

CALS Academic Planning Council Minutes

WebEx meeting

May 5, 2020, 1:00-2:30 p.m.

Attendees: Hasan Khatib, Rick Lindroth, Scott Lutz (depart at 2pm), Guanming Shi, Michael Bell, William Tracy, Nicole Perna, Jill Wildonger, Jamie Nack, Erika Anna, Barb Ingham

Not Present: Jeri Barak, Guy Groblewski, Xuejun Pan

Guests: Carrie Laboski (Nutrient and Pest Management Center Review), Chuck Czuprynski (Food Research Institute center review)

Ex Officio: Kate VandenBosch, Mark Rickenbach, Karen Wassarman, Doug Reinemann, Bill Barker

Minutes taken by: Sarah Barber

Meeting began at 1:01pm

Welcome

Review agenda

Consent Agenda

1. Approve minutes for April 21 meeting

Item 1 was approved.

Action and Discussion Items

2. NPM center review – second discussion

Carrie Laboski, Director of the Nutrient and Pest Management program and Professor in Soil Science provided an overview of the program including a brief history of the program, its mission, an overview of program staff roles, details of current program research and outreach, and program awards.

Questions and discussion:

Q: The APC would like to hear more about the relationship of NPM with the Division of Extension, especially any impact of the recent extension re-organization.

A: One third of NPM budget comes from Extension. The Program's Extension Regional Specialists (non-faculty positions) amplify faculty research and work alongside county agents/offices. NPM works closely with extension teams and is now part of the Crop & Soils area in the Extension reorganization. NPM is vital to keep teams alive and has a role in new Extension working groups.

Q: What relationship/interaction does NPM have with other water-centric entities at UW? Such as the Water@UW-Madison group?

A: NPM currently has no specific relationship with Water@UW. That is a good suggestion. NPM has worked with the Environmental Resources Center now in Extension. NPM has also worked with the Dairy Forage Research Center. Phosphorus is an issue NPM has helped the Dairy Forage Research Center with.

Q: What support is needed to maintain program continuity?

A: One third of NPM's funding comes from Extension. Any disruptions in Extension funding and/or funding disruptions due to COVID would be hard on the program. Grant funding is important and the program is trying to increase grant funding, but funding must align with the program's mission. A goal was to grow the program and in 5-7 years shrink back in anticipation of impending retirements. Maintaining continuity in nutrient management and soil health is important.

Q: The review team indicated that the program should engage in dialog with their funding partners (The Division of Extension + The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection + Fertilizer checkoff funds + CALS) regarding continuity of funding and priorities for programming. How will the funding portfolio of NPM inform the work plan of the program and planning process going forward?

A: NPM is in dialogue with funding partners. NPM demonstrated strong communication with DATCAP in 2019. NPM was in conversation with DATCAP at that time which resulted in DATCAP increasing the program's funding in 2020. The fertilizer checkoff funds are statutorily defined and cannot be easily changed. If funding for the program changes, the program will look for funding within the mission of the program.

Q: The review committee suggested a more formal, objective and transparent process for determining which faculty/projects are chosen for support/collaboration by NPM. How do you envision the development of this process and what are the important considerations in developing a work plan?

A: The Director and Program Manager do not necessarily agree with the idea that the program does not have a transparent process. However, creating a specific document will help document how faculty should engage with NPM. The guideposts for project decisions include evaluating the program's mission with the activity, evaluating how the activity will advance NPM's mission, a review of capacity currently available, and collaboration. As it concerns current grants, the Director feels that is what is currently being done to evaluate projects. NPM has no desire to establish a fee for service model. NPM also does not want to secure a grant and then get fees from faculty to work with the program. NPM prefers to work together with faculty.

Q: The review team recommended a competitive selection process for a faculty director who would have a larger role in strategic planning and resource allocation. What are the desirable attributes of a faculty director and what are the critical management activities of the director?

A: Professor Laboski initially assumed the Co-Director position. An unpaid role. Paul Mitchell stepped down in 2018 as Co-Director. Since assuming the role, Directors and Co-Directors now must attend CALS Center Director meetings and conduct program reviews so there is new work and administrative expectations that should be acknowledged by CALS and the Director's department. Duties of the NPM Director include overseeing monthly staff meetings and annual retreats, conducting annual performance management reviews, overseeing hiring and HR issues, and listening to concerns of staff. The Director has to respect the role of academic staff and their contribute to the institution, have a strong understanding of Extension, possess a multidisciplinary understanding of the field, a nutrient management background, and good relationships with all the stakeholders.

