MINUTES

Members Present: Martin Cadwallader (departed at 3:35), Michael Bell (arrived at 3:45), Duncan Carlsmith, Cynthia Czajkowski, Aparna Dharwadker, Norman Drinkwater, Ted Golos, Mary Louise Gomez, Robert Howell, Daniel Kleinman, Gloria Mari-Beffa, José Pincheira, Pamela Potter, Fernando Tejedo, Susan Thibeault

Members Absent: Steve Ackerman, Lea Jacobs, Lisa Martin, Donna Paulnock, Stephen Quintana, Kevin Shinners

Guests: Working Group Members: Susan Babcock, Mark Cook, Tim Donohue, Michael Gould, Jan Greenberg, Caroline Levine,
Graduate School Academic Planning Council Members: Daniela Busciglio, Nicole Schmidt

Staff: Eileen Callahan, Wendy Crone, Alissa Ewer, Kelly Haslam, Michelle Holland, Jennifer Martin, Kathi Matthews-Risley, Mary Butler Ravneberg, Linda Scholl

Dean Martin Cadwallader called the meeting to order.

The minutes of December 13, 2013 were approved as written.

Dean Martin Cadwallader excused himself from the meeting, but remained available in his office.

Discussion Item:

Charge for the Working Group on Leadership Changes in the Office of the VCR/DGS:

The Working Group on Leadership Changes in the Office of the VCR/DGS is charged with exploring the efficacy of a leadership structure within the research enterprise that involves two positions – a Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies (VCRGS), and a Dean of the Graduate School (DGS). The DGS would report directly to the VCRGS and would remain in the same office. The VCRGS would continue to have oversight responsibility for the operations and funding of the graduate school enterprise, but the programmatic and financial work of that office would be the responsibility of the DGS. The DGS would meet regularly with other Deans and have full standing within that group.

With this proposal in mind, the working group is charged with identifying the issues that would need to be resolved in the following areas:

• Assuring the continuing close association of research and graduate education;
• Assuring an effective relationship between the major research centers and the leadership structure;
• Assuring effective governance structures (including GFEC, the graduate school APC, and CASI), to maintain faculty and staff engagement with graduate school and research policy;
• Assuring that the WARF gift continues to be effectively administered in a way that benefits research and academic exploration across campus, including the role of divisional representatives;
• Assuring that the DGS has an appropriate relationship to the other deans and the Office of the Provost, while reporting to the VCRGS;
• Suggesting options to assure an effective utilization of and a clear reporting structure for the academic associate deans.

The discussion item concerning leadership changes in the Office of Vice Chancellor for Research and Dean of the Graduate School was begun by Tim Donohue, Chair of the Working Group on Leadership Changes in the Office of Vice Chancellor for Research/Dean of the Graduate School. Donohue noted that, in addition to the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) members, all members of the Graduate School Academic Planning Council (GSAPC) and all members of the Working Group (except Petra Schroeder) were present at the meeting. Donohue noted that the intent of the working group’s visit to GFEC was to listen to issues related to the working group’s charge.

Tim Donohue noted that a first draft of the working group’s report will go to University Committee on February 14. They will distribute the draft to faculty and staff for a March 3 Faculty Senate meeting. In addition, there will be two campus town hall meetings to discuss the draft. A final draft of the working group’s report would be provided to the University Committee in mid-March for inclusion in the April 7 Faculty Senate meeting.

Tim Donohue noted that the working group’s mission is to report back on the efficacy of the proposed leadership change and, so far, they have tentatively agreed there is need for a different structure, more resources and additional people. The working group asked GFEC members to voice their comments and questions.

Members of GFEC noted that it seemed possible that if the position of Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR) were split, the new VCR might focus more attention and resources on the revenue-generating research areas, resulting in less attention on graduate programs or other important work on campus that may not generate revenue.

The GFEC asked how graduate education would manifest as part of the VCR’s responsibilities, should the position be split from the Dean of the Graduate School position. A member of the working group noted that they support the theme that research and graduate education remain within the same unit. However, a question arose about the logic of the Dean of the Graduate School not reporting to the Provost as do the Deans of other schools and colleges. The working group noted that Deans are a member of the Dean’s Council and through that membership, a Dean of the Graduate School would have a “dotted line” report to the Provost. The working group also acknowledged that the roles of Vice Chancellor for Medical Affairs and Dean of the School of Medicine and Public Health manifests in one person on this campus.

