

CALS Academic Planning Council

Meeting held via Zoom
March 2, 2021, 1:00-2:30 p.m.

Welcome and introductions
Review agenda
Revisions to current agenda

Attendees: Erika Anna, Laura Hernandez, Michael Thomas, Rick Lindroth, Jamie Nack, Xuejun Pan, Scott Lutz, William Tracy, Samuel Butcher, Michael Xenos, Jeremy Foltz, Nicole Perna, Jed Colquhoun

Absent: Barb Ingham

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

Guests: Julie Scharm, Daniel Phaneuf, Laura Schechter, Paul Mitchell, Larry Meiller, David Long, Katherine Curtis, Vanessa Vosen, Rick Amasino, Heather Mialik

Minutes taken by: Megan Ackerman-Yost and Sarah Barber

Consent Agenda

1. Approve minutes for Feb 16 meeting
Item 1 was approved by consent.

Action and Discussion Items

2. Developmental Economics Undergraduate Certificate (AAE) and Business Management for Agriculture and Life Sciences Undergraduate Certificate (AAE and LSC) Program Review
(2nd discussion)

Dan Phaneuf, Laura Schechter, Paul Mitchell, Larry Meiller 1:05-1:25 pm

Dan Phaneuf, Chair of Agriculture and Applied Economics, responded to the review committee's 5-year review report. The suggestion to offer the Business Management for Agriculture and Life Sciences certificate to SoHE students was appreciated, and will be considered. Representatives from LSC and AAE confirmed their partnership in this certificate and indicated continued commitment to working together to update and expand the program. The original champions in the AAE department for this certificate have retired, so there is a need to secure new faculty champions within the department and tighten the certificate governance. Courses for the certificates will continue to be taught according to demand, and this is a consideration for faculty instruction. Curricular updates are planned to focus on making the ABM certificate more focused on CALS issues and courses. Updates to the certificate will be considered in the context of the entire curriculum. Advising for both certificates is through the AAE department, which is looking at building community for the certificates through student groups and through stronger associations between the Business Management ALS certificate and the ABM major.

Motion to accept report as complete: Foltz/Nack

- *Recommend that certificates pay particular attention to bottleneck courses*

Vote: 13-0-0

3. APL Center Review (2nd discussion)

David Long, Associate Director of APL, and Katherine Curtis, Director of APL and Professor in C&E Sociology, responded to the review committee's center review report. APL is a research and outreach unit within the Community and Environmental Sociology department. Several academic staff lines are funded by soft money and UW Extension. APL is challenged in the area of staff diversity, which they are working to change. The center has a plan, but it's contingent on being able to hire another staff member. The center is also focusing on improving diversity and equity through the student worker hiring process, and they are working with PEOPLE and other initiatives to diversity student workers.

The center works with both research and fee-for-service partners. It is working closely with CALS business office to clarify their fee-for-service definitions and rate sheet to differentiate these options. Professional development is promoted through staff meetings. The center has secured an endowment from the past director for professional development, which will allow professional development opportunities can be constant regardless of budgetary constraints and fluctuations.

The center's plan to continue with leadership model. Katherine Curtis will be stepping out of the director role and Randy Stoecker is the incoming director. David Long will continue, and the center is confident that the leadership model will continue in the future. The center currently has staff as PI on two extramural projects. It is reviewing the Research Professor job title, and one staff member is eligible. This would enable the staff member to apply for seed funding and would be able to execute research separate from the PI but does not provide a permanent PI status for the staff member.

The center reviewed its name about ten years ago and found there was strong name recognition. It is re-evaluating the logo.

Q: If the new title isn't going to solve the issue of permanent PI status, what do you envision as the solution?

A: We're looking forward to knowing more about the titles and definitions so that we know where we are. We're working on finding creative ways to support academic staff research consistent with the university's criteria. The stopgap for us has always been partnering with folks across campus, but this still limits our ability to advance independently of those networks.

Comment: The guidelines for the new Research Professor titling are in their final stage. We will be submitting that to the college, and the final version should be available in the next few months. Unfortunately, the issue of PI status is something the committee is still wrestling with, since conferring permanent PI status is something that would run afoul of FP&P, which is a university issue. The Research Professor title will confer PI status, but not permanent status. PI Status can be conferred on a per project basis, over a set period of years, or on a permanent basis.

