Welcome and introductions
Review agenda
Revisions to current agenda

- No revisions were made to the agenda.

Consent Agenda
1. Approve minutes for Oct 19 meeting (Box)
   - Item 1 was approved by consent.

Action and Discussion Items
2. Doctoral minor discontinuation process for 2021-22 (Box)
   - Campus has realized that there are several doctoral minors across campus that are used so infrequently or not at all that they have created an expedited way to discontinue such programs.
   - The Graduate School looked at the landscape and at minors that haven’t been used over the past 5 years.
   - When a doctoral minor is offered by a program, it means there is teaching of PhD students from another program which requires maintenance such as having advising for the program, updating Guide pages, maintaining information on a website, and participating in the program review process.
   - CALS offers 18 doctoral minors; 14 haven’t had any awards within the last five years.
   - The Graduate School is giving programs this chance to take part in this quick, expedited discontinuation process.
   - It is up to each program to decide if they wish to discontinue their doctoral minor.
   - In CALS, six programs have indicated their plans to discontinue a doctoral minor. Others are still deciding.
   - There is governance around this process. The faculty in each program need to vote to approve the discontinuation which then has to be approved by the college.
   - In about a month, the APC will see the programs wishing to utilize this process. The APC can approve these discontinuations in one motion or discuss individually if needed.
   - After approval by the CALS APC, the programs go to the February meeting of the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee for approval of suspension and discontinuation.
3. Center for Traumatic Brain Injury, College of Engineering: proposal (Box)
   - This proposal from the College of Engineering to establish a research center was forwarded to CALS for review and feedback.
   - The proposal and center are focused on blunt or blast-related traumatic brain injury (TBI), which is a significant epidemic.
   - The center would be located in Mechanical Engineering, where there is a faculty member with a well-funded program in this area.
   - Through feedback the college has received the name, Center for Traumatic Brain Injury, is a concern.
   - The proposal indicates the center is named to encompass a wide variety of possible scientific research and applications to fall within the purview of the center.
   - Those applications tend to be engineering and solution-oriented. The way the center is structured has three areas: Mechanics of Materials, Biomechanics, and Rigid Body Dynamics and Sensing.
   - Feedback from CALS departments is that the center has a broad scope title but is narrow in application.
     - As an example, there are researchers in Genetics that look at TBI in fruit flies, which is a common biological model.
     - Would this center start to define what the study of TBI is on campus?
     - The physiology is missing from the scope one would expect with a name this broad.
   - Some CALS departments had positive feedback about the opportunity for CALS to contribute to the center.
     - There was conversation between the Center for Biomedical Swine Research and Innovation, Engineering, and Meat Science and Animal Biologics Discovery (MSABD) about using pigs as a possible model for TBI.
     - Other units may also have potential for collaboration.
   - Questions and feedback from the committee:
     - What is the advantage of having a center like this versus a large research program?
       - Often centers are created to help make a unit identifiable and get attention in a way it has not prior.
       - Other reasons may be to allow for more collaborators and to capture more indirects through the College of Engineering.
       - The level of funding also may help to rise this program to a center.
     - Is there a better title for the center?
       - That is something we could talk with the center proponent about. It currently doesn’t feel like the right name for all the work going on in the topic area on campus. A solution may be a name that is more restricted in scope, even if it’s a longer title.
     - What is the scope of what this center would work on and could this influence a different name?
       - Most of the work is on preventative equipment and how to engineer a product that helps address TBI and move it through the development phase into implementation, which currently appears difficult.
       - The focus of the center is on prevention and minimizing impacts of TBI in a variety of settings, not on treatment of TBI.
     - Would this center exist without the one specific faculty member slated to be the director? If not, it may fall under the range of a program.
       - We are unsure of this and would recommend that someone related to the center attend a CALS APC meeting to address questions and receive feedback.
         - This person was unavailable to attend today’s meeting.
The proposal indicates that the director leaving as a reason for closing the center, which suggests this is closely tied to his program.