Q: How does the Program's work out in the field also inform your work and set the direction for what the group does?

A: The Director and staff are involved in field days, demonstrations, etc. For the adaptive nitrogen management program, staff were on the grower's fields and heard farmer questions which fine tune the application and research. Feedback also feeds back into Director's others research programs. It's two-way learning.

Comment: Faculty need to understand role the of academic staff. NPM might be a leader in helping faculty understand this support. This is an important part of NPM's experience.

Motion to approve the report as complete: Tracy/Bell

Vote: 11-0-0

3. FRI center review – second discussion

Chuck Czuprynski, Director of the Food Research Institute and Professor and Chair of Pathobiological Sciences, School of Veterinary Medicine provided an overview of the center. The center is in its 74th year. The program is comprised of 12 executive committee members, 13 affiliate members spanning eight departments. FRI works with food companies to enhance the safety of the food supply. The Center has 25 sponsors and 16 major sponsors. The Applied Food Safety Lab provides companies with information to inhibit growth of food pathogens, give companies data, and helps them conform to the food safety regulations. The Center also holds webinars and conducts applied research.

Questions and discussion:

Q: Is there more you would like to share with us about leadership succession?

A: Kristin Schill has been hired as Associate Scientist for the Applied Food Safety Lab. That is a great addition to the program. Chuck has informed FRI colleagues he will step down in the next year. Succession planning for faculty is more problematic. FRI used to be a department and it does not have faculty lines. Retirements will create a void in expertise in basic biology botulinum. Food virology is another area of experience that does not exist on campus. There was a virology cluster hire, but it didn't produce an individual connected to FRI. Food toxicology is another deficiency. There is a great toxicology center on campus, but its focus is not as applied, and there are a limited number of experts that exist in this area.

Q: It was noted that FRI is one of the best kept secrets and that it would benefit the center to do more marketing. What type of marketing support is needed? Features in Grow or eCALS? Are there other marketing needs?

A: Would be happy to work with CALS. Marketing, and primarily relationship building, are integrated into the program. Marketing won't help the Center that much in working with companies. Success of center is built on relationships which often start with companies taking advantage of the Applied Food Safety Lab. Relationship building is harder in an environment when the industry is changing due to buyouts.

Q: The review report suggested meetings between FRI and CALS administration.

A: Center feels there are excellent lines of communication with Ag Hall. Happy to discuss and partner. Center is providing start-up and research funds to a new Food Science hire. FRI want to collaborate when it makes sense and there is a mutual interest.

Q: The food industry is changing with technology and public health considerations. What is FRI doing to reach out to new companies in the food industry?

A: The Center is visible in the industry and attend many relevant conferences. Interacting with small companies. An example of a new sponsor is KwikTrip. The company worked with FRI when they had Cyclospora in salads. FRI hold seminars featuring speakers on many topics. Open to working with any company on microbial safety pre- and post-harvest (strength is post-harvest).

Q: How is the Institute fostering and improving relations with dairy research? What opportunities exist for collaboration with the new Dairy Innovation Hub? How is the Institute fostering more interaction with the Meat Science Lab?

A: FRI is actively engaged with meat and dairy. FRI has a long history working with the Center for Dairy Research. Dairy Farmers of Wisconsin is sponsor and Dairy Food USA. FRI has strong ties to the dairy industry. FRI has helped lead campus-wide dairy science related discussions. FRI's interaction with the Dairy Innovation Hub has been limited to individual faculty interactions. FRI has been very involved in the design and planning of the Meat Science Lab's new biology safety level two lab. FRI is providing partial support for the manager of the lab (in the future should be a self-supporting venture). Chuck is on the search for the Director of the Meat Sciences lab.

Q: Tell us about future collaborations. Do you expect joint appointments with the meat science program?

A: Yes, the new meat lab director will likely have an appointment with FRI. FRI has interacted with the animal sciences department on microbiology and safety issues. FRI is a portal for the outside world and helps connects outside partners with campus.

Q: Tell us more about what kind of marketing you are doing.

