

CALS Academic Planning Council

6201 Microbial Sciences Building
September 20, 2022, 1:00-2:30 p.m.

Attendees: Glenda Gillaspay (Zoom), Jed Colquhon, Mehdi Kabbage, HuiChuan Lai, Patrick Masson, Sean Schoville, Michael Thomas, Thea Whitman, Michael Xenos

Absent: Samer Alatout, Bradley Bolling, Todd Courtenay, Jamie Nack, John Shutske, Francisco Peñagaricano

Ex Officio: Doug Reinemann, Mark Rickenbach, Angie Seitler, Karen Wassarman

Guests: Doug Soldat (Chair of the Review Committee - Renk institute)

1. Sept 20, 2022 meeting minutes for approval

After a minor revision, minutes were approved. Approved minutes will be posted on the APC website.

2. Overview of APC role in Center Review (informational)

Karen Wassarman, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, reminded the members the role APC has on center reviews. She explained that this is a process initiated several years ago by college to monitor the work the centers are doing. In brief, the process is initiated by the Dean requesting the center to prepare a self-study, a review committee is then charged to evaluate the center and prepare a report. This report goes back to the center chair and center director who respond to any errors of fact. Next, all documentation comes to the APC for review in two different meetings:

- In the first meeting, the center review committee chair provides a summary of the process and allows APC members to ask questions. This meeting is also a chance to develop questions for the center chair director.
- The second meeting is a discussion with the center chair director to address the questions from the first meeting.

The job of the APC is to vote on the completeness of the review and provide comments on recommendations or suggestions to the Dean. Finally, the Dean compiles a summary report to the center making recommendations and outlining future actions.

3. Renk Institute Center Review (first discussion)

Chair of the Review Committee of Renk institute, Doug Soldat, introduced himself and the other members of the review committee. He provided a brief historical overview of the institute and talked about how the goals and the mission of the institute have changed over time. It is worth mentioning that this is the first review of this institute, and it covers years 2012-2021. The chair of the review committee summarized his discussion of the institute in mission areas:

- Highlighting the success of CALS undergraduate certificate program, the scholarship program and outreach activities.
- Since 2017 and a change in leadership, an effort for improved record keeping to capture center activities.

The review committee did not find any notable weaknesses and concluded that it is very important who is the director in relation to the success and specific activities carried out by the institute. Recommendations made in the self-study include developing a strategic planning document which includes midterm and long-term goals, a structure to look forward – especially with regards to succession planning. Also, a concern noted in a self-study is that fewer people on campus are capable of serving as a director than when the center was originally formed.

Questions: How was the board selected and is there a rotation?

Answer: There is lack of documentation and procedures in place, however the board is comprised of one founding member and three major Wisconsin Agricultural Association directors. It was a concern of the committee that there is a lack of documentation in place that suggests how membership is determined and rotation of members on and off the board.

Question: Is this center considered as a campus level institute or a program inherited through donation?

Answer: This is a small center compared to other centers.

Question: Is this an officially recognized institute?

Answer: The answer in the meeting is that this is not a UAPC approved center; however correction after the meeting is that the Renk Agribusiness Center is an approved UAPC center and thus subject to full governance processes.

Question: Was there a discussion in the group what the future of the center looks like?

Answer: The conversation the committee had with the director, the vice director and the advisory groups resulted in a main recommendation that there is a need to develop a strategic plan of how the center operates. To provide some document and/or guidelines about what the future might look like.

Question: Is there a concrete plan for succession? How explicit are the conversations on finding a new director?

Answer: The plan is to find a new director; it is a concern that the number of people doing agribusiness work is shrinking.

Question: Is there a plan for representation? A strategy to improve diversity and minority recruitment?

Answer: The committee found very little structure or plans in terms of operations. The idea of diversity and minority recruitment was brought up during interviews and

embraced as a good idea but has not been done until now – perhaps because of this being the first review.

Questions for the director of the center to address in the next APC meeting:

1. Have you captured a vision for the future of the center and a succession plan?
2. Is there a plan that includes succession, diversity, record-keeping, and general operations?