- Has this proposal gone to the School of Medicine and Public Health?
  - Yes. One of their departments has written a letter but they were curious how CALS would respond to the proposal as well.

- Is there a title that could be used to give notoriety to the program and help with receiving additional funding and staff but doesn’t elevate it to a center as far as campus structure?
  - Program is used often; center or institute has to be approved through the Board of Regents.

- What is the timeframe by which they want feedback?
  - We are unsure but having a center representative come talk to the APC would delay us providing our feedback, which is ok.

- Are there other CALS units, aside from MSABD and Genetics, that wanted to comment?
  - Animal and Dairy Sciences, Genetics and the Center for Biomedical Swine Research and Innovation had strong feedback.
  - Other units felt the title is overly broad or recommended other campus units to consult.
  - Biological Systems Engineering was comfortable with the proposal.

- The evaluation criteria (pg. 6) doesn’t seem sufficient.
  - The most important aspect noted is how well they are doing with getting sponsored research funding.
  - The proposal notes that the center will ask a representative from a funding agency to evaluate them.
  - If this will be a UW-approved center, then they should be reviewed internally periodically.

- What opportunities does the UW already provide for any faculty member to publicize their individual program a little bit more? Are there underlying issues that are roadblocks that could be dealt with without the center?
  - This is a good question; we do not have an answer.

- Can this be an opportunity to develop a cluster hire, which could elevate the center from a single PI research program to a multi-PI center?
  - This is a suggestion we could give to the PI. There is momentum on campus for these types of topics.
    - Our agroecology program is an outgrowth of an early cluster hire.

- The APC would welcome an opportunity to speak with the proponent of the proposed center.

4. Review call for Robert G. F. and Hazel T. Spitze Land Grant Faculty Award for Excellence (Box)
   - This award is given annually at CALS Awards in early May.
   - The award recognizes a well-rounded faculty member who excels in research, teaching, and outreach.
   - The award is open to CALS and SoHE faculty per the donor’s wishes.
   - Applications are reviewed by 2 APC members and 1 SoHE member.
   - The APC is asked today to review the call for nomination ahead of when it is made public in December. The call language is the same as it was last year, with dates updated.
   - Motion to approve call as written: Colquhoun/Nack
   - Vote: 13-0-0
   - Volunteers for the review subcommittee: Butcher/Pan

5. Review calls for Wisconsin Distinguished Graduate Fellowships (Box)
• Wisconsin Distinguished Graduate Fellowships (WDGF) are selected through APC.
• There are four different types of WDGFs through CALS. Three of these are available this year, due to funding.
• The draft calls have previously used language and include a frequently asked questions page that helps to answer questions about eligibility.
• The Louis and Elsa Thomsen WDGF is for dissertators only. The Richard M. Heins WDGF and the Senator Robert Caldwell Graduate Fellowship can go to dissertators or non-dissertators.
• There are funds to award three of the Thomsen WDGF and one each of the other two.
• These fellowships are general and awarded to proven, outstanding students who have demonstrated research excellence in either applied or basic sciences.
• APC members Michael Thomas and Xuejun Pan served on the selection committee for these fellowships in prior year(s). They felt the call seemed appropriate.
• Previously the APC made one change to the nomination materials to require the candidate to write a description of their research project at a level understandable to a general audience, outside the field of specialty. Former reviewers felt this was helpful.
• Question from the committee:
  o For the Caldwell WDGF, it says, “In programs where a Master of Science is the terminal degree, nominees should have completed one year of graduate study,” and in the frequently asked questions it says dissertators or non-dissertators are eligible. Is a master’s student in a terminal master’s degree eligible?
    • Do we have terminal master’s degrees?
      • This may be a residual of Landscape Architecture.
      • A terminal master’s degree is when the master’s degree is the highest degree in the field. The MS in Clinical Nutrition is an example; there is no PhD and the master’s is required for certification.
    • If CALS has no programs with this, it can still be left in the call, in case the situation arises.
• Motion to approve calls as written: Shi/Xenos
• Vote: 13-0-0
• APC members Guanming Shi and Francisco Peñagaricano both may be interested in serving on the selection subcommittee but may have students who are candidates.
• Volunteers: Kabbage/Xenos, one member yet to identify

