

CALS ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL - MINUTES
February 5, 2019
1:00pm-2:30pm
2321 DeLuca Biochemical Sciences Meeting

Attendees: Erika Anna, Jeri Barak, Jane Collins, Barb Ingham, Chuck Kaspar, Hasan Khatib, Rick Lindroth, Nicole Perna (arrived at 1:38pm and departed at 2:17pm), William Tracy, Alan Turnquist

Not present: Guy Groblewski, Paul Mitchell, Dietram Scheufele, Doug Soldat,

Ex officio: Kate VandenBosch, Bill Barker, Dick Straub (departed at 2:12pm), Karen Wassarman

Guests: Brian Kirkpatrick (Plant Breeding and Plant Genetics program review), Chuck Czuprynski (Center for Dairy Research center review), Victor Cabrera (Center for Dairy Research center review), Audrey Gasch (Center for Genomic Science Innovation proposal), Cynthia Czajkowski (Center for Genomic Science Innovation proposal)

Minutes taken by: Julie Scharm

Public meeting attendees: None

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

Review agenda

No changes were made to the agenda.

Review minutes for January 15, 2019

Rick Lindroth made a motion to approve the January 15, 2019 meeting minutes. Charles Kaspar seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Action and discussion items

1. Program review, Plant Breeding and Plant Genetics, first review
Brian Kirkpatrick, faculty member in the Department of Animal Sciences, joined the CALS APC meeting to present the Plant Breeding and Plant Genetics program review committee report. In the program review process, the review committee met with the outgoing and incoming chair, faculty, staff, and graduate students; faculty and graduate student turnout were good. Overall, Plant Breeding and Plant Genetics is a strong and effective graduate program with an excellent reputation. It ranks in the top 4-5 in the country. The program effectively competes for well-qualified graduate students. Students who are trained by the program are highly sought after. It is sometimes a challenge to keep the students in school, because they are often being sought out for jobs. The diversity of species studied in the program is a strength. It is successful in having productive faculty, who provide the majority of funding for the students. The program has a strong connection to industry.

The review committee made some of the following recommendations (not an inclusive list):

- Recommend using training grants to allow for students, who are not sure of their area of study, to have a rotation of labs. There are occasions when the program is not successful in recruiting a student because there is currently no rotation of labs. This is not a large concern, as it seems the majority of students already know what lab they want to work in/who they want to work with, but the rotation of labs would attract additional students.
- Encourage documentation on the method of evaluation for the prelim exam and of performance. The current prelim exam process does not have a clear structure of expectations.
- Encourage a more transparent and consistent process for student stipends. Student stipends are currently not uniform due to the differences in support received.
- Develop options for facilities improvement, such as seed storage at Arlington.
- Address challenges in the transportation of students to field work.

Comments and questions:

- Question: Did the committee consider the low numbers of students in the upper graduate level courses and the possibility of opening up those courses to include undergraduates to increase those numbers? Response: The committee did not make this suggestion.
- Comment: The committee did a nice job answering the program review questions.
- Question: Do you have any concerns about whether this program is functioning as a program or more like an independent department? What makes it a program? Response: It functions as a program. There is a lot of encouragement for students to be engaged in symposiums, activities, student organizations, etc.
- Question: Are the graduate students co-advised by faculty in different departments? Response: There are about 36 faculty in the program and the majority are on student committees.
- Question: What were the specific facility issues (e.g. for seeds, tubers, or something else)? Response: Seed storage was specifically mentioned but unsure whether that was a generic term or not.
- Question: Is there difficulty in offering a variety of graduate level courses with a small amount of students? Response: This is more a concern for the future.
- Question: Did you explore the master's versus the PhD program? Response: The majority of students come into the program with the intent of pursuing a PhD. Some students who don't succeed in the PhD program move into the master's program.
- Question: The review does not assess climate. Did you discuss the climate for the students? Response: There was a situation discussed by the outgoing chair that was brought up again in a later discussion regarding an undesirable student interaction. There is some concern about maintaining a positive climate but it did not seem to be a pervasive problem.
- Question: Did you get the sense that the program is proactively working on climate? Response: Yes, in response to the specific situation mentioned, they made efforts to communicate expectations to the students.
- Question: Did you discuss time to degree? The average time to degree seems reasonable but there is an added bump in 7/8/9-year zone? Response: The committee did not address this.
- Question: Did you discuss whether the program defined a policy about students who want to change labs? Response: The committee did not discuss this.
- Question: Who brought up lab rotation lab issue? Response: It was brought up in discussions about competing for students and competing with other institutions that allow this. The graduate students did not raise this issue.

