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September 27, 2017

TO: Steve Ventura  
Program Chair, Agroecology

FROM: Sarah Pfatteicher  
Associate Dean of Academic Affairs

RE: Agroecology 10-Year Review

CC: Sandy Bennett, Nikki Bollig, Sarah Kuba, Jocelyn Milner, Marty Gustafson, Dick Straub, Alan Turnquist, Kathryn VandenBosch

As you know, the Board of Regents requires that all academic programs be reviewed every ten years. We would therefore like to initiate a comprehensive review of the Agroecology M.S. to be completed in the next two academic years.

We are requesting the program conduct a self-study in preparation for the comprehensive review and prepare a single self-study document for the program listed above. Once the self-study is completed, we will convene a cross-college review committee to review these materials, talk with you, your colleagues and students, and prepare a report to the CALS and University Academic Planning Councils and the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee. These governance bodies will discuss all of the documents and make recommendations about the program. Completion of the full review process is due to the Board of Regents by Spring of 2019. In order to meet this deadline, we ask that you please submit your self-study to academicaffairs@cals.wisc.edu by March 1, 2018.

Purpose of the Review

As you prepare for the review, please consult the UW-Madison Program Review Guidelines and Resources, posted at http://apir.wisc.edu/programreview.htm, and excerpted here:

Purposes of Ten-Year Reviews:

a. Focus on the recent past and key points over the past decade as context for present and future improvements.
b. Concentrate on the academic program and student experience.
c. Review program learning goals and assessment of learning.
d. Understand the current student experience with regard to academics, advising, climate, and career development.
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Identify program strengths and recommendations for improvements.

The overall well-being of the administrative home is also important for the success of academic programs, particularly how the functioning of the administrative home relates to educational programs and student outcomes. As such, CALS practice has been to use the program reviews as an opportunity to summarize the departmental/programmatic trajectory and priorities. This approach provides a context to align program planning with that of the department/program overall. We encourage you to use the consultative nature of the review process to identify and resolve administrative or structural matters that affect your program. Your self-study will draw upon all of this information to reflect more generally on the quality and future of the program.

Content of the Self-Study

In preparing your self-study, please refer to the following resources:

- Self-Study Guidelines: https://kb.wisc.edu/vesta/page.php?id=63649
- Self-Study Template: https://kb.wisc.edu/vesta/page.php?id=63649

The CALS Dean’s Office also requests a concise overview of other aspects of the department/program, including faculty engagement, facilities, and research and Extension/outreach missions. Please include a brief discussion and assessment of these aspects in a separate section of the self-study, emphasizing not only how they affect and intersect with the academic program under consideration, but also how they impact the overall strength of the department/program. Of particular interest in this section are how the department/program’s overall strengths and priorities align with the academic program under review, and how any long-term trends affecting the department/program or the discipline impact the academic programs.

In addition, the Dean’s office asks that you please address the following topics in your self-study:

- We have intentionally structured the program review process to cluster reviews of similar programs at the same time in order to evaluate the relationship between like subjects. The following programs are also undergoing review:
  - Horticulture, MS, PhD, Doctoral Minor
  - Plant Breeding and Plant Genetics, MS, PhD, Doctoral Minor
  - Plant Pathology, MS, PhD, Doctoral Minor

  Please comment on the relationship of your academic program to the other programs under review, including any useful synergies that may exist.

- Given that the program is not housed exclusively in one department, due to its interdisciplinary nature, how do students in the program develop community? What is the sense of cohesion between students, faculty, and instructional staff?

Resources for Program Review

It may be helpful to include in the self-study data relevant to the program, such as program requirements, number of students declared, number of students completing the program, etc. The UW-Madison Office of Academic Planning and Institutional Research offers a wealth of data.
and metrics that can help with program evaluation. We strongly encourage you to consult these resources, consider them in light of similar programs, and reflect on whether or not the data reveal any issues that require attention. (For example, see http://apir.wisc.edu/students-degrees.htm; and Resources that Support Program Review: https://kb.wisc.edu/vesta/page.php?id=56637.)

Thank you for your prompt attention to this important activity. We look forward to working with you in this process. If you have questions, please contact Nikki Bollig or myself.
Response to previous program review recommendations

Summarize recommendations from the previous program review and how they were acted upon.

The five-year review recommended the following comments (italicized):

1. the program should identify potential funding sources that will provide opportunities students with interests in the public practice track (noting a bias toward the research track).

Providing opportunities and funding for students who are interested in pursuing projects that result in deliverables distinct from theses has proven challenging on a campus where most of the resources of our affiliated faculty are for supporting publishable research. We remain committed, however, to offering the Public Practice Track to serve the interests of this subset of our students. In step with the recommendation in the five-year review, we successfully secured two Hatch-funded projects (multi-investigator and individual, both with Randy Jackson as lead PI, beginning in October 2014) that explicitly require graduate students to play a broadened role in project development, management, and stakeholder engagement. Providing opportunities for applied work that could result in Public Practice projects is at the heart of this effort. While the project has thus far only yielded one Public Practice graduate, even those students in the research track have gained experience in public engagement and project management very much in the spirit of the Public Practice Track. A new USDA grant recently received by current program chair Steve Ventura is for creating a School of Urban Agriculture. This will provide an opportunity for Agroecology students to engage in education and training aspects of public practice.

More broadly, we have also developed an internal memorandum to share with our affiliated faculty that helps to explain the purpose and potential of the Public Practice Track. A growing number of our students find funding, at least initially, through TA positions in Zoology (Bio 151/2 sequence) which has allowed more flexibility in their track choice. A number of students in this scenario have chosen the Public Practice Track. Overall, we have graduated nine students in the Public Practice track since the completion of the five-year review and have three current students pursuing that track. That accounts for approximately one fifth of our student body during that period. We will continue to seek ways to fund, and otherwise support, students interested in pursuing the public practice track.
2. *Increase engagement with alumni through listserves, etc.*

The program has greatly increased interaction with alumni in recent years. We have an active group on LinkedIn that connects current students and alumni. Currently there are over 40 members sharing job postings and networking. It has been quite useful, as Graduate Coordinator Alan Turnquist has connected multiple students to alumni through this network based on conversations with students about professional interests. Additionally, the program secured an $800 Professional Development Grant from the Graduate school to bring in two alumni in the 2016-17 academic year. Those alumni led group workshops and met with individual students. Their visits also provided the occasion for local alumni to join for social gatherings with current students, which resulted in networking opportunities for our students. We will continue to invite alumni to return to present and meet with students, but a lack of funding for the effort will restrict which alumni we bring in.

The program is one of five campus groups that sponsors the Food & the Wisconsin Idea networking event. These are monthly discussions and social occasions intended to connect the campus with the broader community of food systems interested people, including program alumni still in the area. In the spring of 2018, this program will be expanded statewide via videoconferencing supported by University of Wisconsin Extension.

3. *Consider expanding to a PhD program.*

The Agroecology Governance Committee considered this request extensively following the five-year review, but ultimately decided that it was not appropriate. The reasoning for maintaining an M.S. only program is that the interdisciplinary nature of the program is more appropriate for Masters students and that there are sufficient opportunities for students to continue on to do PhD work in other units if they are interested. Nearly one-fourth of our graduates choose to do so, matriculating in programs in CALS departments, the Nelson Institute, and other universities.
Overview of the Program

Describe the mission and goals of the program and how its structure (both of the program and of its governance) support them. Consider the following questions:

- What are the approved learning goals for each of the programs being reviewed (i.e. bachelor’s, master’s or doctoral degrees? 
- What is the program’s structure? For example, is it a single program or does it have informal tracks/concentrations, formal named options or certificates?
- Describe any substantial and structured collaborations with other programs, such as dual, double or joint degrees and benefits of these arrangements?
- If the program is not the only program within the home unit, what are the other programs? If there are several programs in the same academic home, how are they related to one another and what impacts do they have on student learning?
- How do the program’s governance model, program committees, and membership criteria lead to active faculty engagement? How does succession planning work for leadership?

The Agroecology M.S. Program trains students to research and analyze agricultural systems within a broader environmental and socioeconomic context.

The combination of focused project work and interdisciplinary coursework is the greatest strength of the program. Every student works closely with faculty on an individual project that results in a thesis or final project directed toward a scientific publication or a professional deliverable. Meanwhile, our core curriculum brings together all students working across the disciplines to analyze food and agricultural systems from biophysical, social, and economic perspectives. Our core courses have small enrollment (10-20 students) and high levels of interaction among students and between students and faculty. A typical cohort consists of 8-10 incoming students.

The Agroecology Program offers a Master of Science degree with two tracks that differ in coursework requirements and the nature of the final project – the Research Track and the Public Practice Track. Alumni of both tracks have had professional success in the public and private agricultural sectors, including positions in research, outreach, education, and project management.