Informational Items and Announcements

6. CALS budget metrics and performance metrics
• We often get questions about the college’s finances, the metrics that are used, and the campus budget model. This topic is to help people understand implications of the campus budget model and how it relates to college.
• Mark Rickenbach presented a PowerPoint and provided a handout to the APC. This information was also shared with department chairs last week.
• The campus budget model was adopted in 2016 and allocates 10% of our 101 GPR dollars based on metrics performance; 90% is distributed the way it always has been.
• The metrics are split between teaching and research.
  o Teaching metrics
    • Credit follows instructor (CFI) (80%)
- Credit follows program (20%)
  - Research metrics
    - Federal research expenditures (50%)
    - Federal research F&A returns (50%)

- Metrics look back 2 years with most recent year weighted twice the one before.
- As proposed, the 10% was not fixed but expected to increase.
- The budget model is not without criticisms (some noted below), but it does need to encompass the breadth of the varied missions of campus as a whole.
- The complexity of the differences across campus may be a reason the current budget model and the 10% allocation have stayed the same. With upcoming searches for a new chancellor and a permanent vice chancellor for finance and administration, it may continue as such but there’s also the possibility that the provost may want to work on some options to present to new officers of the university when they start.
- Annually, Associate Dean for Finance and Administration Angie Seitler receives a memo with our budget increase or reduction based solely on the metric component for the schools and colleges.
- Senior Associate Dean and Interim Associate Dean for Research Mark Rickenbach took the last five years of memos (FY18-22) and charted out the adjustments.
  - Teaching budget adjustments (FY18-22)
    - CALS has had a cumulative reduction of $677,739.
    - This model is only for fall/spring; summer has a completely separate model for how it works.
  - Research budget adjustments (FY18-22)
    - CALS has had a cumulative reduction of $630,180, which is based on federal research and federal indirects.
    - For CALS, this is a combined budget reduction of $1,307,919 of our total 101 allocation of $45-50 million.

