched a subcommittee to develop an overarching set of learning goals for the master’s degree, doctoral degree, graduate certificates, and capstone certificates.

Attached you will find a draft of learning goals that will be considered by GFEC in its June meeting. These are intended to encompass both professional and research-based degrees and were designed to provide basic expectations while being flexible enough to apply to all graduate programs across the disciplines. To develop this draft, the GFEC subcommittee has consulted reports developed in the U.S. and Canada on learning goals/outcomes and looked at examples of post-baccalaureate learning goals/outcomes in place at peer institutions.
The GFEC subcommittee is seeking your input as these learning goals are refined and finalized. We would appreciate receiving any feedback you have about these drafts by May 1st.

Contacts:

Duncan Carismith, Chair of the HLC Subcommittee of the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (Professor of Physics), duncan@hep.wisc.edu

Wendy Crone, Associate Dean for Graduate Education, Graduate School (Professor of Engineering Physics), wcrone@grad.wisc.edu

Eileen Callahan, Director of Graduate Student Professional Development, Graduate School, ecallahan@grad.wisc.edu
Master's Level
All UW-Madison students enter the Graduate School’s graduate programs with at least a bachelor’s degree. Graduates obtaining a master’s degree, whether it be a research-based, project-based, or course-work-only master’s degree, are expected to achieve the following learning goals by the end of their degree work.

Knowledge
Articulates, critiques, or elaborates the theories, research methods, and approaches to inquiry and/or schools of practice in the field of study.

Articulates sources and assembles evidence pertaining to questions or challenges in the field of study.

Assesses and/or applies methodologies and practices in the field of study.

Articulates challenges involved in practicing the field of study, elucidates its leading edges, and delineates its current limits with respect to theory, knowledge, and/or practice.

Appreciates the implication of the primary field of study in terms of challenges, trends, and developments in a social or global context.

Skills
Demonstrates abilities to apply knowledge through critical thinking, inquiry, and analysis to solve problems, engage in scholarly work, and/or produce creative products.

Evaluates, assesses or refines information resources or an information base within the field.

Communicates clearly in styles appropriate to the field of study.

Professional Conduct
Recognizes and applies ethical conduct and professional guidelines.
**Doctoral Level**
Regardless of whether an individual is awarded a master’s degree, the doctoral level learning goals are inclusive of the master’s level learning goals. Additionally, doctoral level students in both research-based or professional programs are expected to achieve the following learning goals by the end of their degree work.

**Knowledge**
Initiates, assembles, arranges and/or reformulates ideas, concepts, designs, and/or techniques in carrying out a project beyond conventional boundaries.

Engages diverse cultural, historical or personal perspectives and articulates how these perspectives contribute to a project, paper or performance.

**Skills**
Creates research, scholarship or performance that makes a substantive contribution to the field of study.

Demonstrates breadth within their learning experiences.

Implements methodologies and/or practices and illustrates their relationships to allied fields.

Develops new concepts and methodologies and/or identifies new research opportunities.

Communicates complex and/or ambiguous ideas clearly.

Evaluates the implications of one’s own scholarship/research/performance to broader social concerns.

**Professional Conduct**
Fosters ethical conduct and professional guidelines.