Learning Outcomes:

- Students will analyze tradeoffs of different agricultural systems embedded within the greater complexity of socio-ecological systems.
- Students will consider and synthesize concepts of systems, ecology, and public process.
- Students will learn to engage in careful consideration of the social, economic, and environmental outcomes of different industrial and biological processes.
- Students will understand the potential of inclusive participatory processes in research and analysis of agroecological systems.
- Students will recognize and apply principles of ethical and professional conduct in their coursework, research, and communications in the field of agroecology.

Minimum graduate degree credit requirement: 34 credits

Minimum graduate residence credit requirement: 16 credits

Minimum graduate coursework (50%) requirement:
23 out of 34 total credits must be completed in graduate-level coursework; courses with the Graduate Level Coursework attribute are identified and searchable in the university's Course Guide.

With program approval, students are allowed to count no more than 9 credits of graduate coursework from other institutions. Coursework earned five or more years prior to admission to a master's degree is not allowed to satisfy requirements.

With program approval, up to 7 credits from UW–Madison taken as an undergraduate or university special student and numbered 300 or above are allowed to count toward the degree. Coursework earned five or more years prior to admission to a master's degree is not allowed to satisfy requirements.

Program-specific coursework requirement:

Agroecology Field Study (Agroecol 720); The Farm as a Socio-environmental Endeavor (Agroecol 701); The Multifunctionality of Agriculture (Agroecol 702); and three semesters of Seminar in Agroecology (Agroecol 710)

Students must also complete four categories of “cross-training” electives, which differ between the Research Track and the Public Practice Track. Please see our learning plans for more details: https://agroecology.wisc.edu/about/program-tracks/

GPA requirement:

3.00 GPA required

Other Grade Requirements

Students must earn a B or above in all core curriculum coursework.
Program governance

Agroecology Program governance comprises more than 50 faculty members from numerous departments and colleges, and an elected Governance Committee. The Agroecology Governance Committee, composed of five faculty and two student members, oversees all aspects of the program including admissions, student progress, curriculum development, and budget. Program bylaws outline the processes and authority of the committee. The committee meets monthly during the academic year. All meeting agendas and minutes are public and available upon request. Our pool of faculty affiliates nominate and elect governance committee members each spring. They serve staggered two-year terms. The committee elects the chair in the fall of each year. Similarly, the student body elects students on staggered two-year terms by the student body.

- Program Assessment and Evaluation

  Summarize the assessment plan used to evaluate the extent to which students are meeting program learning goals and how the program is engaged in a coherent process of continuous curricular and program improvement.

  - What has the program learned through assessment of learning goals? Provide key evidence.
  - What changes have been made as a result of assessment?
  - What are the emerging changes in the discipline? What is being done and can be done to move forward and seize emerging/future opportunities?
  - If relevant to the program, how do leaders within industry, business, government, or non-profit organizations become involved in offering advice and perspectives on the program and the curriculum?

Our assessment plan includes:

- Direct Assessment
  thesis committee reviews of written document and oral defense, course grades.
- Indirect Assessment
  course evaluations (Agroecol 701, 702, 724 and 710), exit interviews, semi-annual listening sessions

  **Thesis committee:** the 3-5 members of the committee directly assessed student mastery of subject matter

  **Course evaluations:** all students in Agroecol 701, 702, 710, and 724 respond to direct questions about learning goals.

  **Listening Sessions:** open ended discussion on coursework and research in the context of program learning goals and students’ individual goals
**Exit interviews:** semi-structured interview by the graduate coordinator, asking students about their overall satisfaction with coursework, research, and other aspects of the program (E.g. interaction with cohort and alumni). This year, we also included direct questions about specific program learning goals.

Student assessment and feedback have led to a number of programmatic changes since our five-year review. The listening sessions have been particularly useful, as it brings out the conversations that students are having about a variety of subjects.

**Courses:** student feedback received via course evaluations, listening sessions, and exit interviews, shapes our core course offerings. In specific:

- Agroecol 710 seminars now dive deep into the complexities of a specific topic or issue each semester (E.g. agricultural impacts on local water resources, public-private partnerships in conservation), whereas they previously had more of a “journal-club” or student presentation approach that could range widely over the course of a semester.
- The Agroecol 720 field study now includes coordinated readings leading up to the field visits, more facilitated discussion following the field study, and an orientation session that includes a representative from the Graduate School Office of Professional Development.
- Agroecol 701 and 702 work together as complementary courses, with 701 (taken in students’ first semester) serving as a knowledge-building course with more weight on lecture and guided discussion by the instructor, and 702 (taken the spring following 701) requiring more student responsibility in facilitating reading and discussion to build on organizational and communication skills.

**Professional development/alumni engagement:** students often indicate a need for more professional development and networking activities to connect their coursework and research to future career opportunities. To address this feedback, the program has taken a number of steps:

- Creating a LinkedIn group for current students and alumni
- Inviting in alumni for workshops and personal interaction (detailed above in the response to the previous program review
- Graduate Coordinator Alan Turnquist sought and received Career Development Facilitator training through a Graduate School scholarship. As a result, he created a program-specific Individual Development Plan template for students and offers individual consultation in plan development
- Creating a mentorship program to connect incoming students with continuing students to provide support in the transition to graduate school and to answer questions regarding coursework, advising, etc.
- Offering Professional Development Grants of up to $300 to offset travel costs or other expenses related to the pursuit of professional development activities. While the majority of these grants go to individual students, groups of students have also submitted ideas for speakers or workshops that can benefit the entire program
**Research and project work:** Many students have voiced a desire for applied engagement and interdisciplinary synthesis in their individual thesis or project work. This can lead to a tension in an interdisciplinary graduate program where many students are working on discipline-specific, faculty-directed, research projects. As noted above in our response to the previous program review, we have put significant effort into providing opportunities for students to engage in broader projects through the Public Practice Track. Funding this work is challenging and we continue to seek ways to support students with more applied interests.

- **Recruiting, Admissions, and Enrollment**

  Analyze current practices and trends to determine if enrollment levels are consistent with plans and program resources. Discuss relevant program data in the context of the following:

  - Are admissions practices and enrollment levels consistent with plans, program resources, and career outcomes?
  - What effort has the department/academic unit or program made to enhance student diversity (traditionally underrepresented groups in field)? Have those diversity efforts been successful?
  - If applicable, what do trends in application volume, admits, and enrolled students signal about program strength? For graduate programs, does the program directly admit students? If so, how does the program ensure student integration and success beyond the admitting advisor?

Admissions practices and enrollment levels have remained consistent since our most recent program review. While our applicant numbers have declined from their high point in 2012-13, our total enrollment has remained consistently in the high twenties, and in line with program resources. Because we require program applicants to secure funding and an advisor to gain admission, funding availability among our faculty affiliates primarily determines our enrollment. We receive many top-quality applicants, some of whom are not able to secure funding, advising, and thus admissions. The program policy to require that applicants secure funding does keep numbers small, but it also results in students that are highly engaged and on equal footing with their peers in the program. Overall, we feel the quality of our applicants and enrolled students is the strength of our program.

**Efforts to promote diversity**

Our Graduate Coordinator Alan Turnquist attends recruitment events on campus and also reaches out to underrepresented prospective students who have topical interest in Agroecological study through lists compiled by SciMed GRS tabling at conferences from the Society for Advancement of Chicanos/Hispanics and Native Americans in Science, National Institutes of Health and the Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students. After initial contact, Turnquist utilizes phone conversations to begin the matchmaking process with potential faculty advisors. We prioritize minorities in our recruiting efforts, including in offsetting travel costs for prospective students to visit campus. We receive $475 annually for
AOF recruiting, but we have spent an average of $1000 in the past four years for travel costs for AOF eligible candidates. The difference comes from funds raised by students through an annual fund-raising event, an indication of the support within the student body to promote diversity.

We have had excellent success in recruiting women (traditionally underrepresented in the agricultural sciences), as roughly two-thirds of our students and graduates since the last program review are women. We have also had some success in recruiting and retaining underrepresented students, enrolling an average of one AOF eligible student each year since our previous review in 2011. The SciMed-GRS program has provided crucial resources for networking, funding and general student support. Turnquist, along with many faculty affiliates, are active in the Sci Med GRS program, judging student posters and attending recruitment events. In an effort to promote diversity, Turnquist and faculty Chair Steve Ventura (Soil Science) submitted a proposal to the USDA for a National Needs Fellowship grant in the fall of 2016 to help recruit 2-3 underrepresented students each year for the next three years. While we did not receive an offer, we plan to resubmit in the coming years.

- **Advising and Student Support**
  Discuss the process by which students get regular advising and accurate program information. Reflect upon the following:
  
  - How are advisors assigned and matched to students? How many advisees does each faculty member have?
  - How often are program contacts and student handbooks updated and made available online? Is the handbook inclusive of program learning goals, program requirements as well as a program-level grievance procedure?
  - How are students transitioned between advisors when personnel changes?
  - How often and in what manner is satisfactory progress monitored? Do students receive written annual feedback on their academic progress?
  - How is the impact of advising assessed?