- Takeaways from the data
  - CALS has effectively lost 14 faculty lines or upwards of 24 academic staff FTE.
  - Loss is somewhat “masked” in that faculty and staff compensation exercises are roughly the same amount (hence no layoffs).
  - There are base adds to our budget, such as the pay plan and faculty block grants, so we don’t necessarily notice the reductions, but they do impact how we can hire and support faculty.
- Can one understand budget adjustments based on key metrics, namely simply looking at CFI and federal research expenditures?
  - These data are really hard to pull. To do so you have to pull each school and college by individual line in the Data Digest.
  - The college would like to conduct similar tracking for our departments.
  - Overall, trends in two metrics, CFI and federal research expenditures, correlate to the budget model adjustments.
  - While the college trend in either metric is important, one must look at how it contributes to the overall trend on campus.
  - Minimally, units must perform at campus level to remain neutral.
  - Outside of L&S, the STEM schools and colleges have the same trends as we do.
  - While CFI growth is stable, there is a lot more variability for federal research expenditures.
  - For cross-college research, there is policy as to where grants go so that expenditures and distributions take place where the work is done.
• The handout shows the trends in CFI and federal research expenditures across the different schools and colleges and allows the viewer to see trends and how those trends have impacted the budget adjustments for different units.
  o Law, Pharmacy, and Veterinary Medicine have teaching budgets outside of the GPR and can set own tuition, which place them outside of influences of the budget model.
  o Some units benefit from the higher weighting of federal research.
  o It would be interesting to see the CFI per instructor and the federal research expenditures per PI, as this is data overall.
    ▪ Because of CALS recent hiring over 3-4 years, if you look at forward metrics, we are trending upwards.
    ▪ There has been a dramatic upturn in the last two years of awards which isn’t showing up in expenditures yet but it will.
    ▪ Looking at enrollment, it has gone up but we haven’t contributed to CFI.
• Rickenbach asked for feedback from the APC on the format and legibility of the handout, which is currently in draft form.
• The college doesn’t allocate budget reductions in this manner.
  o We have had budget reductions over the last five years. Every department has gotten a reduction and it’s often been related to these metrics in some way.
  o The criteria used by the college to determine budget reductions has been inconsistent over the last few years and this is an area where we can work to create consistency.
  o We currently base our research expenditures on total expenditures not just federal.
  o As a college, we can choose to allocate adjustments differently than the model.
  o It’s not enough to grow, we need to minimally keep pace with campus metrics.
• Extension is not talked about in this budget model discussion, as this is the 101 budget, not the 104 budget.
  o That said, Extension personnel are an aid to us on the federal research side as they generate a lot of federal awards.
• Questions and feedback from the committee
  o Increasing course size is a way to impact CFI metrics but requires resources. How can we do this given increasing size depends on student interest and demand as well as the ability to increase TAs and graders to teach larger sections?
    ▪ We hope to be able to answer these questions moving forward.
    ▪ There needs to be balance for both.
    ▪ Departments want to have smaller hands-on courses but must also have larger enrollment courses that provide the ability to have smaller courses.
    ▪ We are starting to understand the data a little more to help understand this.
  o It may be useful to departments to have a spreadsheet that is customizable and has the cost of production, as units might have different values and costs.
    ▪ This may give the opportunity to analytically look at where we put effort in, whether it’s number of larger courses or effort into larger group federal grants.
  o We should investigate why STEM-heavy colleges teaching numbers aren’t better. Is it because there are more labs and not enough credits assigned to the laboratory portion?
    ▪ The devil is in the details about the structure of academic programs and what courses are used.
• As an example, some academic programs in SoHE and the School of Education have students taking all courses in those schools.
• Biology is the largest CALS major but 80% of the entry courses taken are L&S courses.
  o This is a larger question of if we want to be teaching introductory chemistry/biology.
  o Other programs outside of 101 teaching may be contributing. 133 programs sometimes generate income that is used then to TAs to grow enrollment.
    ▪ There are a few service areas where our students go outside of our college: Ethnic Studies and Humanities.
    ▪ Students across campus are required to take these courses but CALS offerings may be lacking.
• Email Mark Rickenbach with any additional feedback or questions, as he is hoping to finalize these drafts and share materials in the near future.

7. Dean search update
• The Provost’s Office has been working with the University Committee to finalize the search and screen committee membership. Governance defines the make up of the committee though faculty, academic staff, university staff, students, and at least one external stakeholder will be included.
• The search firm, Isaacson Miller, has been engaged. They have assisted with several dean searches, both here at UW and across the country.
• The position description is close to final and has come to the Dean’s Office for feedback.
• The search appears to be on target to select the next dean by mid-spring semester for a summer start.
• We should expect to hear official news about the search soon.
• Question from the committee
  o Is the timing of the chancellor and UW System searches relevant to this search?
    ▪ The UW System president finalists are expected to be announced in mid-January, at which point then Regents will flip to beginning the chancellor’s search.
    ▪ Chancellor Blank has mentioned she wants to make the CALS dean decision while here.

CALS chief diversity officer search
• There are three finalists moving to the interview stage.
• eCALS has information on the interview and public presentation schedule.
  o Don Gillian-Daniel, currently the Director of Inclusive Teaching and Programming - Collaborative for Advancing Learning and Teaching in the Provost’s Office.
    ▪ Friday Nov 5 at 8 am in 108 Plant Sciences
  o Louis Macias, currently the Executive Director of Recruitment, Diversity, and Inclusion at UWPD
    ▪ Thursday Nov 11 at 9 am in 103 Taylor Hall
  o José Madera, currently an Assistant Dean for Student Academic Affairs in L&S.
    ▪ Friday Nov 12 at 12 pm in 108 Plant Sciences
• Presentations also will be livestreamed and recorded.

The meeting adjourned at 2:27 pm.