

**Academic Programs Committee on Organization and Policy (ACOP)**

**Summer Meeting July 21, 2015**

**Providence Marriott Downtown, Providence RI**

**Meeting Minutes**

Attendance: Richard Crowder, CARET Liaison  
Anne Veeger, University of Rhode Island  
Linda Martin, The Ohio State University  
David Shintani, University of Nevada, Reno  
Cindy Akers, Texas Tech University, NARRU Liaison  
Bryan Garton, University of Missouri  
Wendy Fink, Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities  
Susan Sumner, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University  
Cynda Clary, Oklahoma State University  
David Buchanan, North Dakota State University  
John Stier, Budget and Advocacy Committee Representative  
Sarah Pfatteicher, University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Jon Pedersen, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Board of Human Sciences Liaison  
James Allen, Northern Arizona University, guest speaker  
Donna Brown, University of Wyoming

Meeting was called to order at 1:13 pm by Chair Bryan Garton. Introductions were made.

Minutes from March 2014

Garton asked for additions/corrections. Garton indicated that given no corrections the minutes were approved as distributed. Any corrections should be sent to Brown.

University Education in Natural Resources

Fink introduced the guest speaker, James Allen, from Northern Arizona University where he serves as Executive Director of the School of Forestry. Allen was representing the National Association of University Forest Resource Programs (NAUFRP). See the attached presentation handout. Questions and discussion followed the presentation.

Innovative Teaching Awards - Fink

See the attached handout (Report to ACOP on Innovative Teaching Awards). Fink reminded the group that ACOP had agreed to fund these awards at the previous year's summer meeting (9 awards @ \$2000 each for a total of \$18000). Fink explained the program requirements. Of the nine awards given, six resulted in presentations at the North American Association of College Teachers in Agriculture (NACTA). These projects resulted in some collaborations and important data collection. Fink reported positive

feedback from the award recipients, and recommendations for fewer awards provided annually. Fink asked the group for feedback on whether or not to make the awards again, and whether or not to consider industry partnerships if so? Clary indicated that providing such awards lends credibility to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Veeger indicated support for the idea of building the funding pot with contributions from industry, though asked Fink if such contributions would come with strings attached? Fink indicated that she wouldn't know the answer until industry representatives were approached. Stier asked about the award project outcomes. Fink responded that several projects already had clear outcomes as a result of the awards, while others were still in the process of data collection. Fink indicated that as a result of the awards made, some had used the information gathered to submit Higher Education Challenge (HEC) Grants, however it is unknown if any of these submissions were funded. Stier indicated that if these awards are offered again they should be awarded only to new recipients, not to previous award recipients. Martin questioned whether or not there should be fewer awards – 5 and 5? Stier indicated that awards should be kept smaller but provide more to elevate the status of teaching on our campuses. Sumner asked if to new awardees only? Stier responded should be preference given to new awardees. Veeger suggested two categories one of which would include previous award recipients but for smaller amounts for additional/follow-on work – this should be a smaller category. Shintani indicated that it would be nice to collect data on HEC success of these award recipients over the next three years. Fink indicated that funding five awards at \$2000 each over the next two years is possible. Sumner asked if we should request match. Fink indicated that this has already been done. Garton asked if there was consensus on what to do – Fink recommended six awards. Stier made the motion to make five awards per year at \$2000 each following the same guidelines. Garton repeated the motion, and indicated that he thought additional funds could be sought. Garton asked for further discussion. Martin indicated that language should be added indicating first preference to new awardees. The motion passed unanimously. Veeger asked if ACOP/Academic Programs Section could make political hay from the program. Garton indicated that project abstracts could be placed on the website. Stier indicated that perhaps something could be placed in the Chronicle. Garton suggested following up with a letter to each recipients' institutional administration. Shintani suggested a listing of award recipients in the APLU booklet – Fink indicated this may be possible next year but not in 2015. Martin cautioned to be careful re: industry funding not to get too discipline specific.

Fink began a discussion on the HEC grants. She indicated that she had been working on these as her FSLI project. She sent out a survey to 163 individuals who had received HEC grants – the data was back at the time of the meeting with a greater than 50% return rate. Fink indicated she was still working on the data analysis and hoped to have a report by fall, though she did report some very preliminary data. The first step as a result of this project will be for Fink and ACOP to report to USDA/Cornerstone to advocate for funding the line, and not to award this fund through NSF. Fink indicated that the second step will be to move to Congress to explain the value of the line and the need to maintain it.