4. CALS Facilities Master Plan update

An overview was given by Mark Rickenbach, Sr Associate Dean. Discussion around completing a facilities masterplan was introduced last year. The master plan is a campus requirement that helps schools/colleges to evaluate the quality and quantity of space, and ensures that the existing space is used appropriately, determines maintenance plans, and identifies the capital investment needed and to approach the needs. It looks from 10-20 years into the future. Worth noting, this CALS masterplan does not include the Agricultural Research Stations (it will be a separate masterplan) but does include the Walnut Street green houses as they are continuous with campus space.

Some things to highlight:

- Buildings are becoming expensive, so we are seeing more utilization of space rather than new construction.
- Some old buildings could be repurposed. For example, a building not appropriate for research could be used for something else like office space.
- We are at the 30% completion of the planning; this means buildings have been visited, discussions completed with users, chairs of departments and centers, and space assessments are done.
- Of importance during this process is to address how do we account for a greater role of the computational research and the space needed for this research.
- The Facilities Master plan does an elaborate dive in the teaching spaces, analyzing spaces used for teaching in our space (even if not dedicated instruction space) as well as use of space outside our college to teach our students.
- CALS Admin is reviewing the data and will assist with developing assumptions about growth and needs moving forward.

Question: How is this process organized? How does it work at the campus level?

Answer: This is the role of the facilities committee.

Question: Does the assessment get granular enough to detect multiple office assignments? Is it forward looking enough to accommodate remote work situations?

Answer: There were attempts to deal with that level of granularity determining multiple office spaces. Remote work is something that is considered and investigated. There is an ongoing conversation on campus how to accommodate remote work in the future.

Question: Campus is offering more online educational programs. Is there a discussion how do we accommodate or provide physical space for the instructional staff doing online instruction?

Answer: Such online only educational programs are not very common, but it is something worth considering.

5. CALS Centers (extension-funded)

Associate Dean for Extension and Outreach, Doug Reinemann, gave an overview of a particular group of centers funded by the Division of Extension. Of importance is that historically the Division of Extension has typically funded academic staff and recently, over the last 5 years, it is prioritizing their funding to CALS faculty and maintaining staff positions in the Division of Extension.

6. Non-Point Pollution

Non-Point Pollution program was established in 1977 and originally had line item funding. Due to disappearance of the line item funding for this program, it has been inactive for some time now, so the program is being closed. Because it is a UAPC it needs to come to APC for formal discontinuation as part of the governance process.

Thea Whitman moved to support closure of the program, Sean Schoville seconded and there was a unanimous vote in favor of closing the program.

7. Center for Cooperatives move to Division of Extension

Associate Dean for Extension and Outreach, Doug Reinemann, informed the members that the Center for Cooperatives is moving into the Division of Extension.

8. Pathways to new programs (informational)

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Karen Wassarman, informed APC about the processes for new program proposals. The proposals of new major or degree programs are usually a two-step process:

- I. The Notice of Intent to Plan (NOI) – comprised of the justification of the need for the new program (idea and student interest), creating the learning outcomes, identifying resources and support for the program. This should be done in consultation with the office of Academic Affairs.

For approval the NOI undergoes the following steps:

- Departmental vote
- Curriculum Committee review
- CALS APC vote
- GFEC (Graduate Faculty Executive Committee) vote for Graduate/Prof programs
- University Academic Planning Council vote

- UW System review
- II. Once UW System has approved the NOI proposal, the next step is to prepare the full proposal – which includes program requirements and curriculum, program faculty, instructors and staff, resources and fiscal considerations, letters of support, etc. The full proposal is submitted online (Lumen Programs) and is done in consultation with the office of Academic Affairs. The following approvals are needed:
- Department vote
 - CALS Curriculum Committee review for comment
 - CALS Academic Planning Council vote
 - GFEC vote for Grad/Prof Programs
 - University Academic Planning Council vote
 - Board of Regents vote (for new Grad and UG majors only)

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs pointed out that there are two exceptions to this normal process:

- New certificates and new named options do not require an NOI step but go directly to the full proposal
- Programs that are essentially already in place can apply to use the Fast-Track pathway. If approved for Fast-Track, these programs skip the NOI and go directly to a full proposal.

Meeting adjourned at 2:09 pm.