Our program requires that students seek and secure academic advisors and funding sources as part of the admissions process. Faculty members of the Agroecology Governance Committee assist in the networking and matchmaking process, but ultimately the decision to advise is a transaction between advisor and advisee.

Graduate Coordinator Turnquist, with supervision from the Governance Committee, created and regularly updates the program Handbook since our previous review. The Handbook includes learning goals, program requirements, and a grievance procedure. Additionally, Turnquist created two new websites since our previous review (DoIT required that we convert to the WordPress platform shortly after completing a new site on WiscWebCMS). Online materials include the Handbook and other student resources such as our learning plans and professional development grants. [Here’s a link](#) to these resources.
The program monitors satisfactory progress through the faculty advisor and the Graduate Coordinator. We require all students to go over their learning plan during their second semester and again before requesting a warrant, at which times both the advisor and Graduate Coordinator sit down with the student and match course enrollment and grades against program requirements. Advisors must sign off on the document. The Graduate Coordinator also asks students about their relationship with their advisor and their progress toward completion of the thesis or Public Practice project at both of these times. The assessment of the impact of the advisor/advisee relationship is thus in narrative form and confidential. In two cases since our previous review, students have voiced significant concerns over their relationship with their advisor to the Graduate Coordinator. With the students’ permission, the Graduate Coordinator notified the faculty Program Chair who successfully worked with the students to find the best path forward. From these experiences, the program recognizes the value of the involvement of the faculty chair to help with potentially difficult conversations between student and advisor.

**Program Community and Climate**

*Where applicable, evaluate exit survey and climate survey data. Describe the efforts taken to foster overall program diversity, a climate of respect and inclusion, and a sense of community by considering the following:*

- Discuss efforts to welcome, orient, and retain new students. What is offered to connect students within the program, as well as with the greater campus community?
- What efforts are there to enhance faculty/staff representation of traditionally underrepresented groups in the field? How does the unit rate its ability to attract and retain a diverse faculty/staff?

Building community within the cohort and program is a priority for the program beginning at the outset of each fall term. Incoming students all enroll in a weeklong field study prior to the start of the fall semester. That field study has significant orientation and community building goals built in. The week starts with a morning orientation to the program that includes continuing students. After travelling together for four days, the incoming cohort returns to a fall potluck/picnic (traditionally at the faculty Chair’s house) where continuing students, alumni, and faculty join them. The following day, the incoming cohort gathers once again on campus for an orientation session on professional development opportunities on campus and beyond. Continuing students also join this session to answer any questions that incoming students may have about advising, courses, and live on campus and in Madison.

Beyond the orientation activities described above, our program prides itself on its personal contact with students. At a minimum, we offer open listening sessions once a semester, but we also typically have multiple social gatherings at student, faculty, and staff residences. This helps to connect students to faculty and staff and provide them with opportunities to discuss issues. Graduate Coordinator Turnquist also regularly advertises an open door policy for any students needing to discuss any academic or personal issues. Finally, we share campus and community opportunities through an active listserv that Turnquist maintains.
**Degree Completion and Time to Degree**

*Referencing relevant data and campus goals, describe efforts to help students make timely progress to degree. Include the following in your discussion:*

- Use institutional data sources to examine and evaluate progress to degree metrics and comparison to peers.
- What efforts have been made to improve progress to degree performance and completion rates?
- Do students from educationally underrepresented groups (racial/ethnic minority, low-income, first generation in college) succeed in the program at rates comparable to other students? How are equity gaps addressed?

At an average of 4.9 semesters to graduation, we are satisfied with student progress toward degree. This period is in line with the typical expectation for two agricultural production seasons of data collection, followed by one semester to analyze data and write up results before defending a thesis.

We have not made systematic efforts to decrease time to degree nor to increase completion rates. These efforts have been on an individual basis, as each student faces unique challenges on coursework and in completing their thesis or project work. We are not aware of any discrepancy in the success rates of educationally underrepresented groups.

**Career Services and Post-Graduation Outcomes**

*Evaluate student career outcomes, exit survey, and alumni survey data, and reflect upon how these outcomes are consistent with program goals.*

- What do students do after graduation? How does the program prepare them for careers or further academic training?
- What career resources are available to students?
- What is the range of student career outcomes, and are these outcomes consistent with program goals? Does the program track the career progression of its graduates?

Consistent with the goals and expectations of our interdisciplinary program, our graduates go on to a variety of professional careers after graduation. About one-third of our graduates continue on to PhD work in another department or program. Of those who do not continue their studies, the vast majority have gone on to work in fields relevant to agriculture, natural resources and rural development. According to exit survey data, our alumni work in equal portions across government, non-profit, education, and private for profit sectors. They engage in wide-ranging topics from urban agriculture to commodity crops, from farm-to-school to international development, and from county extension and outreach to managing international
research portfolios. We track the career progression of our graduates and publicize the information on our website here.

Regarding career resources for current students, Graduate Coordinator Turnquist is a certified Career Development Facilitator and has engaged students in completing Individual Development Plans and one-on-one discussions. The Program also takes affirmative action to connect students to the resources in the Graduate School of Professional Development. Specific examples (detailed above in our response to recommendations from the five year review) include inviting representatives from the Graduate School in to orientation activities for incoming students, successfully applying for Professional Development Grant funds used to bring Alumni presenters to campus, and consistently sharing Grad School Professional Development opportunities through our listserve and website.

- **Overall Analysis of the Self-Study and the State of the Program**: outline key findings from the self-study, including primary program strengths and challenges, and priorities the program has identified for improvement.

Overall, the Agroecology Program is robust. Our biggest strength is our continual capacity to attract and retain high quality students that go on to successful careers in the field. Program enrollment numbers remain consistent, with between 7 and 10 new students admitted annually. These enrollment numbers are low due to constraints in funding availability among our affiliated faculty, coupled with a program policy to admit applicants only after they secure an advisor and funding source for their first year of study (minimally). While we have the administrative capacity to admit additional students, our recent cohorts have been of sufficient size to attain critical mass in our core courses, community building, and professional development activities.

In 2012, the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences created a strategic plan that identified seven priority themes (economic and community development, healthy ecosystems, food systems, changing climate, bioenergy and bio-products, health and wellness and basic sciences). Students and faculty associated the program touch on aspects of all these themes, and centrally on healthy (agro)ecosystems and food systems. As evidenced by the successful placement of graduates in a wide range of agricultural and food system careers, the program is also contributing to the mission and reputation of the university.

The program does face a number of challenges. It is increasingly difficult to continue to offer small enrollment classes, particularly our three credit core courses: Agroecol 701 and 702. A combination of factors influence this, including budgetary pressures facing campus (credit follows instructor rules), program faculty that all “belong” to departments with their own teaching needs, and even program maturity itself as faculty succession for instruction of our core courses created by program founders has proven difficult. Despite these factors, we expect to offer 701, 702, 710 (x2), and 720 annually. We will try to alleviate issues in both
staffing of core courses and funding for new students by enticing active participation in the program by affiliated faculty.

A second issue is that the program has no physical home. While Turnquist does have a centrally located office, our students do not have a single lounge or other open space where they can gather. Instead, many students gather in the home department of their advisor where they are conducting research or public practice work. Students have been able to overcome this obstacle and remain close to their Agroecology peers by having shared experiences in classes and planning regular social, professional development, and academic gatherings.

Finally, the program continues to struggle to meet the prospective student demand for Public Practice projects and other applied food systems work, particularly in the realm of urban agriculture. We discuss the challenges of funding Public Practice projects in detail above in our response to the five-year review. The issue of applied work in urban food systems is similar in that there is a scarcity of funding on campus for the work, but the problem is also one of a scarcity of faculty on campus engaging in this work. The very concept of “Agroecology” requires an interdisciplinary, contextual analysis of agricultural and food systems. While we can offer that breadth of engagement through coursework, there remains a tension when it comes to funding student research with similar breadth or applied nature.

Additional Considerations for Graduate Students

Funding

Discuss the program’s student funding data and mechanisms, along with any goals for providing funding guarantees. Include a discussion of funding issues, such as:

- How is the program ensuring PhD students have adequate funding and taking steps to provide a multi-year funding guarantee upon admission? Are there opportunities for graduate students to secure individual extramural support? What efforts are made to ensure PhD students have funding?
- To what extent is the program making use of funding for diversity efforts?

We require all prospective students to have an advisor and a “funding plan” before we officially recommend their admission to the Graduate School. The minimum funding expectation is that the prospective student has at least one semester of guaranteed funding (including tuition remission) with a strong chance of subsequent funding. Since the previous review, no full-time student has had low or no funding for any semester. The students listed as having “no/low/other funding” on our program profile have had to extend their time here to complete their thesis work while enrolling in the minimum number of credits for that semester.

Because we are an MS only program, we do not take affirmative steps for PhD funding outside of University Fellowship nominations, which include one year of MS funding and one year of
dissertation funding. To the extent feasible, we coordinate support efforts with departments that are likely continuation paths for students, such as the departments of Horticulture, Agronomy, and Soil Science, and the Nelson Institute.

