

Minutes

CALS Curriculum Committee Meeting
Tuesday, September 28, 2021, 1:00 – 2:30 p.m.
6201 MSB

Voting members present: Forest, Goldman, Lankau, Ney, Van Pijkeren, Vermillion Kalmon, Wagner
Student Members present: Mui
Absent:
Ex Officio: Ackerman-Yost, Barber
Minutes Taken by: Arnfelt

Chair for today's meeting: Jan Peter van Pijkeren

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Review meeting minutes from September 14, 2021 van Pijkeren

Item 1 approved by consent.

ACTION ITEMS

1. New Course 1:05-1:15pm
INTER-AG 321 – Study Abroad Pre-Departure Seminar Vermillion Kalmon/Wagner
Effective Spring 2022
<https://next-guide.wisc.edu/courseadmin/?key=89255>

Motion to approve (Vermillion Kalmon, Wagner)

Discussion: The course is designed to improve DARS encoding since these types of courses are currently being offered as 375 courses in multiple different departments. This proposal includes all aspects needed and the committee supports this new course. There were a few recommendations the committee made to clarify the syllabus: align the credit hour definition to reflect the schedule, which indicates less than 15 weeks; clarify whether the online discussion is synchronous or asynchronous; and review the definition to ensure that the "hands-on" experience is referred to correctly (e.g., does the student receive hands-on experience in this course or only in the study abroad portion?)

Vote: 7-0-0

INFORMATIONAL AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Program Discontinuation – comment to APC as necessary 1:35-1:45pm
Certificate in Science of Fermented Food and Beverages van Pijkeren
Suspension starting Fall 2022, Discontinuation on Fall 2025
<https://next-guide.wisc.edu/programadmin/?key=199>

Discussion: This certificate was designed to build the next generation of brewing specialists but did not have the enrollment expected. The proposal outlined some characteristics that resulted in this low enrollment, including age restrictions on certain coursework and course prerequisites. Students who already committed to this

certificate will be supported to complete this certificate, and no courses will be discontinued. One committee member indicated that the department of Bacteriology would be interested in having further conversations with Food Science to consider a partnership on fermentations offerings for students.

2. Crosslisting Working Group report

1:45-2:30pm

Endorsed by UCC, feedback requested from schools/colleges Ackerman-Yost

Discussion: The committee discussed the report submitted to UCC by the Cross-listing Working Group. Ackerman-Yost was on the working group and provided some of the background and key findings. One large finding by the working group was that cross-listing was used to represent a wide array of different things, which were sometimes contradictory. Cross-listing causes confusion and problems for students and staff who schedule courses, and it causes increased cost, time, and effort for governance, instructional software, and student information tracking. The working group noted that cross-listings are not very visible to students during enrollment, as cross-listed courses are listed separately in the enrollment system by each subject listing, with only a small note on the course entry that it is cross-listed with other subject listings. The recommendations from the working group included education to campus partners on the complexities and drawbacks of cross-listing, finding other avenues to express certain things currently represented through cross-listing, and limiting the reasons for courses to be cross-listed.

The committee was generally in support of the report's recommendations. Some committee members discussed their personal difficulties with cross-listed courses, including linking courses in Canvas, managing enrollment and waitlists, and accurately representing department homes when instructors leave. The committee had some hesitations about the recommendations, however.

- One concern was that cross-listing is currently used to highlight small departments looking for higher enrollment – if a course is cross-listed with a larger department, it will be more visible to students looking at that department's subject listing. Cross-listing also promotes enrollment and visibility for majors that require taking a certain number of courses in a subject listing.
- Another concern was that the proposed rationales for cross-listing was still fairly vague. If the purpose of the new rationale is to support a coherent understanding of what cross-listing means, the proposed rationales should be more clearly defined.
- The committee emphasized that the educational component was important, as the drawbacks to cross-listing were not always well understood by the faculty members making cross-listing decisions. Committee members suggested that a one-page handout or similar easily accessible methods of communication would be helpful to communicate the drawbacks to cross-listing.
- The committee indicated that cross-listing appeared to cost a lot of money, so it would be useful to have a more concrete idea of how much money the University is using up in this process of cross-listing courses.
- The committee discussed the implications on program requirements. In addition to changes needed to curricula that require certain numbers of courses in a subject listing, some courses are used as requirements in multiple majors. The committee discussed the impact of cross-listing on ownership, which can be important to ensure courses are appropriate for the program. This issue will need to be addressed if cross-listing is limited in certain ways.
- There is hesitation to take away crosslisted courses before we have a robust system in place.
- One concern was regarding communication among departments for cross-listed courses. From an admin standpoint, there are several conversations that need to happen with each department involved in the crosslisted course. It can be slow to meet with each department and determine who will teach the course

and when. Since this can already be a communications issue, there was concern about how this would be managed if a course was not cross-listed.

- The committee suggested that this initiative to limit cross-listing would need to be well-communicated and led by campus administration, not individual colleges and departments.

The committee is in support of the report and the recommendations provided, particularly the need for education on the costs and drawbacks of cross-listing. They were also in support of the suggestion to start with new courses in implementing a more restrictive definition. The committee strongly suggested that the definition of a crosslisted course be revisited, and the reasons for cross-listing should be well-defined before any process is implemented.