

CALS ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL - MINUTES

December 18, 2018

1:00pm-2:30pm

2321 DeLuca Biochemical Sciences Meeting

Attendees: Erika Anna, Jeri Barak (arrived at 1:27pm), Jane Collins, Claudio Gratton, Guy Groblewski, Barb Ingham, Chuck Kaspar, Hasan Khatib, Larry Meiller, Paul Mitchell, Nicole Perna, Doug Soldat, William Tracy, Alan Turnquist

Not present: None

Ex officio: Kate VandenBosch, Bill Barker, Dick Straub, Karen Wassarman

Guests: Irwin Goldman (Horticulture program review), Brian Yandell (Biometry program review), Denise Ney (Dietetics program)

Minutes taken by: Julie Scharm

Public meeting attendees: None

The meeting was called to order by Kate VandenBosch at approximately 1:01pm.

Welcome and introductions

Kate VandenBosch welcomed the committee.

Review agenda

No changes were made to the agenda.

Review minutes for November 6, 2018 and December 4, 2018

Paul Mitchell made a motion to approve the November 6, 2018 meeting minutes. Bill Tracy seconded the motion. The motion was approved (13 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain).

Bill Tracy made a motion to approve the December 4, 2018 meeting minutes. Paul Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Action and discussion items

1. Poultry Sciences Major – discontinuation of major
This is a low enrollment major. Students will still have access to learn about poultry science through the summer Midwest Poultry Consortium.

At the December 4, 2018 CALS APC meeting, Jane Collins made a non-quorum motion to support the department's request to discontinue the major, and Chuck Kaspar seconded the motion. The motion carried forward to this meeting and the motion was unanimously approved.

2. Campus policy on low award producing programs
When a low award-producing program is identified, campus requests an evaluation of the program. Low award producing programs are defined as < 5 degrees in 5 years (or < 10 certificates in 5 years for certificate programs). If the decision is to continue a low award-producing program, a

justification and a compelling reason for continuation are required. The administrative costs to running a program also need to be evaluated.

Some of the programs coming to the CALS APC this year through the program review process are small enough to be very close to being designated “low award producing programs”. The APC should be proactive about evaluating these types of programs and making recommendations on future actions.

3. Horticulture program review – second review

The review encompassed all four degree programs: BS, MS, PhD, and PhD minor. The department will be phasing out the undergraduate program but not until plans are in place for a new degree program.

Irwin Goldman, department chair and professor in the Department of Horticulture, joined the CALS APC meeting to provide a response to the program review:

- The review was fair and honest.
- The programs have relatively low enrollment.
- The direction of the recommendations is the same direction the department is moving towards.
- There is a subcommittee working on the new undergraduate major.
- The department hopes to revise the graduate program after the undergraduate major is complete.
- One challenge is that there are Horticulture faculty training graduate students in production agriculture and the Hort PhD program is the only option for these students/faculty (i.e. there is not another graduate program suited for this type of work).
- The review committee report identified good areas to work on.

Comments and questions for the department:

- Question: In light of the small degree programs, can students be served in other programs on campus? Response: Horticulture has a lot of graduate students connected to faculty in the department but the students are connected to other programs, such as Plant Breeding and Plant Genetics, which is the dominant program. Amaya Atucha and Yi Wang are training graduate students in production agriculture; the Plant Breeding and Plant Genetics program is not the right fit for those students, so that is a challenge area. For undergraduate students, they can receive a degree in another CALS plant science area, in Botany in L&S (which is also small), and in the plant biology option of the Biology major (which has less than 10 students). Among our plant science departments, there might only be around 100 students interested in the plant sciences. We want to capture those students, so one thought is an integrated major to pool all of those students together.
- Question: Do you think the agricultural ecosystems major will be a good fit for the current students interested in plant sciences? Response: The new major will hopefully have tracks or concentrations that will be suitable.
- Question: How do you address what students want in the applied sciences? What if the skills don't transfer to job placement? Response: The department has hired faculty on the cutting edge of science. The department has not been able to hire people in traditional horticulture since it is difficult to obtain funding in that area; this is one reason the department cannot offer a true horticulture degree.

- Question: As the department is planning for its future, what types of faculty are you thinking about hiring? Response: The department has had retirements in crop physiology so there will be recruitment in plant resilience. The department would like to make a hire in sustainable landscapes, to focus on a modern way to look at landscapes. The department still wants to service traditional clientele, such as the cranberry and potato industries, and there are young faculty in those areas.
- Question: If a student is interested in a traditional horticulture degree, is UW-Madison still the place to go? Response: There are 14 places in Wisconsin in which a student can do this. Students do not necessarily need to go to UW-Madison, but Madison provides connections to research programs and laboratory work in a way that other campuses do not.
- Comment: The time to degree seems long. Response: This is due to sample size. Because the program does not have a lot of students, the statistic is not representative of a large sample.
- Question: What are the plans for the PhD minor, which has not been awarded in the recent past? Response: In the revision of the graduate programs, the department expects that the PhD minor will phase out and something different will take its place. The department and college could take steps to discontinue the PhD minor.