GFEC and GSAPC members advised the working group that they seek input from and speak with the various Graduate School centers. One member noted that centers are a good match for both hats. A GFEC representative asked: where would the research centers be housed in the proposed arrangement and who would be the assigned principle investigator for those centers? It was noted that there are many centers on campus that are not in the Graduate School. It was also noted that some federal agencies that fund research centers have specific requirements of the PI’s title or the reporting
structure, however the campus has often able negotiate reasonable flexibilities with the agency. A GFEC member with close ties to a GS center also indicated who the Graduate School centers report to was a relevant issue as it relates to advocacy for centers’ interests. It was noted that GS center directors should be consulted. A working group member responded that the research centers were sent email messages requesting feedback on the working group’s charge and that the working group has received very few emails.

The working group asked GFEC members to characterize typical GFEC agendas. Are they mostly graduate education or research-based? A GFEC member responded that the GFEC agendas are primarily graduate education-based, whereas the GSAPC is the governance body that handles graduate centers’ issues. The working group also asked questions regarding the election of members to GFEC and/or the GSAPC. GFEC members are elected by divisional faculty and there is a rotating structure in place for their involvement in the GSAPC. The academic staff member on GSAPC is elected and the student member is appointed. One working group member wondered if there should be a distinct governance structure for research.

One working group member noted that the University Committee meets more frequently with deans than vice chancellors.

A working group member noted a perceived shift in research where less research may be done in conjunction with graduate education and a need to recognize such a trend if it is intended for the University of Wisconsin-Madison to be nationally competitive.

Both the working group and GFEC acknowledged that the University of Wisconsin-Madison has a unique governance structure. The structure is “bottom-up”– which starts with the faculty — and this makes it difficult to apply other universities’ structural models to our institution.

A working group member noted that divisional representation is important, recognizing the benefit of awareness of the particularities of the four divisions of graduate education and research via the four divisional graduate associate deans. The GFEC stressed that it is important to not neglect the needs of the Arts and Humanities division, for example, just because they do not generate large amounts of external forms of revenue.

A GFEC member noted that many on campus do not have a clear conception of what is “broken” in the current leadership structure and why it needs to be “fixed”. A working group member explained that there is not a list of things broken, but rather they are charged to consider resilient and responsive structures that will position the UW-Madison well for the future. This may include consideration of new revenue streams, greater federal presence, and greater advocacy and innovation.

A GFEC member noted that we can learn from similar discussions in the past, particularly the so-called DeLuca Report. A GFEC member recommended broad communication where points are clearly and carefully stated, and well-understood. Some points to consider when crafting and distilling this message: should the positions split, what responsibilities would fall under each, separated position; if we are ranked well, what could be wrong with our institution’s current structure to warrant such a change; where will the WARF money go; what is being taken away; what is gained; and how might a change distract focus from graduate education.
A working group member noted that emails have been sent to members of campus regarding their charge, and that they were eager for feedback via email from campus constituents. A working group member encouraged GFEC and GSAPC members to return to their departments and encourage their colleagues to provide feedback.

A GFEC representative wondered if some of these discussions ultimately signify a need for more resources. Ultimately, there are several important positions on campus and their success is linked to securing sufficient support. Regardless of a split of the two positions, there is still the question of who is going to do all the work. The GFEC also signaled that it would be nice if research and graduate education could be equal and not one on top of the other. It was suggested that perhaps there could be a Graduate School Dean and a Research Dean.

The GFEC noted a potential concern, that if a Dean of the Graduate School was structurally under the position of Vice Chancellor for Research, then the Dean of the Graduate School is inherently weaker and less able to enforce/promote matters related to graduate education. In turn, this could result in a deficiency in the impact of program reviews and maintaining quality graduate programs. A GFEC member stressed that program review quality must remain intact.

A working group member responded that the working group believes in the importance of a strong Dean of the Graduate School, noting that the landscape is changing in graduate education, with increased focus on master’s programs and distance education. It is important to consider resources for investment in these and other areas to position graduate education well for the future.

A working group member noted that restructuring in the right way has the potential to strengthen both graduate education and research, and reiterated a call for more feedback, emails, and input.