

CALS Academic Planning Council Minutes

Meeting via Zoom

October 20, 2020, 1:00-2:30 p.m.

Attendees: William Tracy, Nicole Perna, Jill Wildonger, Erika Anna, Xuejun Pan, Laura Hernandez, Jed Colquhoun, Michael Thomas, Jeremy Foltz, Rick Lindroth, Scott Lutz, Barb Ingham, Jamie Nack

Not Present: Dietram Scheufele

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

Guests: Donna Fernandez, Jae-Hyuk Yu, Sarah Kuba, John Shutske, Dhanansayan Shanmuganayagam, Federico Rey

Minutes taken by: Sarah Barber

Meeting began at 1:00pm.

Welcome and introductions

Review agenda

Revisions to current agenda

Consent Agenda

1. Approve minutes for October 6, 2020 meeting

Item 1 was approved by consent.

Action and Discussion Items

2. Biology Major Program Review (2nd discussion)

Sarah Kuba, the Biology Program Manager, Jae-Hyuk Yu, the Biology Co-Chair, and Donna Fernandez, the Biology Co-Chair provided a brief overview of the program, answered prepared questions, and then responded to additional questions by the APC. At the last meeting, the chair of the review committee, David Wassarman, provided an overview of review committee's recommendations.

Overview – The Biology major is a large intercollegiate interdisciplinary major. There are slightly over 1,110 students declared in the major. Approximately 60% of the students – 684 students - are in CALS. There are two named options as well. There are five professional advisors, including the Program Manager. Program was reorganized in 2013 as a result, in part, of last program review. Current structure is working.

Q: What goals does the program committee have for the future of the major? Is it appropriately sized? What goals do you have for enrollment?

A: The program leadership feels it is appropriately sized right now with 1,100-1,200 students.

Q: Are there curricular needs that you want to highlight, that you would like to work on together with contributing departments?

A: Most Biology majors complete one high-impact practice, but the program could benefit from more high-impact offerings such as freshman or senior seminars, independent study and research opportunities. Courses that start later in the semester would help students who drop courses. Additional capstone courses for Biology majors would also be beneficial.

Q: How would program assessment, as suggested by the review, and the recommendations of the review impact your planning? How is the program identifying opportunities for improvement?

A: The program is working on assessment, and also had a discussion with the program committee about additional ways to obtain student feedback. They have now added two students to the program committee – one from CALS and one from L&S. They are surveying students and alumni about programming. They discussed alternative faculty advising models. They have a scientific assessment rubric and 90% of examined senior theses and posters met the requirements. The program sends an exit survey every year. Included in the exit survey are direct assessment questions. From the exit survey, evolution and systematics are showing the poorest results. The program review committee reviews the exit survey results annually and is looking to address this and pilot additional questions in the exit survey.

Q: How will the program address the lack of sense of community among many students? Has the program considered collaboration with the Women in Science and Engineering (WISE) program to enhance community? How might the program reallocate resources to incentivize more faculty participation?

A: Program is working with student organizations. The program has had recent success working with several campus units including holding a research session with WISCIENCE and holding workshops with BioHouse. The program would be interested in working with the Women in Science and Engineering (WISE) program. The program has worked with career center offices and alumni. Last year the program hung an anniversary banner in MSB and 250 students signed it.

Q: Please comment on the recommendation to discontinue the Plant Biology named option.

A: We agree the Plant Biology option should be discontinued. The optimal timing to discontinue is not clear as it was suggested it might be appropriate to coordinate this process with the opening of the planned new Agricultural Ecosystems major. There are currently seven students in this option. Other comments were around further discussion on when the named option should be discontinued.

Q: The Evolutionary Biology and former Neurobiology named options seemed to foster a sense of community among students and faculty with more frequent student and faculty interaction. Has the program considered other named options?