Comments and questions:

- Comment: The review committee did not address all of the proper questions in the report. The self-study addressed all of the necessary items, but the review committee report did not. Examples of this include:
 - The review committee report does not address items such as evaluation for program improvement, measures of student achievement, and curriculum rigor and design.
 - There is only one paragraph in the review committee report that discusses the future, as opposed to the present.
 - There are only a few recommendations in the review committee report and they do not evaluate/address the problems. If program reviews are important for departmental improvement, we need to have strong recommendations and evaluations.
 - There is only one sentence on departmental climate in the review committee report. This is not helpful for the APC evaluation process.
 - The review committee gave single-sentence responses to the points that the charge letter said might be useful to address.
- Question: Are we evaluating the work of the review committee or the department's self-study?
- Overall response:
 - There are still students in the major and we want to make sure they are well supported.
 - The review committee charge letter indicates "it may be useful to briefly address the following questions." There was not a strong charge to the committee on those points.
 - It is difficult to review an academic program that is going to change.
 - We should consider including language in the review committee charge to address future plans.

Decision: Bring a program review committee charge letter to a future APC meeting to further develop the review committee expectations.

Bill Tracy made a motion to accept the Horticulture program review as complete. Chuck Kaspar seconded the motion. The motion was approved (12 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain).

4. Biometry program review – second review

Biometry has an MS program and is also a center-like entity that provides a service. The review of the MS program and the CALS Statistical Lab/consulting service were combined into one program review.

The Biometry master's degree is conferred at the same time that a PhD is conferred in another area of biology. Three faculty are part of the program: Cecil Ane, Brian Yandell, and Jun Zhu (all with joint appointments). There are currently six graduate students in the program. The program graduates about one student per year. Each faculty member has 1-3 students, and the maximum capacity for advising is three students per faculty per year. In the 699 course, students provide statistical consulting for faculty and staff in other departments, gaining both consulting experience and the skills of working with someone in another discipline. This course is supervised by Nick Keuler (academic staff). CALS Statistical Lab services are free to anyone in CALS, Botany, or Zoology. The lab helps people work through their own statistics and helps people at any stage of their project. The review committee reported that they were surprised by the vibrancy and vitality of the program.

Brian Yandell, Biometry director, joined the CALS APC meeting to provide a response to the program review. Student maturity and growth occurs through learning how to bridge disciplines and communicate ideas. The MS program is essentially a chapter in a dissertation which will bring quantitative methods into the student's field of study. This fall, two master's students are creating a community of practice in the plant sciences. They have become leaders in the community of practice and in working with high volumes of genetic data.

Comments and questions for the program:

- Question: How does the future of Biometry dovetail into campus conversations? Response: The Biometry MS is not related to campus-level conversations, but the Biometry program serves as an example for the data science initiative and data science hub.
- Comment: This appears to be a low award-producing program. Response: It is a low cost program with very little administrative cost. Volunteer staff administer the records. Graduate students in a PhD program typically have one extra year of work. The program involves an intense collaboration with two advisors. The small number of faculty is one reason for the low award numbers.
- Question: Why is there a maximum capacity of three students per faculty member? Response: The faculty member is guiding students through the program. They are serving as a co-advisor of the master's program, which results in a chapter of a dissertation. Apprenticeship training requires supervision. Faculty are also training students in their home departments.
- Question: Is it possible to form a workgroup to imagine/develop a higher enrollment scenario? Response: Imagining this takes more staff and more faculty engagement. The program has submitted faculty position requests to increase faculty numbers and those requests have not been approved. The program would need more support to proceed with such a task.
- Question: Could the structure of the program be altered to achieve its goals in a different way? Response: Yes, and the program could also broaden its audience, but there is still a capacity issue.
- Question: Are you turning students away because of limited capacity? Response: No, but the program is only advertised in modest ways, such as in the 571 and 572 courses.

- Question: It seems that there are other faculty that could participate. What are the barriers to their participation? Response: People have other draws on their attention. There also needs to be a momentum to make that happen. The program does not have the infrastructure to support a large program. There needs to be a broader conversation about how to move forward, which would be of value if there was interest.
- Question: Is the program unique? Response: Not aware of another program like this.
- Question: What are your thoughts on future demand or growth of the student experience? Response: The need for students to work at this junction will only grow.
- Question: Did Biometry come around a decade too early or will a new structure be needed to address increased demand? Response: Biometry grew out of conversations in CALS amongst colleagues who saw a need for it. It was ahead of its time. There is a growing interest in the data area and there is an opportunity to grow but the question is how to do that. Advice on this is welcome. It might be possible to bring together people for a conversation about this.
- Question: Could the consulting program still exist if the Biometry MS program were to ever dissolve? Response: The consulting facility is the training ground for master's students, who are apprentices for one to two semesters. The students who show promise may do some work on their own, but there is a lot of oversight. The impact of the master's program on the consulting program is minimal.
- Question: Do the students get any training in how to consult? Response: Yes, they receive this through their apprenticeship. They are experiencing on-the-job conversations, meetings, etc. The project assistants go through a statistical consulting course and semester-long training. Some of that training materials have been adapted to train the master's students.
- Question: Is there any relationship between Biometry and the new PhD minor in quantitative biology? Response: This has not come up. The PhD minor serves a different population of students. Biometry works with students who are strong in a biological discipline and show an interest in carrying forward with quantitative data. The PhD minor only has 3-4 courses and no apprenticeship.