Diversity efforts
We have invested quite heavily in diversity efforts from the recruitment stage through enrollment and retention. We have successfully recruited and retained an average of one AOF eligible candidate per year since our previous review in 2011, which is slightly over 10% of our students over that time.

As a small program, we rely heavily on word of mouth and personal contact throughout the recruitment process. Our Graduate Coordinator Alan Turnquist attends recruitment events on campus and reaches out to underrepresented prospective students who have topical interest in Agroecological study through lists compiled by SciMed GRS tabling at conferences from the Society for Advancement of Chicanos/Hispanics and Native Americans in Science, National Institutes of Health and the Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students. After initial contact, Turnquist utilizes phone conversations to begin the matchmaking process with potential faculty advisors affiliated with the Agroecology Program. We use our modest $475 annual AOF recruiting fund as well as additional funds to bring AOF candidates to campus. We have a programmatic policy to prioritize spending of our extremely limited program funds on AOF eligible candidates.

While we feel that our student body is quite diverse in terms of geography, and we have been very successful in recruiting top-tier female students, we see room for improvement with recruiting minority and other underrepresented students. In the fall of 2016, Turnquist and Faculty Chair Steve Ventura (Soil Science) submitted a proposal to the USDA for a National Needs Fellowship help recruit 2-3 underrepresented students each year for the next three years. We were not successful, but intent to pursue other outside funding options to improve opportunities for recruitment and retention of students from underrepresented groups.

• Professional Development and Breadth
  Discuss the professional development opportunities of graduates and consider the following:
  • How does the program encourage students to participate in professional development opportunities that will enhance their skills and support their career goals?
  • What resources and guidance are available for exploring academic and/or non-academic careers?
  • How is the program using Individual Development Plans, which are recommended for all graduate students and required for those with NIH funding?
  • What opportunities and funding are available to attend and present at professional meetings?
To what degree does the program offer teaching experience and teaching-related professional development to graduate students?

How does the typical graduate’s program ensure exposure to breadth training? Does the program require a doctoral minor for doctoral students or evaluate other breadth requirements?

The Agroecology program has taken a number of steps to improve our Professional Development Programming:

- Creating a LinkedIn group for current students and alumni. Currently there are over 40 members sharing job postings and networking. It has been quite useful, as Graduate Coordinator Alan Turnquist has connected multiple students to alumni through this network based on conversations with students about professional interests.
- Inviting in alumni for workshops and personal interaction (detailed above in the response to the previous program review
- Graduate Coordinator Alan Turnquist sought and received Career Development Facilitator training through a Graduate School scholarship. As a result, he created a program-specific Individual Development plan and offers individual consultation
- Creating a mentorship program to connect incoming students with continuing students to provide support in the transition to graduate school and to answer questions regarding coursework, advising, etc.
- Offering Professional Development Grants of up to $300 to offset travel costs or other expenses related to the pursuit of professional development activities. While the majority of these grants go to individual students, groups of students have also submitted ideas for speakers or workshops that can benefit the entire program The program has greatly increased interaction with alumni in recent years.
- The program secured an $800 Professional Development Grant from the Graduate school to bring in two alumni in the 2016-17 academic year. Those alumni led group workshops and met with individual students. Their visits also provided the occasion for local alumni to join for social gatherings with current students, which resulted in networking opportunities for our students. We will continue to invite alumni to return to present and meet with students, but a lack of funding for the effort will restrict who we bring in.

To address the question of breadth training, our curriculum is remarkably interdisciplinary. Our core curriculum engages students in systems issues that cross many disciplinary lines to consider agriculture from different paradigms. All Agroecology students must also satisfy independent study and breadth coursework requirements that includes courses in:

- Ecology
- Agricultural Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Data Analysis
- Community Process
April 19, 2018

Professor Gary Green, Community & Environmental Sociology (Chair)
Professor Doug Rouse, Soil Science
Professor Steph Tai, Law School (GFEC Representative)
Professor Milo Wiltbank, Dairy Science

Sent electronically

Dear Professors Green, Rouse, Tai, and Wiltbank,

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the committee reviewing the Agroecology, M.S. The committee is chaired by Gary Green.

We expect your work to take place over the next few months and would appreciate receiving your report by November 1, 2018. We will forward your final report to the program chair to review for errors of fact and then to the CALS and University Academic Planning Councils as well as the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee.

The self-study document prepared by the program will serve as your main reference for organizing the review. The committee should work with the program chair, Steve Ventura, to coordinate meetings with the program’s faculty, staff, and students and to tour the facilities, if appropriate.

The chair of the committee will be responsible for scheduling and convening committee meetings, setting the meeting agendas, making specific assignments to committee members, getting feedback from the committee, overseeing the writing process, and submitting the final report to academicaffairs@cals.wisc.edu with attention to Nikki Bollig and Dick Straub.

The review committee final report should provide a summary of the programs’ strengths and challenges as well as recommendations for improvement or focused attention.

The most important question for the committee to consider is the most general: how well is the program fulfilling its mission of teaching and learning? Are there areas that are exemplary? Are there areas that need improvement? If the latter, do you have particular recommendations for steps the program should take to strengthen its performance? Paying attention to the following particular issues may help you address the more general questions:

1. How well is the academic program functioning? Are there a sufficient number of students in the program and are the students of high caliber? Is student advising functioning well?
2. Should the program be taking any steps to improve the quality of its educational mission? Are student learning goals clear? How is learning evaluated and used for program improvement? How well does the learning assessment plan measure student achievement of learning goals? Is the curriculum clear and appropriately designed to achieve the learning goals?
While the focus for the review is the academic program, it may be useful to briefly address the following questions that provide context surrounding the functioning of the academic program:

3. What is the standing of the program within its disciplinary base and within the University of Wisconsin-Madison? Is it in need of strengthening? If so, what can be done to improve its standing?
4. How effectively does the program satisfy its outreach and research missions, if appropriate? Are resources deployed in a way that satisfies its stakeholders?
5. Is the climate in the program one that encourages productivity and feelings of inclusiveness by staff, students, and faculty?
6. Are there issues concerning the program’s functions or interactions within CALS that should be considered as part of the College’s ongoing strategic planning process?

Please do not hesitate to contact me or Nikki Bollig, Assistant Dean for Academic Programs and Planning, if you have any questions as you proceed. We will represent the dean’s office to assist you in the review process.

Thank you again for taking time on this important task. You are performing a valuable service to the department and CALS, and we all appreciate your efforts. I look forward to seeing your final report.

Sincerely,

Richard Straub
Senior Associate Dean

cc: Sandy Bennett
    Nikki Bollig
    Sarah Kuba
    Jocelyn Milner
    Alan Turnquist
    Steve Ventura
    Parmesh Ramanathan
    Kate VandenBosch
Program Review
Agroecology M.S. Program

Review Committee: Gary Green (Chair), Doug Rouse, Steph Tai (GFEC), Milo Wiltbank

Summary of the Activities of the Review Committee:

The Review Committee was charged by Senior Associate Dean Richard Straub on April 19, 2018. The Agroecology M.S. program submitted a self-study document that summarized responses to the previous five-year review, key elements of the program, and current obstacles and issues. The Review Committee also had access to the program’s annual report and additional information available on the program’s website. The Review Committee met with the Chair and Graduate Coordinator (Steve Ventura and Alan Turnquist), as well as graduate students and faculty affiliates of the program. These meetings occurred on June 21 (with Steve Ventura and Alan Turnquist), June 26 (with graduate students), and June 28 (with faculty affiliates).

Summary of the Key Features of the Program:

The goal of the Agroecology M.S. Program is to train students to “conduct research and analyze agricultural systems in their broader environmental and socioeconomic context.” The program is relatively small, with cohorts of approximately 8-10 students each year. The number of applicants has declined in recent years, while the admit rate has declined and the enrollment rate has increased. So, the admissions process has become more selective and those admitted are more likely to enroll.

Students are offered two tracks—the Research Track and the Public Practice Track, with approximately 80% of the students choosing the Research Track. After completing their M.S., many of the students are admitted to Ph.D. programs (mostly on campus), while the rest take jobs in fields related to agriculture, natural resources and rural development. Average completion time to degree for students is approximately 5 semesters. The completion rate appears to be comparable to other M.S. programs, with approximately 80-90% of the entering students completing their degree.
The curriculum for the Agroecology M.S. program focuses on agriculture/food and the broader social, economic, and environmental context. This holistic approach to agriculture adds value to the disciplinary training received in most graduate programs. The program requires students to take two core courses (Agroecol 701 and 702) covering the key concepts for the field, a field study course (Agroecol 720) providing field-based experience in Wisconsin farming systems, and three credits from seminars in Agroecology (Agroecol 710). Students must complete additional courses in “cross-training” electives, with the options differing between the two tracks.

Most students are funded by affiliate faculty or by TA positions in other programs, such as Biology. The program requires that applicants have some funding in place and identify an advisor before they are admitted. The graduate students reported that the Graduate Coordinator was extremely helpful in linking students to funding opportunities.

