Sarah called the meeting to order at 1:04 pm
Kate was unable to attend the meeting due to a prior obligation. Dick Straub was originally scheduled to chair the meeting, but due to an unforeseen issue was unable to attend, so Sarah chaired the meeting in his absence.

No revisions to current agenda

John moved to approve September 19th minutes; Karen seconded; minutes passed; two abstentions

Action and Discussion Items

I. AAE Proposals
   a. Curriculum Changes to MS AAE
   b. Change of MS AAE to Named Option
   c. Discontinue MA
   d. Change REDA Named Option from MA AAE to MS AAE
   e. Update Learning Outcomes
   f. Change CIP code

The proposed change to curriculum will no longer require that students complete a thesis in order to earn the Masters of Science. Instead, students will meet the additional credit requirement by completing at least 6 credits of 300 level or above coursework from any department. Students will still have the option to complete the thesis if desired. The department does not think this will affect the amount of students that complete the thesis, which is currently about half.

The MS is an admitting Master’s program, and it is typical in the field for students to complete a non-thesis masters and remain eligible to continue to a PhD.
Campus has encouraged the department to offer only a Master’s of Science, instead of both the Masters of Science and Masters of Arts. Additionally, most peer departments offer the Masters of Science. The discontinuation of the Masters of Arts will be effective Fall 2018, and is mostly a formality since all students will move to the Masters of Science program along with the named option, REDA.

The two proposed options are the Masters of Science - Agricultural and Applied Economics and the Masters of Science - Resource and Energy Demand Analysis (REDA). Even though one option is general, campus distinguishes between options and would prefer that every program have a named option as it allows for separate data collection for each option.

Will this affect how students find classes? This will not affect how students find classes. The four students that will be affected by the discontinuation of the Masters of Arts program have been notified and provided their written consent.

The overall goal for requesting these changes is to get STEM designation for graduate programs. If the CIP code, which is a federal designation, is changed as proposed, the programs will receive STEM designation. Not only will this classification better fit the program, but it will also provide new avenues for research funding and attract more students. This change is particularly attractive to non-US students, who will become eligible to stay for an extra year of Optional Practical Training because of the STEM designation. This is also important for the REDA program, which is currently a named option under the Masters of Arts degree.

Changes to learning outcomes include the addition of quantitative analysis. Changes to learning outcomes do not require approval by the CALS APC. However, if approved, all of these changes will be brought to Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC), and then the University Academic Planning Council (UAPC).

Karen moved to support items a,b,c, d and f, and to acknowledge the receipt of item e; Katherine seconded; Unanimously approved

2. USDA Civil Rights Review

Bill Barker provided the findings of the USDA Civil Rights Review of the Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station.

This review was part of a systematic review and not due to a complaint. Preparations for the review took about 6 months and began under Rick Lindroth’s leadership. The data used in the review was benchmarked against 2010 census data.

As part of the review, the USDA interviewed about 100 people including staff from the Arlington Research Station, and department chairs, faculty, and graduate students from the Departments of Dairy Science and Plant Pathology. No undergraduates were interviewed, and the USDA chose who was interviewed.
Overall, we received very positive feedback for our full cooperation and our stakeholder input methods. The review recognized that there are areas needing improvement. Generally, the review called for an increase in diversity and creating an inclusive environment. In particular, the review identified that more protections must be put in place to assure academic progress for graduate students that file a complaint. The need for better communication for people with limited English and more accessibility was specifically noted at the Ag Research Stations. Bill outlined areas that will be the focus of improvement.

The USDA would like a response to its findings by January 10th addressing the recommendations in the report. The response will answer the recommendations point by point, in part by identifying what already exists, as well as outlining concrete action steps. There is already an Equity and Diversity Committee in place and reports from this committee will be a theme for APC this year. Salary equity will be examined and advisory boards for the research stations will be implemented. Another suggestion is the creation of a policy outlining protections for students that file a Title IX complaint.

The committee expressed a strong interest in not only responding to the USDA, but taking action to correct the issues. The committee members offered their support and suggested that the topic be revisited in November and December. There was also an interest in hearing from Dean Kate directly regarding her commitment to addressing the issues in the report. Bill encouraged members to email him if they would like to discuss anything in more depth.

3. Post-Tenure Review Policies & Procedures (materials in Box)

Campus has requested that the criteria for post tenure review be submitted by October 6th. At this time, all departments that have faculty up for tenure review this year have submitted something. It is not clear that actual criteria was outlined for three of the departments. A subcommittee has been convened to review the criteria in more detail and will report to APC at a later meeting.

The criteria should make it clear whether or not a faculty member has met one of the following three categories: exceeds expectations, does not meet expectations, or meets expectations. These criteria are not set in stone, but are meant to be available and transparent. After discussion, the committee suggested either: a) faculty could either receive “meets expectations” or “does not meet expectations” with a separate check box for special recognition, or b) faculty could either receive “meets or exceeds expectations” or “does not meet expectations” and individual cases could be considered separately for merit benefits and/or public recognition.

It is noted that the categories could be used differently across departments.

Informational Items and Announcements
4. Update on Transmittal of Departmental Criteria for Post-Tenure Reviews to Campus

Campus has required departments to come up with criteria for post tenure reviews. All have submitted except for 3 that are not required because no one is up for post tenure review. Several departments questionable about whether they actually submitted criteria not just process.
Subcommittee was established to look at the documents, but first we decided to submit to the Provost in order to meet the deadline with the acknowledgement that some more work can be done.

5. All College Meeting October 24th from 9-10:30 am in Upper Carson Gulley

Members are encouraged to communicate future meeting absences to Megan Grill.

Meeting adjourned at 2:23 pm