A: Constantly marketing in industry. Have found booths are not helpful. Strength of FRI is making contacts and developing relationships. Companies often start a project with the Applied Food Safety Lab and then they may get involved in sponsorship. We are open to being more visible within CALS. With stakeholders, relationship building in most important.

Motion to approve the report as complete: Khatib/Lutz

Discussion: Recommendation made to indicate in final review memo the value Chuck Czuprynski has brought to the institute. He has done an amazing job leading the center. The collegiality of staff and faculty and corporate sponsorship involvement is a direct reflection of his efforts.

Vote: 11-0-0

4. CALS Guidelines for Topics Courses – discussion continued

Karen Wassarman led the discussion. She reminded members this discussion started in early March, but the committee didn't have quorum and some members requested additional time to review the documents. Since that initial conversation, Karen wrote an executive summary that points out the action items the Curriculum Committee is asking you to consider today – mostly around the use of Topics Course SECTIONS. The Curriculum Committee document has a lot of additional information.

Though very valuable, topics course can create problems for students. They often do not have any details about a course and the topics course cannot be used to fulfill requirements. University policy states that topic course sections should be offered no more than three times within a five-year period and then should be converted to a permanent course or not taught.

The executive summary is divided into four parts. In essence, the guidelines:

- *Outline the importance of topic courses in our curriculum array*
- *They clarify how topics course sections are generated, their approval process, and expectations (dept are responsible for approval, topics course sections should not be listed as program requirements, every topics course section will have all required course components)*
- *They propose guidelines to comply with campus expectations*

- *They propose processes to transition from the current situation to future compliance*

Under the direction of the Curriculum Committee, Academic Affairs will review and reach out to each department on any future action necessary. The timing to comply is more flexible than discussed at the previous APC discussion. Departments will have a year to respond to any issues with a plan. They have another year for action.

Discussion:

- *These are complex rules to discipline behavior. The bigger issue is getting new courses approved. Faculty find it hard to create new courses. There are unnecessarily complex rules.*
- *This is not a rule change. Goal is to properly represent courses to students. Need to follow accreditation standards. Students need to know what courses are truly about. Expectations for course need to be stated.*
- *Campus University Curriculum Committee meets every two weeks and reviews approximately 110 proposals each committee meeting. The process is not that difficult. Process is a lot easier than it was. Abuse of topics courses does not serve students and faculty. Faculty are not challenged to articulate what a course is actually about. The review process can provide interesting and useful prospective.*
- *Courses should not be taught five or six years as 375. All courses need to be approved. Important to address approved courses overlapping with 375 offerings. All courses should go through college approval process and should not allow faculty to escape this process.*
- *Why can't topics courses fulfill core requirements?*
 - *Individual 375 sections should not fulfill core requirement (except when individual exceptions are made in rare cases)*
 - *Topics courses like NUTR SCI 421 for the Global Health Certificate which is an approved topics course can use all sections to fulfill a program requirement.*
- *Supportive because students benefit*
- *What if Curriculum Committee cannot get compliance?*
 - *If a department cannot meet deadline/criteria, this is an opportunity to start a conversation about options and chart a path forward. Intent is not to be heavy handed but build working relationship.*
- *Experience teaching a special topics course last summer. Proposed permanent course in fall and received approval in January. The entire governance process spanned only fall through January.*

Motion to accept CALS Guidelines for Topics Courses: Ingham/Nack

Vote: 9-1-0

5. Graduate program name change proposal – Zoology to Integrative Biology

The department of Integrative Biology is requesting a name change for their graduate program – current name is Zoology and they would like to change the name to Integrative Biology to match their new department name (changed in 2016) and better represent who they are. Department chairs have expressed support of the change.

Motion to support name change of Zoology to Integrative Biology: Tracy/Lindroth

Vote: 9-1-0

Informational Items and Announcements

6. Faculty Positions, update

Mark Rickenbach provided an overview of faculty hires over the year. There have been 14 accepted offers, 8 offers pending, and 1 ongoing search. Next year, two previously failed searches will open. There are eight approved hires – four for the Dairy Innovation Hub and four approved through departments (3 Extension, 1 research). Extension is allowing PVLS but Extension approval is required and pace slower.

May 19 is last APC meeting. Will have discussion related to COVID19.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30pm