The Agroecology M.S. program has established appropriate learning goals for their program and has an assessment process in place that adequately evaluates these goals. Based on the assessments, program administrators have made several changes. Course evaluations have led to changes in the structure of courses, as well as the introduction to more emphasis on professional development.

The Agroecology program has more than 50 faculty affiliates and an elected Governance Committee (comprised of five faculty and two student members) that is responsible for most aspects of the program. The Governance Committee meets monthly and the affiliates appear dedicated to the program. Students are highly engaged in the program and participate in the Governance Committee.

Identification of Strengths and Challenges:

The self-study prepared for this review indicates that the strength of the program is in the ability to "attract and retain high quality students that go on to successful careers in the field." The program appears to be a very good fit for the CALS priority themes and is a nice complement to the newly established CALS undergraduate certificate in food systems. The program provides an environment that is highly supportive of interdisciplinary research and practice. As attested to by core faculty, affiliates, and graduate students, there appears to be a growing interest in the field of agroecology and the program has addressed a growing demand for research and instruction in this field.

The Agroecology M.S. Program is one of the few in the U.S. (The primary competing programs are: UC-Davis, Iowa State University, Vermont, and Cornell). The UW-
Madison program began in 2007. The program has found a solid niche in CALS and brings together faculty from several disciplines in the College. The interdisciplinary approach has been beneficial not only for teaching, but for research as well (such as a recent UW2020 grant in agricultural ecology). The program is doing an excellent job of professional development. The Graduate Coordinator has created program-specific Individual Development Plan templates for students that helps them identify the skills and training they will need for their professional goals. Over the past few years, the Graduate Coordinator has developed several initiatives that has developed stronger alumni ties to the program.

The Agroecology M.S. program is facing several challenges that may threaten the high quality of instruction. Given the small number of students (approximately 8-10 new students per year), it is a challenge to offer core courses because of pressures affiliate faculty face in their “home” departments. Although the campus budget model allows credits to follow the instructor, these small classes provide few benefits for department budgets. In some cases, the program has allowed other courses to substitute for a core course. For example, the program has allowed other courses to satisfy the requirement for 701. This probably is not a preferable long-term strategy as the substitute courses may not be focused on the needs of the students.

A second major challenge is the lack of physical space for students. Most students become integrated into the departments where they are funded rather than with the Agroecology program. Graduate students often benefit from the informal exchanges that take place outside the classroom and the agroecology students may be missing some of these opportunities. There have been a few unsuccessful attempts to identify space for the program, such as the effort to renovate the old Horse Barn.

Third, the program faces challenges in funding the Public Practice students, given their particular career focuses on urban agriculture. There is less funding for these issues, but many of the career opportunities are in this field. This situation may make it more difficult for students in the Public Practice track to obtain needed experience in the field in which they wish to be employed.

Fourth, many of the students in the program are able to find funding as TAs. The timing works for those students in the research track because many of research projects are conducted in the Summer. It works less well for students in the public practice track who are likely to be slowed down by the TAship during the year. Additional effort to find funding for these students would help resolve this conflict.
Finally, last year, the Graduate School decided to no longer grant any University Fellowships to the Agroecology program because it admits only M.S. students, even though in the past, such funding was available to the Agroecology program. This will produce some additional challenges to attracting the most qualified applicants who are likely to receive fellowship offers from other programs. In order to remain competitive, the Agroecology program needs to be able to offer fellowships to the top applicants who are most likely considering several options. Graduate school support for this program seems consistent with the research mission and trajectories of the graduate students in the Agroecology program.

**Summary of Opportunities for Improvement**

The self-study points to a continuing struggle to find support for students in the Public Practice track. Most funding sources on campus are related to research activity and it is relatively rare to find funding sources for the types of experiences students in this track require. In a few cases, faculty affiliates have been able to obtain Hatch funds to support students in the Public Practice track. To address this issue, the program may need to work with nonprofit organizations, state government agencies, alumni, and other sources to identify potential funding for students in the Public Practice Track.

Although students are able to find ways to interact outside the classroom (such as the barn fundraiser event), the program would benefit from having a devoted space where students and faculty could interact on an ongoing basis. Although the program has found some innovative methods for creating community (such as the Field Study course and fundraisers), the lack of common space makes it more difficult for students to interact on a regular basis. Finding some devoted space for the program would enhance the graduate student experience. Such common space may be especially important for students within the Public Practice track, who—depending upon their faculty advisors—may not have a “home office” that can provide them with non-classroom interactional synergies. Additional efforts at creating social time also may help create a greater sense of community.

The loss of University Fellowships for the program may limit the ability to attract high quality graduate students to Madison. Many of the graduates go on to pursue a Ph.D. in UW-Madison graduate programs and some are working on another graduate degree at the same time. Committing University Fellowships to the program would largely benefit students who will eventually enter a Ph.D. program on campus. A few of the program affiliates mentioned that the quality of the agroecology students is higher than applicants in their own departments. We recommend that the Graduate School will reconsider this decision about University Fellowships for the program.
The University’s budget model will continue to create obstacles for interdisciplinary programs like this one. Due to the small number of students in the program, it will be difficult for faculty affiliates to justify teaching these classes due to the demands in their “home” department for generating more credit hours. This issue of teaching is critical for the core courses (701 and 702) in the Agroecology program as it is has been difficult to find instructors to cover these courses. Using alternative courses for these core requirements undermines many of the objectives of offering an interdisciplinary graduate program. It would help to develop at least a three-year teaching plan so the program can identify appropriate faculty to teach these courses. It also might be possible to cross-list these courses with home departments to ensure an adequate enrollment. Additionally, some mechanism to compensate departments for faculty to teach these interdisciplinary courses should be considered.

The program has made several efforts to increase diversity. Currently, about 14% of the students are domestic targeted minority students. The Agroecology M.S. program has made several efforts to diversify the program, such as using lists of underrepresented minority students compiled by professional organizations. The program chair also recently submitted a grant proposal to the USDA for a National Needs Fellowship grant that would fund 2-3 underrepresented students each year for three years. The program has been much more successful in recruiting women, who now comprise about two-thirds of the students.

Summary of Overall Program Review Findings

Overall, the Agroecology M.S. program has been extremely successful over the past decade. It has been able to recruit and retain outstanding graduate students. The program has attracted faculty from a wide variety of disciplines. The program has several faculty affiliates who are extremely committed to the program and are willing to invest in the program. The interdisciplinary program has been successful despite a minimal amount of financial support and dependence on students finding funding opportunities in other departments. Institutional support is needed to insure the long-term viability and quality of the program, and to possible expand the program to meet the growing demand in the field of agroecology.
Dear Karen,

Following the Development Studies Program’s (DSP’s) procedures for governance, between September 24 and September 28 I convened four one-hour meetings with DSP faculty and staff to discuss whether or not the program should enter into suspension. At these meetings, we discussed issues related to student funding, faculty involvement in the program, and governance. We then called the matter to a vote.

The DSP faculty voted to suspend the program. The final vote was 16 in favor of suspension, 1 against, and 3 abstentions.

The faculty also agreed to create an Executive Committee, which will be formed in October 2018 and will consist of all interested faculty. Once formed, the Executive Committee will be tasked with determining whether the DSP should be restructured or discontinued. The Executive Committee will submit its report and decision to your office no later than May 31, 2019. If the Executive Committee determines that the DSP should be restructured, then the report will include responses to all of the questions raised in the CALS/L&S/Graduate School memo (2017), as well as a clear delineation of the proposed new governance structure of the DSP.

Please let me know if I can provide any additional information at this point.

Thank you,

Nancy Kendall
Director, Development Studies Program
Professor and Chair, Department of Educational Policy Studies
College of Agricultural and Life Sciences Collaborative

Draft August 6, 2018

Management of Collaboratives

A collaborative unit in the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences at the University of Wisconsin–Madison is comprised of at least two departments working together while maintaining some departmental autonomy. By forming a collaborative, departments will share some resources, jointly perform some functions, and have greater critical mass to advance common priorities. A successful collaborative will increase impact and efficiencies and, while not necessarily permanent, would be stable over time. Collaborating on a single activity does not necessitate forming a collaborative.

Departments in a collaborative would maintain their own governance and executive committees (FP&P 5.02), but would have a “steering committee” for the collaborative. At a minimum, that steering committee must consist of the chairs of the departments, but can include other faculty and staff as long as there is equal representation for each department. The steering committee would meet on a regular basis (i.e. monthly), and all faculty and staff in the collaborative would have joint department meetings once per semester. As part of the annual department reviews, the dean would also meet with the collaborative steering committee.

Decisions on faculty hiring and retentions could be made by the individual departments in a collaborative, but the Dean’s Office encourages departments in the collaborative to work together to make decisions that bolster common priorities. The collaborative steering committee should also consider common priorities when making resource requests. Together, the departments in the collaborative should develop a joint-mentoring plan for joint faculty. If a faculty member is hired jointly, they should be reviewed jointly. For policy on faculty appointments, see FP&P 1 and FP&P 7.