- Question: Did you discuss the administrative structure of the program and whether the program is considering being housed in a specific department? They are currently housed in the college.
Response: It was explained how things operate but the committee did not discuss this topic beyond that.
 - Additional comments related to this topic:
 - The college does not provide any funding for the administration of this program. Departments pay for the administration of the program. Employees are supervised in the department where the program is housed.
 - The administrative structure of the program comes up most often in regards to who is responsible for the employees in the program and who advocates for their best interest.
 - It can be a disadvantage to not be part of a department. The program can lose institutional memory when the leadership or administrative home changes.

Possible topics for the next discussion of the Plant Breeding and Plant Genetics program review:

- Master's degree versus PhD
- Climate
- Structure of the prelim exam
- Graduate student access to transportation (to their field work)
- Perspective on lack of opportunity for new students to rotate amongst programs
- Whether the program is a burden on the department and departmental staff

2. Center review, Center for Dairy Research, first review

CALS recently developed a policy for the 10-year review of college-level centers. Each college center has an associate dean assigned as the primary point of contact. College center directors are also undergoing performance reviews with the associate deans. Center director meetings are held three times a year.

College centers will have a comprehensive review every ten years. All centers will be reviewed in the first five years. The Center for Dairy Research and the Agricultural Safety and Health Center reviews will be presented to the CALS APC this year. The center reviews for the Food Research Institute, Applied Population Lab, and the Nutrient and Pest Management Program have recently started.

Chuck Czuprynski, faculty member and department chair in the Department of Pathobiological Sciences (School of Veterinary Medicine), and Victor Cabrera, faculty member in the Department of Dairy Science, joined the CALS APC meeting to present the Center for Dairy Research (CDR) review committee report. The review committee worked with John Lucey and Debra Boyke to schedule face-to-face visits with senior leadership individually and with staff in small groups during April and May of 2018. The committee also provided the opportunity for staff to communicate one-on-one with the committee afterwards either in person or via phone/email. Through the interviews, the review committee generated a list of CALS faculty, staff, and stakeholders to interview. The main discussion prompts were: 1) what is your experience with CDR, 2) what is working well, and 3) what could be improved/changed. The review committee also asked follow-up questions and asked questions to corroborate information from the self-study. The review committee report was shared and discussed with the senior associate dean prior to its final submission. CDR was

established between CALS and U.S. dairy farmers and was funded by the Wisconsin Milk Marketing Board. It was one of six centers of its kind established this way and has become the largest and most successful of the group. CDR is both nationally and internationally recognized. It is a multi-faceted center that works on research education and training with a focus on dairy foods and dairy products. It is a very productive group. CDR works closely with stakeholders and industry. The original bylaws stated CDR would work with the college and with CALS faculty to bring innovative products to the global marketplaces; CDR continues to do this but their work with the faculty has diminished to primarily working with the Department of Food Science. CDR has an annual operating budget over \$4 million and has less than 4% state support. The center has about 40 full-time staff. CDR is very visible with industry and helped to raise funds for the dairy plant innovation. The center works with companies and other groups on events and training, and is well-regarded. The center is led by John Lucey who reports to the dean of CALS. CDR has a top-down structure with working groups. They hold monthly meetings and annual staff retreats. Twice a year, the CDR staff meet with a Board of Visitors for the Dairy Farmers of Wisconsin. CDR has a group of dues-paying members who meet twice a year. The staff is diverse and is comprised of more than 50% women. The center has mechanisms for staff recognition but the staff salaries are low for those who come from industry, so while that can be a challenge, CDR has been able to attract and retain talented staff who are well-regarded by industry. The center is involved in a lot of outreach that is not funded by the state.

The review committee made some of the following recommendations (not an inclusive list):

- Review the center director's performance.
- Hire a dedicated HR staff member. The current person working on HR issues is wearing too many hats. It might also improve climate to have someone who is better able to address HR issues.
- Form an advisory committee that includes university faculty/staff, as well as stakeholders, to discuss the CDR's fulfillment of its function (instead of just meeting with stakeholders).
- Plan for upcoming retirements of senior staff.
- Annually report activities to CALS.
- Expand the connection with other units in CALS.
- Expand research and outreach to include food and milk as well.
- Encourage a climate survey for staff and staff issues.
 - CALS is working with the center on a climate survey, to be conducted by the college and not the center itself.
- Note: There is tension between CDR and Food Science, which has been exacerbated by the building project, that was noted.

Comments and questions:

- Question: Can you elaborate more on the negative climate? What is going on in the center?
Response: The center has been managed more like an enterprise with a top-down management style. The staff feel like their concerns are not heard or addressed.
- Question: Climate seems to be a serious issue – what is the review committee's recommendation? Response by the Dean's Office: The college is working on a process to address this. The review committee's role does not include a focus on HR issues but the committee can bring issues to the college's attention.

