

## CALS ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL

October 16, 2018

1:00 PM-2:30 PM

2321 DeLuca Biochemical Sciences Building, 440 Henry Mall

**Present:** Erika Anna, Jeri Barak, Jane Collins, Claudio Gratton, Barb Ingham, Chuck Kaspar, Hasan Khatib, Larry Meiller, Nicole Perna, Doug Soldat, William Tracy

**Absent:** Guy Groblewski, Paul Mitchell, Alan Turnquist

**Ex Officio:** Doug Reinemann, Dick Straub, Karen Wassarman

**Guests:** Gary Green, Nikki Bollig

**Minutes:** Megan Grill

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 pm.

There were no changes to the agenda.

Minutes were reviewed from the October 2<sup>nd</sup> APC Meeting.

**Bill moved to approve the minutes, Chuck seconded; unanimously approved**

### Action and Discussion Items

#### 1. Program Review Process Reminder

- Karen outlined the process for program review and distributed a handout that emphasized the role of APC in program review. The document has been shared in the APC box folder.
- Program reviews are brought before APC twice. The program review committee chair attends the first meeting, and the department or program chair attends the second.
- At the first meeting, APC will develop a list of questions to ask the department or program chair at the second meeting.
- APC will decide whether or not the review has been completed. APC often may also convey other messages or make recommendations to the program.
- After APC determines that the review is complete, programs with a graduate component will go to GFEC and then UAPC, programs without a graduate component go straight to UAPC. Joint programs also may require additional steps, such as discussion at other college APC.

#### 2. Agroecology Program Review (first review)

Guest: Gary Green, chair of Agroecology review committee

- The Agroecology review committee consisted of four members; Gary Green, Doug Rouse, Steph Tai, and Milo Wiltbank.
- Much of the work of the review committee was completed over the 2018 summer, using the self- study, available data, and interviews conducted with the program chair, faculty, faculty associates and students.
- The Agroecology program began in 2007 and is made up of small cohorts of about 8-10 students. Students can pursue the Research or Public Practice Track, with approximately 80% of students pursuing the research track.

- Strengths for this niche program include: a good completion rate, with the majority of students completing in 5 semesters; good faculty involvement; and a governance committee that meets regularly. The program attracts strong students, and about 20% go on to further education, while the majority go directly into the workforce.
- Challenges for the program include: the ability to staff the program's core courses, a lack of physical space for students, and difficulty in securing funding for students pursuing the Public Practice Track. Additionally, the program has made efforts towards increasing diversity, but has not been successful.
- APC discussed the difficulties in staffing core courses, and recommended that the program develop a three year teaching plan to ensure staffing. The interdisciplinary nature of the program, combined with the campus budget structure, was cited as the biggest obstacle to finding instructors.
- APC questioned how many students pursue a dual degree in a related program, such as soil science, but the answer was unknown. They also discussed the program's admission process, and examined the reasons that students are having difficulty finding funding. Recent changes to University Fellowships, now only offered to PhD students, is a key factor. The program chair, Steve Ventura is engaging in conversations with the Graduate School in hopes of making this funding available to Agroecology students.
- APC also discussed how the lack of a physical space and a dedicated department home affect the program. Members questioned whether or not the program has considered inclusion in an existing department. In particular, APC expressed concerns about retaining institutional memory without a departmental home. Alan Turnquist, who was described as an asset to the program, and the previous program coordinator, are able to provide some institutional memory, but it was questioned if relying on staff retention for institutional memory was appropriate.
- Questions will be shared with the program chair, Steve Ventura, who will attend the next APC meeting.

### 3. Suspension of Admissions to the Development PhD program

- The Development PhD program, often referred to as Development Studies, was reviewed in 2015, and identified as being very small (approximately 2 students) and struggling with finding funding for students. The interdisciplinary nature of the program has led to issues similar to those of Agroecology in terms of ability of faculty to commit time and funding outside of their departmental programs. There are 16 total faculty members in the program, primarily in AAE and C&E Soc.
- This request to suspend admission will allow the program time to define governance structures and to explore potential funding models.
- By the end of next spring the program will return to APC to discuss which of two outcomes are proposed for the program – 1. the program will identify solutions to their small size, lack of concrete faculty commitment, and funding issues, or 2. The program will return with a request to discontinue.
- Suspension of admissions means that students currently in the program will be able to continue, but no new students will be admitted.
- If the request to suspend admissions is approved, it will go on to GFEC and UAPC, but is somewhat unique in that the graduate school has already suspended admissions prior to the approval process.

**Nicole moved to approve suspension of admissions to the Development PhD program, Larry seconded, unanimously approved**

### 4. Collaborative Function and Governance

- The discussion about collaborative function and governance was briefly discussed at a previous meeting, and APC requested that it return.
- Kate recapped that she met with Jocelyn Milner and Steve Smith last year to request their input on the collaborative model and regulations regarding FP&P.

- Departments will retain their governance bodies. Governance is clearly outlined regarding faculty personnel and academic programs. In areas where governance does not have a role, decision making processes will be outlined in advance.
- Kate requested feedback and questions from APC.
  - In response to discussion and questions, Kate clarified that the executive committees could meet jointly, much in the way that CALS and L&S APCs meet jointly. Discussion could occur with both groups or separately if desired. Voting would remain separate.
  - APC asked whether or not the collaborative would be evaluated as a whole. This could be useful, but is dependent on available data.
  - APC recommends that the Dean's office draft a recommendation for chairing the steering committee.
  - APC also asked that the Dean's office clarify their role in recording and enforcing MOUs. The Dean's office has created a template for MOUs, which has been shared in the APC box folder.
  - Collaboratives are intended to submit hiring requests together and the Dean's office will make this more explicit in the document.
  - The suggestions will be reviewed and the collaborative document will return to APC.

### **Action and Discussion Items**

#### 1. Role of APC in 5-year Planning Documents

- Kate requested input from APC as to their involvement with 5 year plans. When this was discussed previously, APC likened their role to that of a grant panel. There was some concern about the work-load of discussing all 5 year planning documents every year.
- Kate suggested that the 5 year plans for programs could be brought forth during their program review, which would also spread out the discussion of all departmental planning documents through several years.
- APC agreed that centralized review of 5 year plans could help recognize synergies across the college, much in the way that UCC helps oversee all course proposals. APC questioned whether they are the best body for this, and suggested the Dean's office might be better suited.
- APC questioned whether or not 5 year plans will be revised based on feedback. Kate imagined that feedback could be incorporated into the following year's plan.
- Kate will be reviewing 5 year plans when she meets with departments in the spring. This aligns well with the meeting Kate has scheduled with the Chancellor later in the spring to discuss mainly financial matters.

#### 2. APC 5 year Self-Study subcommittee

- APC is required to review its functions, and this was last completed about 4-5 years ago. This self-review will focus on representation. The review will take place over the course of the year, and will not be on an accelerated timeline.
- Kate requested 3 volunteers, and Doug Soldat offered to serve on the review committee. Kate will follow up with individual requests.

Meeting adjourned at 2:06 pm