ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL
Minutes of Meeting
February 28, 2001

Members Present: Branson, Buttry, Butts, Ceylan, Drefcinski, Parsons, Schlager, Shelstrom,
Sides, Wilson & Wurtzler

Guests: Rich Shultz and Sue Price

Meeting was called to order at 4:05 pm by Chair Branson

1. There were no announcements.

2. Minutes: 1/24 “Inactive Status” was clarified to mean courses required for the major only
would not be offered; courses for general education requirements would continue.

Minutes with this clarification were approved.

Minutes: 2/14 Parsons corrected to Parsons’
Special review will be an agenda item for next meeting

Minutes approved with these corrections.

3. Review of the Agricultural Programs
Shelstrom moved and Buttry seconded a motion to receive the report prepared by the School
of Agriculture.
Shelstrom highlighted the review and the response to the faculty questionnaire. Program
limitations include remodeling of Russell Hall completion slow, absence of the greenhouse, the
age of the swine center, and a shortage of faculty. The recent increase in charge back for use
of university vans was expressed as a concern. Without an increase in budget, van costs have
went from $6.50 to $20.00. Thus a round trip to the University farm has increased threefold.
Shelstrom then referred to the executive summary prepared by Sue Price.

Dr. Price addressed the council. She reviewed her executive summary with emphasizing the
following:
Challenges created by the recent lateral review of all Ag programs in state.
Ag. Education positions reduced from 2 to 1.
No new budget.
Van charges.
Ag Stewardship Program at University farm.

Question by Parsons concerning the goal to increase enrollment: Will enrollment be limited if
no new faculty are allocated? Response: Ag Ed demands a growth in enrollment. Ag Ed was
dropped at Madison as part of the lateral review.

Question: Enrollment in Reclamation is down to 29. Is the program essential (½ FTE)?
Response: The Ag Stewardship Program depends on reclamation.

Question concerning the monies spent on faculty professional development.
Response: Foundation funds support professional development. These funds are donated by alumni, advisory council and friends.

Motion to receive the report passed unanimously.

4. Position allocation in EMS
Rich Shultz shared some data and concerns with the group.

The Fall 1999 new freshman class was the largest on record. It appears that the Fall 2001 class may be larger. This might require additional staff in general engineering and mathematics.
UWP’s student to faculty ratio in engineering is the 4th highest (32.89) of 245 out of 324 responding to a 1999 survey by ASEE. UWP is the highest in our CUPA Study Group. In his opinion these must not go higher.
Software Engineering has exceeded predictions. If enrollment continues to grow, additional staffing will be needed.

Branson asked if reallocation within the EMS was a possibility. Response was that General Engineering is used as a buffer to account for some fluctuations in the degree granting programs so that reallocation is improbable.

5. Branson compiled a summary of special reviews and actions to date. The summary also had actions to be considered. This lead to much discussion about the special reviews and duties of the APC in general.

Was the search for a graphics position in Fine Arts halted? To be answered.
38 new positions have been requested for UWP
Reallocation or assignment of new positions without data should not be done
Guidelines for position allocation need to be formulated

6. April 11 meeting with Industrial Studies
Request was made for us to meet in Russell Hall to view IS. Council did not concur with this request.

7. Review schedule for 2001-02 was reviewed and discussed.

8. Meeting adjourned 5:38

recorded by Ken Buttry