#### Annual Meeting Planning – Garton and Fink

Garton indicated that on Monday pm the Academic Programs Section may go to Dow Agrosiences. He also indicated that the group may go next door to the National FFA Center for a reception after the Dow visit, and hear from FFA on their goals, etc. Fink asked the group for ideas on who to meet with/what to

do at Dow, such as the student intern program supervisor, VP of Research, and hands-on activities. Director Ramaswamy suggested a tour of the facility – Fink indicated that was planned. Clary suggested a discussion with Dow regarding what they are seeing with students/graduates and how they are doing, as well as what they would like to see in these students and graduates. Veeger suggested meeting with new employees and hearing their reflections on how they are transitioning, what surprised them, etc. Shintani asked if the group should meet with research personnel to understand what they are looking for in employees. Martin indicated a desire to hear about Dow’s diversity initiatives.

#### Director’s Update – Sonny Ramaswamy

Director Ramaswamy updated the group on several topics of interest, including the Pipeline Study, AFRI Research and Extension experiences for undergraduates, and the ongoing infrastructure study. The Director responded to questions.

Garton released the group for break at 3:07 pm. He called the meeting back to order at 3:30 pm.

#### Board on Human Sciences Report – Pedersen

Pedersen indicated the groups mission was to work on ideas of families, community, health and textiles and that the BOHS group meets annually outside of APLU.

#### Visioning – Garton

Garton indicated that all should refer to the goals sheets (attached). He discussed the sheets/goals and asked the group how these should be implemented. i.e. should there be micro goals under each goal, without adding any new goals? Stier asked about the ways to assess each of the goals/micro goals. Martin indicated that there was a need to develop measurables, timelines, etc.

#### Goal 1

Shintani mentioned the phone call campaign planned by WAPD with the indication that it should help address Goal 1. Discussion ensued within the group about what had been accomplished so far on Goal 1. Several members indicated that planning remote access for meetings may increase engagement.

Stier asked if the goals should be posted on the APS website. Veeger responded that the group should record its accomplishments somewhere, then list the goals for the next year. Veeger indicated support for the idea of remote access for those that cannot attend meetings, but expressed concern about the possibility of diminished physical attendance as a result of this access.

Group discussion continued on meetings and where to focus the drive for attendance, and how to reach these members. The group also discussed how to make better use of opportunities at the Annual Meeting.

Garton asked about goals for 2016, especially related to Goal 1. Veeger indicated that a goal should be to add remote access, at least for the regional meetings held at APLU. The group also discussed increasing the involvement of Academic Programs personnel, including engaging the support of the respective Deans to further engagement and attendance of Academic Programs personnel at meetings. Shintani suggested having a joint meeting between Ag, Natural Resources and BOHS to discuss and work on common issues, such as the STEM pipeline, diversity and attendance. Garton and Fink indicated the need for a great Winter meeting agenda that would give people a reason to attend.

Garton indicated that on the Goals he planned to add a column titled progress and that he had already begun to add the responsible persons for each.

### Goal 3

Martin indicated that part of the reason for the development of Goal 3 was to create opportunities for personal growth for individual members of the APS group. Many of the APS group lose contact with professional development associations if/as they become administrators. Garton indicated that under strategies there was the indication of a professional development sub-committee. Garton indicated that there should be the addition of a micro goal of mentoring – which had actually been voted on years ago. Fink indicated the group should develop a thriving mentoring program. Garton indicated a possibility of re-ordering the goals as Goal 3 is more closely related to Goal 1.

Shintani asked a question about the strategy re: digital resources. Fink indicated that it is possible to do more on the new website, but that there needs to be a committee to assist. Garton suggested the committee should consist of the regional chair-elects. Stier indicated that this should be a reasonably stable group if there were staggered/rotating 4-year terms. Shintani asked if each region had their own website. Fink indicated that these could be housed on the national site. The first digital committee consists of the following: Buchanan (4 years), Shintani (1 year), Veeger (3 years) and Akers (2 years). Fink questioned if there should be a Natural Resources liaison (Jim Allen). Stier suggested two At-Large members from 1890, 1994, Canada, Natural resources, etc. Martin indicated that the group would need to add some things into the By-Laws, especially if standing committees were being formed or if roles came with specific responsibilities.

### Goal 2

Garton indicated the group should look at the version with Track Changes from Tracy Hoover. Allen indicated that for the micro goal on digital repository that the group should partner with Natural Resources as they were already doing this.

Garton asked each team assigned to goals to come back to the group at the next meeting with timelines, etc.

### Old Business

Sumner provided a CIP Codes/FAEIS task force report, indicating that this was a 1 year project. Sumner also discussed the pipeline issue as it related to getting information on community college transfers – she may be asking institutions for related data.

Martin indicated that she would report on the staff development workshop at APLU in November.

### New Business

Garton indicated that the East needed to provide two nominees for the position of Secretary and that the West needed to provide two nominees for the position of Chair-Elect.

Elaine Turner and Cameron Faustman are the two representatives for Policy Board of Directors.

The meeting was adjourned by Garton at 4:57 pm.

