

# **CALS Academic Planning Council**

6201 Microbial Sciences Building

September 17, 2019, 1:00-2:30 p.m.

**Attendees:** Hasan Khatib, Rick Lindroth, Scott Lutz, Jamie Nack, Guy Groblewski, Erika Anna, Jill Wildonger, Guanming Shi, Nicole Perna, William Tracy, Michael Bell

**Not Present:** Xuejun Pan, Jeri Barak, Barb Ingham

**Ex Officio:** Kate Vandenbosch, Bill Barker, Karen Wassarman, Mark Rickenbach

**Minutes taken by:** Sarah Barber, Megan Ackerman-Yost

The meeting was called to order by Kate Vandenbosch at approximately 1:00pm.

## **Welcome and introductions**

Kate Vandenbosch welcomed everyone to the APC and introductions were made. Dean Vandenbosch reminded the council that Robert's Rules of Order are used for committee meetings. Consent agenda items are approved on a slate, but any member can remove them if discussion is warranted.

## **Review agenda**

No changes were made to the agenda.

## **Review minutes for May 7, 2019**

The May 7, 2019 minutes were approved via the consent agenda.

## **Action and Discussion Items**

1. Introduction to APC

Dean Vandenbosch provided an overview of the purpose of the committee, common types of agenda items, and procedures of the committee. Members received an email with a Box link for all the materials. Box included a document with the charge and information about the APC. APC provides oversight for the college on program review, significant program changes, and other topics important for the mission of the college. APC decisions are advisory to the Dean, and she may bring any items to them for discussion on which she is seek additional information and guidance. The structure of APC was developed a few years ago to ensure that members represented different divisions of the college. It is important that members represent their divisions and the best interests of the college in discussions.

2. Preview of program reviews and center reviews

Presented by Karen Wassarman. APC will be reviewing a number of programs this coming year, and those programs have already been alerted and are in process. There is a review committee assigned to

each program that will prepare a report of their findings. The program review comes to APC twice – the first time, the review committee chair will present their findings and answer questions. APC will generate questions for the Department/Program Chair to address at the next meeting. At the second meeting, the Department/Program Chair will present and respond to questions from the APC. APC is asked to consider if program reviews are complete and may make recommendations to the Dean for further consideration on each program. After college level review, program reviews will be forwarded to the Provost's office for review, including to GFEC for graduate programs.

The college started doing a similar review for centers last year, and a few center reviews will be coming to APC this year. The process at the college level is similar, but reviews do not have the same formal university review. APC is asked to consider if center reviews are complete, and may make recommendations to the Dean for further consideration.

Karen noted that there are other items relative to academic programs that APC will review, including new programs (both the Notice of Intent to Plan and the full program proposal) and discontinuing academic programs. Process documents were provided to members which outlined the major steps. If the program is a revenue-generating program, there are extra steps for budgeting not included in these versions that focus on governance approvals of the academic programs. Karen indicated that there are two new undergraduate majors in development that the committee will see this year, a professional masters program, and the possibility of additional new programs including a capstone certificate.

There was discussion of templates for the program reviews and self-studies to assist review committees and programs with providing with appropriate information. This was a discussion item that there was not time to address last year, but can be revisited this year when there is time, later this fall or next spring.

Q: How will the Biology review work with the shared colleges? A: Programs shared between colleges will need to be reviewed by both college APCs. For Biology, it is possible that we will discuss this review at a joint CALS and L&S APC meeting, but the review processes for L&S are different from CALS in that they do not include discussion with guests (program review chair and program chair). Thus, if the timing works out, we could discuss the Biology review at one of the shared meetings with L&S, but if it is important for the committee to discuss the review with the review committee chair or the program directors, a separate meeting may be best.

3. Organizational redesign and current projects update
4. Agenda topics for the year

Presented by Dean Vandebosch. Agenda items 3 and 4 were discussed together due to the amount of overlap.

Other items that may come to the committee this year are:

- departmental merger with Animal Science and Dairy Science
- Benchmarking with other institutions for appropriate departmental staffing
- Changes with staffing and joint positions
- Faculty hiring – college has goals of increasing faculty numbers, and has benefited from cluster and spousal hires to assist with these goals, in addition to college initiatives.
- Undergraduate enrollments – goal of increasing enrollment and ensuring strong advising. The census data isn't out yet, but it will come to the committee
- Revitalizing a policy for teaching load for the college – goal is a college wide policy to assist departments, which are expected to have more detailed policies appropriate for their needs and disciplines.
- Equity and Diversity – every program is expected to include information about equity and diversity in their five-year plan
- Building master plan – campus has requested a master plan to outline what the needs are, how well the current facilities are meeting those needs, and planned improvements and changes
  - Intent is to develop research station master plans after the campus plans are complete

Questions from the members:

Q: regarding the teaching policy, what factors are going into the policy, and what are the goals for the college? Were there issues with the teaching load that needed to be addressed?

- A: many departments don't have a policy for what constitutes an appropriate teaching load. Also, the college is expected to increase its instructional metrics in addition to the numbers of undergraduates enrolled in our majors. Looking at other colleges to see what policies exist, and how we can provide a baseline policy for what we can expect for teaching appointments. The college is not planning to dictate CFI, but a consideration of what responsibilities are for the instructor. The policy would also encompass flexibilities for different departments to provide more detail, such as to take into account other activities, including support cross-departmental majors.

Q: Does this affect the use of faculty associates?

- A: Possibly, although the first consideration will be centered on Faculty, it will be important to expand expectations to staff at some point. The Title and Total Compensation project will probably not help with that directly. However, the university committee voted last year to institute two new non-tenure track titles for teaching professors and research professors. Expectation is that campus will develop a generic policy that the college will need to develop and implement.

Q: Would like an update on the use of HATCH and Stennis funds and extension?

- A: we will put that on the list.

Q: When will the RFPs, such as for the post-docs, occur for the Dairy Innovation Hub?

- A: Not until after the joint finance committee meets and formally approves the initiative. There is not a firm date on when this vote will take place at this time. We will invite Heather White, the director of the Dairy Innovation Hub, to a future APC meeting to discuss the Hub.

Q: It has been reported that the UW System is involved in a freshwater initiative, is Madison involved here?

- A: We haven't heard information about this recently. We know there are a number of initiatives that didn't end up being bills.

Dean Vandenbosch provided a few other topics:

- Industry partners supported additional funding in Dairy Innovation Hub – will be decided on next month. The funding is largely personnel, with \$7.2 million dollars, with ~50% allocated to UW Madison and the rest divided between our partners at UW-Platteville and Riverside. The first year will be a fraction of this number. Note that the term "dairy" is very broad, and could include traditional dairy areas as well as projects related to food and nutrition.
- Another potential topic is the summer term, and the college's responsibilities for summer term funding.

## **Informational Items and Announcements**

### 5. APC five-year review

Presented by Dean Vandenbosch. Campus policy requires that APC undergo a self-review at least once every five years, and it is due this year. As part of that review, we will need to review and potentially revise APC representation to retain balance after the departure of Landscape Architecture and URPL from the college. Additionally, we are seeking a policy for how substitutes should be chosen (and by whom) when members cannot attend or complete a term. Dean Vandenbosch will appoint a sub-committee. Nicole Perna suggested the possibility of approaching previous members for inclusion.