If the collaborative will partner on course or academic program offerings, the collaborative must establish guidelines to identify appropriate committees for review of course and/or academic program proposals, and procedures for approval of changes. For instance, if the chairs of each department currently delegate authority to departmental curriculum committees for such decisions, a joint meeting of the committees at least once per semester is recommended. Alternatively, if a faculty vote is required for some decisions, votes could be done independently in each department, could be done in joint faculty meetings (again recommended to occur once per semester), or by some other mechanism defined within a collaborative agreement. All academic programs must comply with APIR and UAPC (see the course proposal process and the academic planning process).

A memorandum of understanding (MOU) is required for all departments in the collaborative (see MOU template). Departments in a collaborative are encouraged to share resources (e.g.,
facilities, administrative functions), especially those that support the joint activity. Shared activities such as advising should be outlined in the MOU.

Additionally, as part of the five-year planning process, departments in a collaborative should convene to establish strategies and actions for shared goals and priorities.

**Examples of effective collaborative activities could include the following:**

- Shared academic program or curriculum
- Joint revenue-generating instructional programs
- Community of shared research interests and shared infrastructure
- Partnering on hiring and mentoring of faculty
- Shared administrative structure
- Shared intellectual community (e.g. seminar series)
FY19 Guidance for CALS Departmental Five-Year Planning

I. Overview

Departmental five-year plans are an approach to thinking strategically about the future. The plans are intended to help maintain robust departments, while also helping the college define and attain its goals. Each department in the college must develop a five-year plan in the fall of FY19, and will update its plan annually thereafter. In this way, departments are looking out at a rolling five-year window that allows them to assess progress and refine goals as the years progress.

Departments should consult five-year plans on a regular basis to guide activities and make decisions. Completion of actions and performance measures should be monitored throughout the year to ensure departmental progress is being made to meet goals.

The Dean’s Office will review plans every January, in advance of the annual department meetings that take place early in the spring semester. The Dean’s Office will use the plans to provide feedback on department priorities, guide resource allocation decisions, shape annual departmental meeting discussions, inform college-level planning, aid in reporting to campus, and advise on overall departmental success.

Departments that are partnering on joint objectives should work together on a five-year plan for their shared activities. For example, departments forming a collaborative must work together to identify strategies and actions that comprise larger collaborative efforts – these will be consistent within each department’s plan. Similarly, departments with a plan to merge should coordinate to develop a joint Five-Year Plan. Note that the five-year plans will differ from proposals for merging or forming a collaborative. A five-year plan is a long-term planning tool, rather than documentation of organizational restructuring.

Below is a timeline for developing the first department five-year plans.

- **September 1, 2018**: Final five-year plan templates and guidance are sent to departments.
- **December 31, 2018**: Five-year plans are due to the Dean’s Office (please submit them to kara.luedtke@wisc.edu).
- **January - March 2019**: Five-year plans are reviewed by the Dean’s Office and discussed at annual department meetings.

As departments work on their five-year plans, they may find the appended documents to provide useful context. Appendix 1 contains the college’s mission and vision statements and guiding principles from the 2014 strategic framework. Appendix 2 is a list of both required and suggested performance measures and other indicators, which will be used to evaluate progress towards
college and departmental goals. Data for the required measures will be provided to departments in September.

II. Components of a Five-Year Plan

This section of the guidance document provides an overview of each component of the plan. Additional resources for developing these components will be provided with the plan template. There is no specific page limit on the components of the plan. The document should suit the needs of the department, however, as this is meant to be a high-level summary, a concise document is best.

A. Overview Section

This section of the five-year plan provides a brief background and history of existing departments, no more than a few paragraphs, as well as the current view of new structures, if applicable. It is likely that the department already has “about us” language that could contribute to the department overview. Departments forming a collaborative or exploring a merger should also include a one-page overview of that joint effort. This section may include the following types of information, as examples:

- Founding date, enrollment, and faculty trends of existing departments
- Proposed size and composition of the merged department or collaborative, if applicable
- Undergraduate programs now offered and any planned changes
- Research focus areas
- Significant affiliations
- Signature Extension efforts
- Other points of pride

_Mission Statement_. A department’s mission statement briefly describes its core purpose, in essence the department’s reason for existence. A mission statement is meant to remain consistent over time and highlights whom the department serves, what it provides these individuals, and the outcomes it is trying to achieve through its work. Departments should indicate when their mission statement was written or most recently revised. The same approach applies to documenting a collaborative’s mission statement.

_Vision Statement_. A department’s vision briefly describes its big-picture desired state, something that a department strives towards over time, an idealistic yet attainable picture of what the department hopes to be five years from now. Departments should indicate when their vision statement was written or revised. The same approach applies to documenting a collaborative vision statement.
B. Goals Section

The CALS goals outlined in the five-year plan derive from the Desired Outcomes for Achieving Robust Departments document, which was shared with departments earlier this year. Several of the goals also correspond to the top campus priorities for FY19 and the chancellor’s strategies for increasing campus revenue as articulated at the August 2018 Leadership Summit (see Box folder for presentation). Departments should include a brief interpretation of the college’s goals from the perspective of the department, and specific strategies, action plans and performance measures for guiding progress towards goals. The CALS goals are to:

1. Strengthen the Research Portfolio
2. Strengthen Academic Programs
3. Strengthen Extension Programs and Outreach Activities
4. Foster Diversity and an Inclusive Climate
5. Strengthen Advancement Activities
6. Enhance Administrative, Service and Governance Efficacy
7. Enhance Collaboration on Shared Priorities
8. Increase Revenue Generating Activities

Each goal is accompanied in the five-year plan template by a description. CALS has prepopulated the template with some language defining what each goal means, and why it is important to the college. For goals 1-6, departments are asked to add language defining what the goal means from their perspective as well.

Goals 7 and 8 overlap with Goals 1-6. Therefore, the strategies, actions and measures of Goals 7-8 will be embedded within Goals 1-6. When preparing the five-year plan, departments in a collaborative should summarize their joint strategies, actions and measures in the final section of the five-year plan. Other projects that represent collaborations among departments, or between departments and centers, including those outside of CALS, can simply be listed in under Goal 7. Likewise, Goal 8 will capture planned efforts in revenue generation. Most of these will also be contained within Goals 1, 2 and 5. Therefore, departments should restate the strategies, actions and measures for revenue generation in the template under Goal 8. Departments are free to add additional goals to the end of their five-year plan should they wish to do so; however, this is not required.

Strategies. Departments are asked to identify the strategies they will use to achieve each goal. As an example, a strategy for strengthening academic programs may be to increase undergraduate course offerings, which could be done through a variety of actions. As another example, a strategy to enhance a research program might be to procure additional greenhouse capacity. The five-year plan template includes fields for two strategies per goal. Departments
should add or remove fields from the template depending on the number of strategies they have identified.

**Action Plans.** Each strategy will be accompanied by a list of associated actions the department will take to achieve the goal. Each action should include a brief description, targeted start and completion dates, and who within the department will oversee the effort. For instance, in the example of procuring additional greenhouse capacity referenced above, associated actions might be to quantify the amount of additional space needed, find a suitable site, identify funding sources, etc. The five-year plan template includes rows for four actions per strategy. Departments should add or remove rows from the template depending on the number of actions they have identified.

**Performance Measures.** Each goal will also have performance measures for tracking progress, and each performance measure should have a five-year target and most recent data. Annual targets are also encouraged. While a few performance measures have been pre-populated into the template, departments have the opportunity to add additional performance measures and targets unique to the department as well.

### C. Resources Outlook

Following the goals section, departments are asked to speak to their priorities for utilizing resources that might become available over the next five years, including revenue that the departments will be generating. In addition to financial resources, departments may cover human resources, facilities and other investments. For example, this is where departments should document hiring priorities for faculty and staff.

### III. Best Practices for Developing Five-Year Plans

Through our work with the Office of Strategic Consulting, a few best practices have been identified for development of five-year plans. We encourage you to consider adopting these practices.

**Committee Approach to Five-Year Planning.** Departments should form a five-year planning committee comprised of faculty and staff, and charge it with proposing content for the plan. Departments may also elect to form a subcommittee for each goal within the five-year plan. When taking the committee approach to five-year planning, an open and transparent process offers opportunities for input and feedback from all faculty and staff along the way.

**Assigning a Project Manager.** In many ways, the development of a five-year plan is a project. As a result, it is important to have a plan for managing the development of the plan. Assigning a project manager to the planning efforts can help keep things on time and on task. In most cases, this will be a faculty or staff member in the department.
**Leverage Available Resources.** The Office of Strategic Consulting offers additional resources for developing a mission, vision, goals, strategies, action plans, and performance measures. Several resources can be found in the Box folder: go.wisc.edu/CALSPlanning. Presentations from the August 2018 Leadership Summit outlining current campus goals and strategies are also in Box. Departments are encouraged to use these resources to help aid the planning process. In addition, the Office of Strategic Consulting has the capacity to help any interested department to plan and execute a half-day planning retreat this fall and the Dean’s Office would provide the funding needed. If you are interested in a half-day planning retreat, please email kara.luedtke@wisc.edu.

