

CALS ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL - MINUTES

January 15, 2019

1:00pm-2:30pm

2321 DeLuca Biochemical Sciences Meeting

Attendees: Erika Anna (arrived at 1:14pm), Jeri Barak, Rick Lindroth, Guy Groblewski, Chuck Kaspar, Larry Meiller, Nicole Perna, Doug Soldat (arrived at 1:27pm)
Not present: Jane Collins, Barb Ingham, Hasan Khatib, Paul Mitchell, William Tracy, Alan Turnquist
Ex officio: Kate VandenBosch, Bill Barker, Dick Straub, Karen Wassarman
Guests: Tom Browne (updates to policy regarding scholastic actions)
Minutes taken by: Julie Scharm

Public meeting attendees: None

The meeting was called to order by Kate VandenBosch at approximately 1:01pm.

Welcome and introductions

Kate VandenBosch welcomed the committee.

Review agenda

No changes were made to the agenda.

Review minutes for December 18, 2018

Larry Meiller made a motion to approve the December 18, 2018 meeting minutes. Erika Anna seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Action and discussion items

1. Updates to policy regarding scholastic actions, probation and dropped status
Tom Browne, senior assistant dean for academic affairs, joined the CALS APC meeting to present this update. The following handout was provided: "Proposal to Revise CALS Undergraduate Scholastic Actions."

In 2011-12, CALS academic actions were revised to provide more consistency and structure to probationary and dropped statuses. Scholastic actions occur at the end of fall and spring semesters, and summer semester has not been included. CALS and Engineering are the only colleges that do not include summer semester in determining academic status.

The CALS Academic Affairs Office proposes the inclusion of summer term course results to determine academic action status. This will be more consistent with other schools/colleges and will better recognize the importance of summer session learning. See the handout for the additional specifics of the proposal.

For dropped status, summer term will not be counted as a semester when a student is required to sit out for one semester or one year. A student dropped for one semester at the end of the spring

semester will be required to sit out the summer term and fall semester, unless allowed to continue through appeal. This is because the summer semester period is not the same length as fall and spring semesters and many students are off-campus for the summer.

Students who are in dropped status can submit an appeal to continue their enrollment at UW-Madison without taking time off. Any requests will be reviewed by the CALS Scholastic Policies and Actions Committee. The student will need to present a reasonable plan for success and if applicable, information regarding circumstances that may have been out of their control. The student should work with their advisor on the plan.

The CALS Scholastics Policies and Actions Committee and the CALS Curriculum Committee have provided support for this proposal. Tom Browne has shared the proposal with other academic units on campus, which have indicated their support for CALS having a policy more consistent with other units.

Comments and questions:

- Question: How many CALS students are in this status? Response: After the fall semester, 31 students were in dropped status and 80 students were on probation.
- Question: How many students appeal the dropped status? Response: Out of the 31 students in dropped status, about half of them appealed.

Chuck Kaspar made a motion to approve the inclusion of the summer term course results to determine academic action status, and accept the proposal provided. Larry Meiller seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

2. Biometry program review (MS and computing services) – continued discussion

Biometry has an MS program and is also a center-like entity that provides a service. The review of the MS program and the CALS Statistical Lab/consulting service were combined into one program review.

APIR has classified the MS program as a low award-producing program which requires justification and must be addressed in the program review. CALS did not provide information on addressing the low award-producing status in the charge letter to the review committee. If the decision is made to continue a low-award program, a justification and compelling reason to continue the program are required.

At its last meeting, the CALS APC requested more information on a related program, the PhD minor in quantitative biology. It is a new program designed to complement the depth of training in biological or quantitative sciences that a student achieves through UW-Madison's graduate programs with the breadth that is needed to conduct research under this paradigm. In addition to coursework in biological, quantitative, and integrated courses, students in the program will take an interdisciplinary research seminar to prepare them for research that crosses these boundaries.

Comments and questions:

- Comment: If the Biometry program is not going to accept more students, they will not be able to grow.

- Comment: Biometry did not seem to generate ideas for improvement beyond increasing faculty members. Even with additional faculty, the program still restricts the number of students per faculty member.
- Comment: Biometry seemed unwilling to add faculty from the already-existing faculty on campus.
- Comment: Biometry is one of those very small programs that has significant benefits to those who participate. It also provides related or unseen benefits; one of top candidates for ecoinformatics faculty positions was trained by a graduate student of the Biometry program. Students of the program are in high demand.

There are several options the committee can consider for addressing the MS degree portion of the program review:

- Send the report back to review committee to address the low award-producing status.
- Decide that there is not sufficient evidence to continue the program.
- Given the changing campus and college landscape, provide a rationale for the program to continue but ask for another program review in three to five years.
- Request that Biometry develop a plan to address the low award-producing status within one year (or another specified time period), outside of an official program review.

Overall, the college needs to think about its role and investment in data sciences.

Nicole Perna made a motion to return the program review report to the review committee to address the low award-producing status of the program. Larry Meiller seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

3. Discuss expectations for program reviews

The committee has expressed some concerns about the program review reports and has asked for clarity on what should be included in the reports.

The committee was asked for and provided the following suggestions:

- Create a template for program review reports to help with the structure of reports
- Design a way to prompt review committees to provide answers beyond “yes” and “no”
- Develop questions for the review committee to answer
- Provide guidance on climate issues
- Create a checklist
- For review committees that find low participation from the department in the program review process (e.g. interviews, requests for feedback), include this information in the report and an explanation, if possible
- Be clear about the college’s expectations of who (or percentage of who) participates in the program review process
- For the self-study, ask programs to look into the future of the program, as well as their current state
- For the self-study, tie the program into five-year plans or strategic plans

Comments and questions:

- Question: For review committees, should we include external reviewers who are experts in the program's area? Response: It might be hard to find someone willing to commit this amount of time and to accommodate them in scheduling.
- Question: Should the Academic Affairs Office conduct an initial review of the program reviews before they go to APC? In other words, should Academic Affairs make sure the reviews are appropriate and complete before sending the reviews to APC? Response: If there are any questions that are not answered in the reports, the documents should be returned for revision before going to APC.

Karen Wassarman will draft templates for the review committee report and self-study, as well as revisions to the review committee charge letter, and bring the documents to a future meeting for discussion.

Informational items

1. Updated collaborative document

A collaborative is not a department and is not included in Faculty Policies and Procedures. CALS therefore created a document to outline the management of collaboratives. This document was recently revised to address additional questions.

Comments and questions:

- Question: Can there be an MOU between departments, without them being part of a collaborative? Response: Yes.
- Comment: The updated document adequately addresses previous questions.

2. Search updates

Senior associate dean: The search committee has been formed: Jed Colquhoun (chair), Michael Bernard-Donals, Jane Collins, Alfred Hartemink, Chris Hittinger, Kari Straus, Heidi Zoerb, and Guilherme Rosa. The deadline to apply has been extended from February 1 to February 15.

SciMed GRS director: The deadline for applications is today.

3. Staffing changes

There are several staffing and search updates for the Academic Affairs Office:

- Academic planner: Megan Ackerman-Yost has been hired as the academic planner. This is a new position. Megan will provide support to the CALS APC. Julie Scharm will assist with the CALS APC minutes in the interim. Karen Wassarman will be the direct contact for CALS APC in the interim.
- Assistant dean for academic programs and policies: The PVL is open. Applications are due by February 5.
- The office manager, student status examiner, and career services advisor positions have recently become vacant. The office is working on plans for these positions.
- Honors program manager: This is a new position that is in the interview stage of recruitment.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:20pm. No motion was made to adjourn.