### Committee on Legislation and Policy Report – Susan Sumner

Sumner indicated that there was nothing new to report since the November meeting as the committee hasn't met since then.

### NARRU Report – Cindy Akers

Akers discussed the non Land-Grant capacity building grants. She also discussed the next NARRU meeting to be held in Kansas City and indicated that the non Land-Grant capacity building grant recipients will need to report at this meeting. The meeting is normally held the 1<sup>st</sup> week of October each year. Sumner will need to attend as Chair-Elect.

### Lead 21 Report – Laurie Kramer

Kramer indicated that the Lead 21 program is doing well and is at more than capacity (86). This year was the 1<sup>st</sup> time that the program had to turn some nominees/applicants away. To do so the program asked Deans with more than 2 nominees to rank order them. As a result of this increased interest the board has discussed running two simultaneous cohorts.

Kramer indicated that the University of Georgia has been a great host for the program, but they do not want to continue beyond the current contract which finishes in 2017 – a RFP will be coming out from the board for a new host institution in June or July, and the applications will be due in September. The potential candidate institutions will be asked to come to the APLU to be interviewed. It is anticipated that there will be a 1 year transition. The host institution is responsible for logistical issues, hiring new facilitators, budget and financial issues. This will be different than how it has been in the past. Kramer reported that the facilitators typically have jobs as faculty or psychologists – the program takes tuition \$ and pays the facilitators contractually by the day. The board would like to continue with the current facilitators.

Kramer indicated that the Lead 21 program is in the black right now.

Kramer indicated that ACOP needs to decide on a 2<sup>nd</sup> APS representative to the Lead 21 board. Some time will be needed at the APS business meeting to elect someone (Kramer indicated that she would be happy to serve another term).

Martin indicated that FSLI just finished its 2<sup>nd</sup> Residential Session for Cohort 10 and that the program is now soliciting nominations for Cohort 11.

### STEM Food and Ag Update – Wendy Fink

Fink reported that APLU decided not to join STEM Food and Ag, but are contributing as strategic partners. New task forces have been formed and the group wants to do another report to following on

their STEM 2.0 report. The goal of the group is to get more students into STEM Food and Ag and more non-Ag students into Ag-related employment, such as the computer sector. Fink is a member of the Innovation Task Force and will attend the June meeting and then the meeting at the World Food Prize.

Fink indicated that there are some universities that are a part of this group, but not many as it requires a membership fee. Most of the membership is made up of industry groups (such as Pepsi Co., DuPont, Monsanto, Dow, Cargill, Nationwide, etc.) and also groups such as Ag Futures of America, FFA etc. Fink will keep ACOP/APS informed of activities. In fact she may request information from institutions for the task force.

#### Forestry Diversity Update – Wendy Fink

Fink reported that she sat in on a Deans' meeting for forestry earlier in the week – the meeting was very focused on diversity (women and race). The group just received a grant to work on the issue – Fink suggested that ACOP/APS partner with the group as they want to think about diversity broadly (i.e. thought, socio-economic status, etc.). Fink indicated that she would approach the forestry group about a liaison – it needs to be someone with a natural resources focus (especially an interest in forestry). Fink indicated that she needed a volunteer to engage more with the group – Martin indicated an interest.

#### Visioning Follow-Up – Wendy Fink

A handout was circulated – a PowerPoint for Garton to present at the APS Business Meeting on Thursday. Fink indicated that the group also needed to discuss Veeger's questions on the visioning documents as they hadn't been followed up on yet. Fink reported that she would be meeting with Mitch Owens in a couple of weeks and would follow up on the groups/questions.

#### Next Year's Winter Meeting – Wendy Fink

Fink discussed the possibility of changing the date/timing/location of next year's winter meeting, suggesting perhaps late spring/early summer and away from the expense and weather issues related to DC at the current timing. Some of the downsides to this change were discussed and the consensus of the group was to keep the timing and location of the meeting as is – there is simply too much conflict in May and June for Academic Associate Deans. It was decided that perhaps costs could be reduced by meeting in the APLU building.

#### Director's Report – Ian Maw

Maw gave reports/updates on the Anti-Microbial Task Force, the Healthy Foods/Healthy People Task Force, Board on Agriculture Assembly, the Communication and Marketing Committee, the APLU Board of Directors Meeting, budget, the Water Initiative and the Unifying Message.

Fink discussed the new APLU website.

### New Business

Martin gave information on the upcoming staff development training scheduled at The Ohio State May 18 – 20 2015.

Maw reported on the status of the upcoming Global Consortium on Higher Education and Research in Agriculture (GCHERA) meeting scheduled in Beirut.

Garton went over the agenda for the APS meeting.

Meeting adjourned by Chair Bryan Garton at 3:48 pm.