Comments and questions:

- Comment: We might want to consider whether Biometry comes back for program review sooner than 10 years because of all of the new data science initiatives (e.g. undergraduate degree tracks, UW2020 funding for data science up, data science initiative) and changes in the campus space.
- Comment: Several people have used the consulting services for large data sets.
- Comment: It seems that there is some resistance from Biometry to exploring ideas for the MS program. It is not clear why there is resistance to trying to improve, especially since this is a low award-producing program.
- Comment: This program is a collaboration with statistics, but CALS does not get credit for any of the courses.
- Comment: Data science is much larger than statistics.
- Comment: The review committee had some good recommendations.
- Comment: The program review process seems ineffective for programs either going through change or facing changes presented at the campus level. This applies to both this program review and the Horticulture program review.
- Comment: Students in the graduate training program are doing a lot of extra work and are not getting paid. The program is designed for a really small group of people who want to be

statistical consultants. The student has to be really driven and has to have an advisor who is willing to participate, so this program is never going to grow a lot.

- Question: Do we value this small, vibrant program? Response: That is the question to answer. Some people feel that more often than not, this program is not worth the student's time.
- Question: Is this an area where the college should invest? What is the cost-benefit ratio?
- Comment: We do not have the resources to maintain small programs anymore, but data science is a large, future area of work and study. One of the questions is what role Biometry wants to play in this.

Decision: The Biometry program needs to decide how it's going to grow its program and build around its unique qualities. The committee should think about this recommendation and, in general, the college's next steps in the data sciences.

Paul Mitchell made a motion to forward the Biometry program review into spring semester for further discussion. Barb Ingham seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Karen Wassarman will circulate information on the PhD minor in quantitative biology.

5. Dietetics program: name change and changes to admissions requirements
Denise Ney, faculty member in the Department of Nutritional Sciences, joined the CALS APC meeting to present the program changes requests.

The Department of Nutritional Sciences would like to change the name of an undergraduate degree from BS Dietetics to BS Nutrition and Dietetics. The BS Dietetics program provides the matriculation tract for students to complete the Didactic Program in Dietetics (DPD) to become a registered dietitian nutritionist. The DPD is accredited by the Accreditation Council on Education in Nutrition and Dietetics the accrediting agency for the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics. The rationale for changing the name of the degree is to better inform students and employers of their career path and for consistency with national trends. In 2012, the American Dietetics Association changed their name to the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics. The department surveyed senior students about the name change and they were almost unanimously in favor of the change.

The Department of Nutritional Sciences would like to change the admission requirement into the Dietetics program. The department would like to decrease the cumulative prerequisite GPA and overall GPA requirement from 3.0 to 2.8. In 2009, the program was overwhelmed with enrollment and unable to receive new funds from CALS to grow. There were 226 dietetics students and with no new resources, the department had to defend the number of students to the accrediting body. The department therefore embarked on an enrollment management policy, similar to the School of Nursing, and set the GPA requirement to 2.8. That change helped enrollment slightly but the program still had over 200 students. In 2015, the GPA requirement was increased to 3.0. There is now a decline in dietetics enrollment and the program only has 120-150 students.

Comments and questions:

- Can a department ask for a range of authority in the GPA requirement, connected to an enrollment target, instead of needing to seek approval on each change? Response: No. Departments have to ask for approval for each specific change. The decision point is whether the

CALS APC would like to make these decisions or delegate this to CALS Office of Academic Affairs.

Bill Tracy made a motion to approve the name change of the undergraduate degree from BS Dietetics to BS Nutrition and Dietetics. Paul Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Jeri Barak made a motion to delegate the approval of GPA admission requirements changes to the CALS Office of Academic Affairs. Paul Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Informational items

1. Update on searches

Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems director: The Dean's Office will be receiving the search committee's feedback this week.

Science and Medicine Graduate Research Scholars director: The PVL was released and is open to any tenured faculty members in the participating schools and colleges.

CALS Office of Academic Affairs:

- Academic planner: The office is in the process of interviewing candidates for an academic planner position. The academic planner will provide support to the CALS APC.
- Honors Program manager: There is an open PVL for this position.
- Assistant dean for academic programs and policies: A PVL for this position will soon be released.

Campus searches:

- School of Business dean: There are two candidates for the position.
- Dean of students: This will be an upcoming search.
- Vice chancellor for research and graduate education: This will be an upcoming search.
- Provost: Provost Mangelsdorf has accepted a position as president of the University of Rochester and will transition out of her provost position in summer.

2. Updates on progress of programs

Both the suspension of admissions to the Development PhD and the creation of a AAE professional MS option have moved through governance, including UAPC.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:33pm. No motion was made to adjourn.