**Collaborate Early and Often.** Departments in a collaborative or planning a merger must work closely with each other as they develop their individual departmental plans to identify joint strategies and actions. The joint strategies and actions should be the same for the departments within a collaborative. Departments in a collaborative may wish to form a committee to identify strategies and actions the collaborative will pursue to achieve the goals. Partners within a collaborative should also consider collaborative mission and vision statements. Even departments not in a collaborative may wish to share best practices for developing their five-year plans and collaborate on some strategies and actions.
Appendix I. Mission, Vision and Guiding Principles from the FY2014 CALS Strategic Framework

The University of Wisconsin Madison College of Agricultural & Life Sciences adheres to the following mission, vision, guiding principles, and goals.

**Mission:** To advance and share knowledge, discover solutions and promote opportunities in food and agriculture, bioenergy, health, the environment and human well-being.

**Vision:** To lead in science, innovation and collaboration that improves life and sustains the natural world.

**Guiding Principles:** Innovative and relevant research is the basis of CALS activities and provides the foundation for excellence in our teaching and outreach. We strive to:

1. Invest in research, teaching and outreach activities in scholarly domains in which the college has acknowledged strengths or demonstrable potential;
2. Create opportunities and respond to 21st century challenges by drawing on our strategic advantages in basic and applied sciences;
3. Reciprocate the trust placed in us by our stakeholders, in Wisconsin and around the world, through a commitment to excellence and relevance in all activities;
4. Honor and engage the ideas, enthusiasm and commitment of our students through excellence in teaching and learning experiences;
5. Foster diversity and equity through a climate of respect and inclusion;
6. Seek new sources of revenue with which to maintain and improve the quality of our programs, faculty, staff and facilities;
7. Encourage and reward innovation and activities that leverage synergies across units within CALS or the UW–Madison campus; and
8. Communicate CALS’ mission and value with internal and external partners to foster mutual understanding and support.

---

1 The entire strategic framework may be found here: [https://cals.wisc.edu/about-cals/strategic-planning-a-progress-report/strategic-framework-documents/](https://cals.wisc.edu/about-cals/strategic-planning-a-progress-report/strategic-framework-documents/)
Appendix II. Performance Measures for Five-Year Plans

Not all indicators of success are quantitative in nature. Rubrics or brief narratives can also be effective tools for documenting progress towards a goal. Some examples are given below, in addition to more standard metrics.

Goal 1. Strengthen the Research Portfolio

College-level measures (provided as a composite):

- Trends in grant expenditures: Total expenses (direct + indirect) on grants (federal + non-federal) administered through CALS
  - Direct expenses on federal grants
  - Indirect expenses on federal grants
  - Direct expenses on non-federal grants
  - Indirect expenses on non-federal grants
- Trends in proposal submission and success
  - Total number of proposals submitted
  - Total number of new awards
  - Total funding requested
  - Total funding awarded
- Grant success stories, e.g.
  - New large projects (e.g. those that are multi-disciplinary, multi-investigator, $1M plus)
  - Successful outcomes from local seed funding (Hatch, WARF funding, etc.)

Required department measures (provided by the college):

- Total expenses (direct + indirect) on grants (federal + non-federal) administered through CALS
- Total grant expenses/total budgeted funds

Examples of optional measures that departments may want to collect and report:

- Total gift funds expended per year to support research
- Total expenses (direct + indirect) on grants (federal + non-federal) for CALS faculty and staff projects run outside of CALS
- Academic Analytics data on research productivity and departmental standing
- Department or program rankings (US News, professional societies, etc.)
- Narrative stories of research impact, e.g. evidence of national and international leadership, awards, high impact publications.
Goal 2. Strengthen Academic Programs

*College-level measures (provided as a composite):*

- Total fall enrollment
- Total academic year CFI
- Total summer tuition
- Total graduate degrees awarded
- Total undergraduate degrees awarded
- Average undergraduate time to degree
- ‘Vital Signs’ data for undergraduate program
- Student financial aid administered by the college
  - Total CALS scholarship $ awarded
  - # of students with an award
  - Total support for student experiences that are not tallied as scholarships

*Required department and program measures (provided by the college):*

- Data by undergraduate program
  - Total of fall enrollment
  - Degrees awarded
  - Average time to degree
- Data by department
  - Total fall + spring CFI
  - Total fall + spring CFI/adjusted 101
  - Total paid tuition revenues in summer
  - Total paid tuition revenues in summer/adjusted 101

*Examples of optional measures that departments may want to collect and report:*

- Narrative about outcomes of program enhancements, such as curriculum updates, innovations in course delivery, support of student learning outcomes, recruiting efforts
- Financial aid and support for student experiences from departmental resources

Goal 3. Strengthen Extension Programs and Outreach Activities

*College-level measures (provided as a composite):*

- Summary statistics of CALS extension budget and faculty/staff by college and department
Required department measures (provided by the college):

- List of Extension and outreach funded programming faculty and staff and with % Extension/outreach appointment (see spreadsheet in Box), and percentage of Cooperative Extension reporting in compliance
- Departmental allocation for support (administrative, travel, S&E) total and per Extension funded programming FTE

Examples of optional measures that departments may want to collect and report:

- Narrative describing excellence in Extension
  - Description of applied research and extension programs based on documented needs of the state and its residents.
  - Evidence of significant impacts on Wisconsin agricultural, environmental, social and/or economic activity.
  - Commitment to Extension mission, leadership and service to a team/department/program area
- Description of mutual benefit of Extension efforts on research and/or academic programs
- Summary of leveraging of extension-funded positions – gifts, grants, revenue

Goal 4. Foster Diversity and an Inclusive Climate

College-level measures (provided as a composite):

- Participation in required training
- Participation in activities led by the CALS Equity and Diversity Committee
- CALS may choose additional measures from the list of options suggested for departments, below

Required department measures (provided by the college):

- Participation in required training (2018 = Preventing Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence at UW-Madison)
- Participation in departmental diversity liaison group

Examples of optional measures that departments may want to collect and report:

- Participation in activities lead by the CALS Equity and Diversity Committee
- Participation in the WISELI Implicit Bias Training
- Changes implemented as a result of climate surveys
- Successes in recruiting, mentoring, promoting and retaining faculty and staff from underrepresented groups
• Increase in the numbers of targeted minority, underrepresented minority, first generation, and female students who declare and graduate
• Numbers of faculty who participate in professional development programming regarding evidence-based, student centered, inclusive teaching practices
• Assessment (and correction, if needed), of salary equity across race, ethnicity and gender
• Inclusion of members with diverse backgrounds in advisory groups

Goal 5. Strengthen Advancement Activities

*College-level measures (provided as a composite):*

• Total value of new gifts and pledges
• Total number of gifts
• Total discretionary giving
• Number of living alumni
• Alumni participation rates
• Progress towards campaign goals

*Required department measures (provided by the college):*

• Fund 233 expenditures
• Total discretionary giving

*Examples of optional measures that departments may want to collect and report:*

• Results from specific fund-raising campaigns (e.g. for a specific initiative)

Goal 6. Enhance Administrative, Service and Governance Efficacy

Planning under this goal is optional this year. Recommendations for performance measures, to be implemented in the future, are welcome.
Section A. Overview

Department of ________________
Overview of Department

Department Mission:

Department Vision:
Overview of Collaborative

Collaborative Mission:

Collaborative Vision:
Section B. Goals

Goal 1: Strengthen the Research Portfolio

CALS has a strong legacy of quality research with a broad impact. In order to continue to foster this vibrant research program, we must have adequate external funding, space, infrastructure and appropriate administrative support. Each department should define at least one strategy to strengthen research capacity or impact. Examples might include specific plans for facilities updates, faculty hiring priorities in areas impacting research, allocation of seed funding, or administrative support. Please also consider defining strategies to grow research funds (a revenue generating activity included in Goal 8) when developing strategies and action plans for this goal.

In this space, discuss what this goal means to the department. The description should include priority research topics and funding streams.

Strategies and Action Plan

The [Department] has developed the following strategies and actions to strengthen their research portfolio (if it is a collaborative strategy, include that in the title):

Strategy 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Collaborative Action?</th>
<th>Revenue Generating Action?</th>
<th>Target Start Date</th>
<th>Target End Date</th>
<th>Action Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Collaborative Action?</th>
<th>Revenue Generating Action?</th>
<th>Target Start Date</th>
<th>Target End Date</th>
<th>Action Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All collaborative actions should also be tallied under Goal 7.
2 All revenue generating actions should also be tallied under Goal 8.