A: A lot of faculty involvement is required for a named option. Options need to be faculty driven, not committee driven. An Ecology option was proposed. The Biology committee provided feedback but it has not come forward since that initial discussion. Human Biology or Health Biology are areas of interest for students. The Biology program is open to this, but most of the faculty are in SMPH, and faculty involvement is necessary and there is a poor fit between SMPH mission and undergraduate education. They expect student demand would be high so it may be more difficult to achieve a small intimate feel for that type of option.

Q: You said you have discussed faculty advising approaches and models? What does this mean?

A: Students are offered a faculty advisor – very few students take advantage of that option. Professional advising is going well. The program committee discussed having a faculty panel to provide an opportunity for students to talk directly with and meet faculty.

Q: What is the size of the evolution option?

A: Averaging 25 students. All students in this option are required to take the seminar, which is a great opportunity for community building.

Q: Can the College help incentivize the creation of high-impact courses and get more faculty participation?

A: Dean VandenBosch response – when the program completes the review process, a meeting with the Dean's Office and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will take place to discuss this, and further discussion with L&S will be needed.

Program response – The program tracks course proposals in Lumen to identify possible courses for

Biology. Credits follow instructor so it should be an advantage to departments to have these students in their classes and this way the major can provide students with more course options as well.

The next step in the program review process will be for the CALS and L&S APCs to discuss the review jointly on November 17, 2020; votes will be independent for each APC.

3. Agricultural Safety and Health Center Review (2nd discussion)

John Shutske, Director of the Agricultural Safety and Health Center, provided a brief overview of the center, answered prepared questions, and then responded to additional questions by the APC. At the last meeting, the chair of the center review committee, Mark Stephenson, provided an overview of review committee's recommendations.

Q: Please comment on any progress you have made regarding the review committee's recommendation for the small center staff to work more collaboratively to increase the strength and visibility of the Center.

A: The Director and Associate Director have worked together for 14 years. There were some tensions when John returned. The Center was focused on Extension activity and there was interest in pursuing research activity by the Director. During this time with COVID-19, the Director and Associate Director have partnered on programing and climate is improved.

Q: How can the center expand its connections with other groups or entities, including researchers on campus?

A: The Center is developing partnerships and has secured several grants including, recently, a \$1M grant and bilingual health education grant

Comment: Center review process is still relatively new. The review process appears to be a useful activity for both the centers and review committees.

Q: Have you explored connections to the Dairy Innovation Hub?

A: The Center had a lot of contact with the Hub this spring before, and early into, COVID. There is possible collaboration around the health needs of migrant farm workers. Also, John is engaging dairy industry on a capstone course project. The Dairy Innovation Hub is a great resource for the College.

*Motion to approve review as complete and well done: Lindroth/Nack
Approved: 13-0-0*

4. Center for Biomedical Swine Research and Innovation (CBSRI)

Dhanu Shanmuganayagam provided an overview of the proposed Biomedical Swine Research and Innovation Center and answered questions.

Overview – The Center has received approval from the Animal and Dairy Sciences Department and SMPH. The center would provide unique education and research opportunities. It is a partnership between the Biotechnology Center, SMPH and CALS. The pig is at the center of the effort. There is a high level of translation between pigs and humans - similarity in size and immunology. Genetic engineering is only done at a few institutions. The genetic engineering combined with medical research would make UW-Madison most comprehensive swine center in United States.

Q: In this proposed collaboration, what is the role of CALS personnel and SMPH personnel?

A: From an operational perspective, most of the genetic engineering and breeding of swine will be

done in CALS. Imaging will be done by SMPH. From a research perspective both units will engage equally. CALS will engage in more basic research. More applied/translational research will be done in SMPH.

Q: How are the costs going to be shared? Will CALS and the Animal and Dairy Sciences Department be taking on the cost of the care for the pigs? Animal care is expensive.

A: They are working on securing funding for first five years. There is a WARF request to UW Health for financial support for first five years. Similarities to Wisconsin Crop Innovation Center – putting together MOU about financial obligation for multi-year endeavor and planning ahead.