- Question: What types of climate concerns exist in the center? Response: The staff raised their issues when the supervisors were not present.
- Question: Regarding the recommendation for the annual review of center director, can a fair review be done by the center? Response from the Dean's Office: The review should be done outside of the center but with input from the staff. A new, annual, center director performance review process is being started by the college this year.
- Questions: Can staff come to the associate deans with their issues? Response from the Dean's Office: This is a good question for the college to consider.
- Question: Who reviews the senior staff? Response: In this case, John Lucey.
- Question: There are a number of complicated issues between CDR and Food Science. Have those issues been resolved and if not, how are they being addressed? Response: The issues continue. This involves very complicated funding and personalities. The Office of Quality Improvement, at one point, helped to develop a process for how issues should be resolved. The completion of the building project might help ease some of the tension.
- Comment: The small number of Food Science faculty, plus the CDR director coming from the Food Science faculty, puts a strain on faculty resources. The center and the college should think about this and future planning when the director retires.

Possible topics for the next discussion of the Center for Dairy Research review:

- Succession planning
- The transition in funding from the Dairy Farmers Group and whether this changes the center's focus on its work/mission/goals
- How the center is managing risks in the dairy industry
- Barb Ingham will e-mail some of her questions to Karen Wassarman after the meeting

3. Proposal for the Center for Genomic Science Innovation

Audrey Gasch, faculty member in the Department of Genetics, and Cynthia Czajkowski, associate vice chancellor for research in the biological sciences, joined the CALS APC meeting to present the Center for Genomic Science Innovation proposal. The proposed center is a reorganization of the Genome Center of Wisconsin, which has operated as an unofficial center within the UW Biotechnology Center. With several reorganizations on campus and the evolution of genome science, it is a key time to form the Center for Genomic Science Innovation (CGSI), which will be a sister center to the UW Biotechnology Center. The scientific focus is to develop new genomic approaches and technologies and to deliver that information to researchers on campus. Research in the CGSI will focus on three central themes: developing innovations in genomic technology, developing innovations in computational-genomic methods, and creatively integrating genomic approaches for new understanding of complex biological systems. The CGSI will also administer two existing training grants that serve a role in educating the next generation of genomicists: the Genomic Sciences Training Program and the Computation and Informatics in Biology and Medicine training program. The CGSI is being formed around faculty who already have space in the Biotechnology Center. The CGSI will initially encompass 13 members, including 10 executive members currently housed in the Biotechnology Center building. The CGSI has the full intention of eventually incorporating other members who don't have space in the Biotechnology Center. Faculty in the CGSI space will be expected to put grants through the center. Departments will have edits on faculty salary. Any collaborators who do not have space in the center will put grants through their home departments.

Comments and questions:

- Question: Is the Genome Center of Wisconsin administratively changing? Will it be separated from Biotechnology Center? Response: Yes. The two centers will still share office administration, but there will be an assistant director for each center.
- Question: Will PIs submit all of their grants through center? Response: The center will adhere to the campus model that grants will follow where the work is done, i.e. space dictates this. If someone in the center is a co-PI, then the grant will go through the department of the lead PI. This is not a change from current practice.
- Question: Are you in touch with the epigenetics initiative? Response: The goal is to form connections to many different groups on campus. There is an epigenetics group in WID, a new data science initiative, etc. There is a lot of overlap on campus so the center will want to maintain good communication and make sure it is organized both internally and externally to maximize capacity. The focus is not on epigenetics specifically though there might be an opportunity for synergy. The hope is to find mechanisms to connect with basic scientists.
- Question: Are you going to add people from agriculture to the center? Response: The center is comprised of a small group so it will not be able to work on everything. One goal for this semester is to think about scientific opportunities for application, such as microbiology, plant genomics, animal breeders/genomicists, etc. and discuss it as a group in the future. The center members will want to focus on where they can make a difference and not spread the center too thin.
- Comment: Graduate programs that are cross-departmental often comment on the cohesiveness of graduate students and feeling connected with research programs; this will be an important thing to consider. Response: With the training grants, both programs have weekly group meetings for all students and post-docs, and they welcome students who might want to be part of that community. They also hold annual retreats.
- Question: What is next step? Response: The group is working on gathering letters of support from colleges and department chairs. The hope is to have a letter of support from CALS as a result of this meeting. A request will then go to the University Research Council for a vote. If approved, the request will go to the provost and then to UAPC.
- Question: Who will the center report to? Response: The VCRGE.
- Question: How do you solve tensions between center expectations and department expectations?

Barb Ingham a motion for the college to provide a letter of support for the Center for Genomic Science Innovation proposal. Hasan Khatib seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Informational items

1. Search updates

Senior associate dean: The deadline to apply is February 15.

SciMed GRS director: This search is in the public presentation stage.

CIAS director: The search did not yield an appointment. The college is currently working on an interim appointment.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:28pm. No motion was made to adjourn.