Motion to accept report as complete: Lindroth/Anna

Vote: 12-0-0

4. Research Professor and Teaching Professor update

Rick Amasino and Rick Lindroth provided an update on creating the college definitions for the Research Professor and Teaching Professor titles. Campus provided a template with verbiage for colleges and schools to use, which has formed the basis of the definitions. The two working groups are currently finalizing their documents, including how the professor track will be distinguished from the other academic staff titles, as well as standards for the three title levels. There is information on how

departments would apply the criteria. The documents are also being aligned with each other for consistency. The next step will be to work with the dean's office to create a document outlining a communication plan and decision-making process for conferring the titles.

Q: How is the "teaching professor" different from a faculty associate?

A: For example, faculty associates may deliver a specific course or delivering part of a particular course. The teaching professorship would require understanding and knowledge of teaching, assessment, and pedagogy. As you go up the titling levels, we would expect that knowledge to be disseminated throughout the department.

Q: Is there anything that APC members should be asking of our constituents? Is there any information that would be helpful to prepare?

A: I think you will be able to distribute a draft to your colleagues soon. We are looking forward to getting feedback from the rest of you.

Q: Will we be looking at this twice or one time? I want to make sure there is sufficient time to review.

A: We will be getting feedback before it is voted on. We want to make sure this is in front of CASI and the chairs for comment. We could also put this in eCALS to disseminate the draft for comment. The current expectation is that this will be in place for the new fiscal year.

Q: Were there any issues that you found that were specific to CALS and weren't addressed by other colleges?

A: We tailored this to the college. The teaching professor titling didn't require college-specific criteria, but the research professor definition has a structural issue concerning PI-ship, mechanisms for funding, and whether research professors would be eligible for CALS-specific formula funds. The group decided that this titling document would not include specific rules around those specific funds, but that does need to be addressed. The other topic was if extension faculty could serve on mentoring committees for research professors. The group decided that they should be treated consistent with other faculty, and be eligible to serve on mentoring committees.

5. Proposed changes to CALS Honors Program Admission

Sarah Barber, Assistant Dean for Academic Programs and Policies, presented this proposal to the committee. The CALS Honors program is a special program on campus. There are currently about 100 students in the program, and there are two tracks – Honors in the College and Honors in the Major. The proposal is for a change in the admissions criteria for first-year students. UW-Madison has received permission from the Board of Regents to be test-optional, so prospective first-year undergraduate students don't need to submit SAT and ACT scores. Admission into the CALS Honors program as a first-year student currently requires one of three things: class rank in top 10%, SAT scores, or ACT scores. Not all high schools provide a rank, and since students aren't currently required to submit SAT/ACT scores, there may be incoming CALS students who cannot meet the admissions requirements. The proposed

change would remove these requirements and allow any incoming first-year CALS student to apply for the CALS Honors program. The application process would continue to include an application and essay to indicate interest and goals. Current students and transfer students have an additional GPA requirement for admissions, and all students must meet minimum GPA requirements to complete the program. The admissions change will alleviate uncertainty for incoming first-year students without test scores and provide students with earlier access to the program's support services. There is a possibility that the program will grow too fast, but this change will support current efforts to grow program enrollment.

The CALS Curriculum Committee was in favor of the proposal and suggested getting a broader range of majors involved in the program.

Q: Is that essay evaluative, and if not, what is its purpose?

A: We are using that essay as an expression of interest and availability, and monitoring for red flags.

Q: I recommend a rubric for scoring the essay to ensure consistency. What happens if students drop below a 3.25 GPA?

A: That's a great recommendation for a rubric. It's very important for students to stay current on their milestones throughout the program. Students generally opt out of the program if they are in danger of dropping below a GPA of 3.25.

Q: Is there any case where students apply and aren't admitted?

A: No, currently all students that apply are reviewed and successfully admitted to the program. The application asks students to explain their interest and why they are a good fit. Students applying later in their career need to additionally meet entrance GPA requirements.

Motion to approve: Nack/Perna

Vote: 12-0-0

Informational Items and Announcements

6. Spitze Land Grant Faculty Award for Excellence

Bill Tracy, Nicole Perna

Motion to go into closed session: Tracy/Perna

Motion to approve recommendation: Hernandez/Pan