Date
### Performance Measures

The following measures will demonstrate the [Department’s] strengthened research portfolio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Most Recent Data</th>
<th>5-Year Target (FY23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses (direct + indirect) on grants (federal + non-federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administered through CALS (J) (FY18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total grant expenditures/total budgeted funds (K) (FY18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 2: Strengthen Academic Programs

Providing academic programs that serve the needs and interests of undergraduate and graduate students will increase our enrollment and have a broader impact on student success. Robust, quality and relevant academic programs have adequate enrollment, sufficient resources, and an active and effective quality management and improvement process that assure positive student outcomes. When defining strategies and actions, please consider revenue generating activities – expanding summer semester offerings, growing master's degrees and certificate programs for professionals, and expanding enrollment (from Goal 8) – when developing strategies and action plans for this goal. Each department should have at least one strategy to strengthen academic programs. Departments should project the five-year trends in undergraduate enrollment, total academic year and summer CFI, whether or not growth is anticipated.

In this space, discuss what this goal means for the department and its affiliated academic programs. Briefly describe major changes to degree programs that are anticipated in the five-year period as well.

Strategies and Action Plan

The [Department] has developed the following strategies and actions to strengthen its academic programs (if it is a collaborative strategy, include that in the title):

Strategy 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Collaborative Action?</th>
<th>Revenue Generating Action?</th>
<th>Target Start Date</th>
<th>Target End Date</th>
<th>Action Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Collaborative Action?</th>
<th>Revenue Generating Action?</th>
<th>Target Start Date</th>
<th>Target End Date</th>
<th>Action Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date
### Performance Measures

The following measures will demonstrate the [Department’s] strengthened academic programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Most Recent Data</th>
<th>5-Year Target (FY23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data by undergraduate program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fall enrollment by program (N) (FY18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degrees per year by program (L) (FY18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average time to degree (R) (FY17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data by department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fall + spring CFI (P) (FY18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fall + spring CFI/adjusted 101 (Q) (FY18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total paid tuition revenues in summer (Y) (FY18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total paid tuition revenues in summer/adjusted 101 (Z) (FY18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Goal 3: Strengthen Extension Programs and Outreach Activities**

The Wisconsin Idea is at the heart of our Extension and outreach programs and our impact on the state and beyond should be central to our activities. A robust extension and outreach program starts with active two-way communication with stakeholders and clientele to determine educational needs and suitable delivery mechanisms. Successful programs respond to the educational needs of clientele with a well-planned curriculum, delivered appropriately. **Planning for this goal is required for departments with faculty or academic staff funded from cooperative extension funding (104, 143) or outreach (101-5) funding; but is optional for other departments this year.**

*In this space, discuss what this goal means for the department. Summarize Extension/Outreach priorities and clientele, including outreach activities performed by faculty and staff not funded by Cooperative Extension.*

**Strategies and Action Plan**

The [Department] has developed the following strategies and actions to strengthen extension programs and outreach activities (if it is a collaborative strategy, include that in the title):

**Strategy 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Collaborative Action?</th>
<th>Revenue Generating Action?</th>
<th>Target Start Date</th>
<th>Target End Date</th>
<th>Action Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategy 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Collaborative Action?</th>
<th>Revenue Generating Action?</th>
<th>Target Start Date</th>
<th>Target End Date</th>
<th>Action Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Performance Measures

The following measures will demonstrate the [Department’s] strengthened extension programs and outreach activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Most Recent Data</th>
<th>5-Year Target (FY23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of Extension and outreach funded programming faculty and staff and with % Extension/outreach appointment (see spreadsheet in Box), and percentage of Cooperative Extension reporting in compliance (T) (FY18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental allocation for support (administrative, travel, S&amp;E) total per Extension funded programming FTE (U) (FY18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 4: Foster Diversity and an Inclusive Climate

CALS departments demonstrate a commitment to building a culture that embraces diversity, inclusion, and equity. These values are foundational elements of our excellence and fundamental components of a positive and enriching learning and working environment for all students, faculty, and staff. Each department must define at least one strategy beyond required training to address this goal.

In this space, discuss what this goal means for the department.

Strategies and Action Plan

The [Department] has developed the following strategies and actions to foster diversity and an inclusive climate (if it is a collaborative strategy, include that in the title):

Strategy 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Collaborative Action?</th>
<th>Revenue Generating Action?</th>
<th>Target Start Date</th>
<th>Target End Date</th>
<th>Action Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Collaborative Action?</th>
<th>Revenue Generating Action?</th>
<th>Target Start Date</th>
<th>Target End Date</th>
<th>Action Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Performance Measures**

The following measures will demonstrate the [Department’s] commitment to fostering diversity and an inclusive climate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Completed (y/n)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% participation in required training (2018 = Preventing Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence at UW-Madison) (W) (FY18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in departmental diversity liaison group (S) (FY18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 5: Strengthen Advancement Activities

A successful department has engaged stakeholders who can be called on to volunteer, help with research initiatives and make gifts. Given the changing financial landscape for higher education, it is important for departments to increase philanthropic support and stewardship of donors. **All departments should define at least one strategy to strengthen advancement activities.**

*In this space, discuss what this goal means for the department. Include an overview of specific departmental fund-raising goals or campaigns, if any, and anticipated results. Briefly also summarize stewardship efforts, such as thank-you letters, donor engagement, newsletters, scholarship reception, or other donor engagement activities.*

Strategies and Action Plan

The [Department] has developed the following strategies and actions to strengthen advancement activities (if it is a collaborative strategy, include that in the title):

**Strategy 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Collaborative Action?</th>
<th>Revenue Generating Action?</th>
<th>Target Start Date</th>
<th>Target End Date</th>
<th>Action Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategy 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Collaborative Action?</th>
<th>Revenue Generating Action?</th>
<th>Target Start Date</th>
<th>Target End Date</th>
<th>Action Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Measures

The following measures will demonstrate the [Department’s] strengthened advancement activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Most Recent Data</th>
<th>5-Year Target (FY23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund 233 expenditures (V) (FY18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total discretionary giving (X) (FY17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 6: Enhance Administrative, Service and Governance Efficacy

In order for CALS to provide quality programs to students and to have a broad impact globally, we must maximize the time of faculty and staff. It is important to have administrative services and governance policies that allow for a department to cover its responsibilities, critical mass to serve on governance and other important service committees, and efficiencies in administrative support. Strategies and actions to address this goal are not required this year. However, if departments wish, they can begin working on this. CALS will work with selected departments on pilot projects, which will provide insights for planning in future years.

In this space, discuss what this goal means for the department (if being pursued this year).

Strategies and Action Plan

The [Department] has developed the following strategies and actions to create efficiencies (if it is a collaborative strategy, include that in the title):

**Strategy 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Collaborative Action?</th>
<th>Revenue Generating Action?</th>
<th>Target Start Date</th>
<th>Target End Date</th>
<th>Action Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategy 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Collaborative Action?</th>
<th>Revenue Generating Action?</th>
<th>Target Start Date</th>
<th>Target End Date</th>
<th>Action Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Performance Measures**

The following measures will demonstrate the [Department’s] enhanced efficiencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Most Recent Data</th>
<th>5-Year Target (FY23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 7: Enhance Collaboration on Shared Priorities

Because departments should be enhancing collaboration on shared priorities as part of all other goals, goal 7 will be embedded into the strategies, actions, and measures of goals 1-6. Please use this section to summarize collaborative activities (both in the college and across campus), including collaborative partners, and cross-reference to the above goals.

Goal 8: Increase Revenue Generating Activities

The Chancellor has articulated these six potential activities to generate additional revenue (related to these specific CALS goals):

- Growing research funds (Goal 1: Strengthen the Research Portfolio)
- Expanding summer semester (Goal 2: Strengthen Academic Programs)
- Growing master’s degrees and certificate programs for professionals (fund 131 programs) (Goal 2: Strengthen Academic Programs)
- Bringing tuition for out-of-state and professional students up to market levels (fund 131 programs) (Goal 2: Strengthen Academic Programs)
- Exploring the student mix and numbers (e.g. increasing enrollment and out-of-state recruitment) (Goal 2: Strengthen Academic Programs)
- Building alumni (and other philanthropic donor) support (Goal 5: Strengthen Advancement Activities)

Please incorporate the strategies, actions and measures for these activities in each goal section as is appropriate for your department, and summarize the relevant strategies and actions for revenue generation here. Include the anticipated revenue to be generated. If you are planning additional revenue-generating activities that are not on the chancellor’s list, please include them here as well. These new revenues should, in part, be used to increase faculty and staff numbers. Departments are not expected to pursue all of the activities listed above.

Section C. Resources Outlook: Action Plan to Meet Your Goals

What are your priorities for utilizing resources generated by the department over the next five years? What academic, scientific, or other investments are you hoping to make during this period to support your goals? Are you anticipating any departures during this period that would result in resources for reinvestment in the department? What are your priorities for investment of resources in faculty and staff? How will these investments support your goals? Note: This section should reflect a summary of departmental priorities. It is not a submission of specific requests. Twice per year the college will issue a call for specific requests. Future requests will be compared to the priorities listed in this section.