Comment: Plan with the end in mind. Build in questions you are going to ask yourself such as how to navigate leadership changes and what success looks like. Centers can revolve around individuals and it important to decide when the endeavor has fulfilled its mission.

Q: Centers live and die by their ability to raise external grants. What success has this group had in securing grants in the past?

A: Have secured multi-institutional RO1 funds. There have also been several grants from foundations for cancer. The Biomedical Swine Conference will be held in Summer 2022 and NIH is providing funding for it which they have not done before so they believe the creation of the center is the reason. NIH requested a panel and white paper. FDA reached out to collaborate on safety in genetic engineering.

Q: Education and training is one of the missions. What do you envision for this and what is the source of funding?

A: NIH has indicated in discussions that expertise in swine has waned. Many experts are retiring. NIH needs a new wave of scientists with an understanding in swine immunology and gene editing. Medical training is other aspect of training opportunities. Medical residents often work immediately with humans. Pigs can help with proficiencies for residencies. A NIH training grant is possible. Hospitals need staff who know how to do this work as well. They might have interest in recruiting from the program.

Q: Currently, there is no additional space. What kind of facilities may be needed? On or off campus?

A: The Center is considering off-campus space as an extension to the swine research center in Arlington. Seeking more isolation for immunocompromised. If any area is in high demand, they don't want to be in business of breeding swine so they may license breeding to companies so focus is on research.

Motion to approve center: Perna/Thomas

Vote: 12-0-1

5. Clinical Nutrition, Capstone and Capstone Internship (1st review)

Federico Rey, chair of the program review committee, provided an overview of the Clinical Nutrition Capstone Certificate and the Clinical Nutrition – Dietetic Internship Capstone Certificate, and shared the committee's recommendations.

Overview – The Clinical Nutrition Capstone Certificate is 12 credits. The Clinical Nutrition – Dietetic Internship is 18 credits. The programs are designed to serve three groups of students - graduates of

undergrad dietetics programs seeking an internship, graduates of dietetics programs who receive an internship and want to work on obtaining postbaccalaureate credit, and professionals seeking professional development.

The review committee met with program leadership. The programs have met their goals and objectives outlined in their program proposals. Job placement is high.

A big development is coming January 2024 in this field. A graduate degree will be required to be a registered dietician. The department created a 30-credit online Master's degree to fulfill this requirement, but that has led to a decline in capstone certificate enrollment. The program feels the capstones were instrumental in the development of the Master's program. Students from all three programs -the two capstones and the Masters – are enrolled in many of the same courses.

The value of keeping the Capstone w/out the internship is questionable. There has been a marked decrease in enrollment. The program has plans for recruitment, but there should be set goals for this effort and a timeline established to evaluate whether the Capstone with no internship should continue to be available. The program does not think there is cost to offering all three.

Comment: This is a five-year review. This is a progress report. Our job is to, in part, make recommendations for the program in advance of its 10-year review.

Q: Is the committee recommending discontinuing the certificate without the internship? Does the program agree with this?

A: The committee's recommendation is to keep a close eye on it. The program has plans for recruitment. Watch how those efforts play out.

Q: Is there any reason we need an answer before the 10-year mark?

A: A sooner check-in is possible if that is what they choose to recommend. It was also noted that with program reviews, the 10 year review may not happen until an additional 10 years (not 5 years after the 5 year review).

Comment: Concern program will limp along.

Comment: If program wants to discontinue, they can do that.

Comment: It will be helpful for the department to talk about the balance of these two programs and the Masters.

Comment: How will they take student feedback when planning for future of the programs? While interviewing students during the program review, there were significant costs to the students. Continue to gather information from students about what they're getting from the program and its value, and if they know that before they start. For some it is challenging and expensive.

Q: What is department thinking about for recruitment and how will they evaluate these recruitment strategies?

Q: Can they better outline the programs' costs and benefits in their online description?

Meeting adjourned at 2:25pm