Thirty Senators signed in. Dean Sandefur chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 3:50 p.m.

1. Announcements, Updates and Questions
   a. Dean Sandefur offered congratulations to the L&S departments that offer graduate programs that were ranked highly in the *US News & World Report* 2013 “Best Graduate Schools” rankings. Several L&S programs were in the top ten (Clinical Psychology, Speech-language pathology, Sociology, Geology, Chemistry, and Library and Information Studies) or top twenty (Computer Sciences, Social Work, Statistics, Public Affairs, Economics, Earth Sciences, History, Political Science, Mathematics, Physics and English). The Dean also noted that UW-Madison, overall, was recently recognized as one of the world’s top institutions, placing 27th in the annual Times Higher Education World Reputation Rankings. (He expressed a preference for the Shanghai Jiao Tong University ranking, which places UW-Madison at 19th, ahead of the University of Michigan.)
   b. Dean Sandefur also congratulated faculty who had recently received awards that recognize their excellence in research and in teaching. Kellett Mid-Career Awards honored the following L&S faculty: Jin-Yi Cai (Professor of Computer Science); D. Charles DeMets (Professor of Geoscience); Tom DuBois (Professor of Scandinavian Studies); Michael Newton (Statistics and Biostatistics and Medical Informatics); Robert Nixon (English); Larry Shapiro (Philosophy); and Christopher Taber (Economics). Romnes Fellowships were awarded to: Helen Blackwell (Chemistry); Karen Britland (English); Don Davis (Languages and Cultures of Asia); John Hawkes (Anthropology); Mark Hetzler (Music); Sunduz Keles (partial appointment in Statistics); Timothy Rogers (Psychology); and Scott Straus (Political Science, International Studies). Wisconsin Alumni Associate Distinguished Teaching Awards honored several excellent teachers: Jeffrey Beneker (Classics); Parry Karp (Music); Cameron Macdonald (Sociology); Gart Shiu (Physics); Jake Vander Zanden (Zoology); Lee Palmer Wandel (History, Religious Studies and Visual Culture); and John Sumbrunnen (Political Science).
   c. The Dean provided a brief update on University Budget Reductions. He noted that current budget constraints are likely to continue in the medium term, given the state of the state, nation, and world economy. The university and college are taking stock of resources, and trying to identify what must be protected and what can be reduced. He stressed that the overall goal of the College will be to maintain its strength as the heart of the university, to maintain obligations related to the Madison Initiative for Undergraduates, maintain access to key courses, protect core research, teaching and service. Observing that the last pay plan was in 2008-09 (and part of that was rescinded), he reported that discussions are under way concerning salary adjustments for faculty and staff, because the administration understands that excellence should be
rewarded. This will mean taking full advantage of post-tenure review, compression equity exercises, and other policies.

d. Dean Sandefur provided an update on the “L&S Innovations” project. He began by noting that these are different from the innovations being promoted at the campus level. The L&S project is seeking ways to allow departments to free up existing revenue, or to generate new revenues, that can then be shared with departments to support their priorities. There are a wide variety of proposals under discussion.

2. Motion to approve the minutes of the last two L&S Senate meetings carried unanimously.

a. L&S Faculty Senate meeting held 15 March 2010
b. L&S Faculty Senate meeting held 21 March 2011

3. First Discussion: Proposal to Establish a New “College of the Arts.”

Dean Sandefur introduced this item by noting that the discussion was not intended to produce a vote or recommendation to the dean; rather, he sought suggestions from the Senators concerning questions or information needed prior to formal consideration of the proposal, which will help inform the L&S Academic Planning Council’s discussion. Senators were provided with the most recent version of the proposal (“Proposal to establish a new College of the Arts”, March 2, 2012, entered into the record as L&S Faculty Document 287). He noted that in developing the proposal, the arts community had convened many previous discussions and had held open forums, which culminated in the formal recommendation to establish a new College of the Arts. There are several Governance steps to be followed to establish this new unit:

a. Departments seeking to transfer to the new unit vote and transmit that request to the Dean of their existing college.

b. The Dean shares that information with the Academic Planning Council of the college, and seeks their recommendation as to whether the transfer should be allowed.

c. If the recommendation is affirmative, the Dean reports that recommendation at a faculty meeting, and facilitates their discussion of the proposal.

d. If the discussion leads to a recommendation, the Dean prepares a comprehensive report of the process and recommendation and submits these to the University Academic Planning Council.

e. The UAPC votes and reports to the University Committee.

f. The UC reports to the Faculty Senate, which discusses the request and votes.

g. If the request is endorsed by the Faculty Senate, the University submits the recommendation to the Board of Regents for consideration and approval.

h. At this time, the university had not ascertained whether the Legislature must also be consulted, but there is likely to be legislative interest in the creation of a new college.

Dean Sandefur reported that in L&S, formal votes had been held in three departments concerning the question of whether to support creation of a CotA, and if so, whether the department would move. Departments in the Schools of Education and of Human Ecology also held formal votes. Concerning the question of transfer to CotA, the L&S results were as follows:
a. Art History: unanimously abstained on the question of establishing CotA; voted unanimously against a motion to leave L&S.

b. Theatre and Drama: 18 of 19 eligible voting members (including 6 members of Academic Staff) participated. Concerning the motion to establish a CotA, 13 voted approval, 1 voted against, 4 abstained. Concerning a motion to transfer to CotA, 12 were in favor of transfer to CotA, 1 against, 5 abstained. (The vote of the faculty only on the latter point was 8 in favor, 1 against, 3 abstaining.)

c. Music: 45 of 51 members of the SoM faculty participated. Concerning the motion to create a CotA, 25 were in favor, 19 against, and 1 abstained. Concerning the motion to transfer to CotA, 24 votes were in support; 20 against, 1 abstention. Of 10 non-instructional Academic Staff and Classified staff with appointments of more than 50%, on the first question, 8 voted in support of CotA, 1 against, and 1 abstained; on the second, 8 voted to transfer, 2 voted against, 0 abstained

d. The Creative Writing faculty (English) decided not to consider the questions.

e. Communication Arts faculty voted last year not to leave L&S, should a CotA be created.

f. The Chazen Museum has decided not to join the CotA.

Regarding the departments outside L&S, Art and Dance voted overwhelmingly to move; while Design Studies voted to remain in SoHE.

Dean Sandefur asked Senators to counsel him so he can better frame discussion with the L&S Academic Planning Council and, eventually, with the L&S faculty. He plans to meet with the chairs of the units that voted to transfer, to get a better sense of what their votes mean. He introduced Professor Norma Saldivar, Professor Theater and Drama, and Director of the Arts Institute, and invited her to explain the CotA proposal to the Senators.

Professor Saldivar explained the role of the Arts Institute and summarized the history of efforts to establish a CotA at UW-Madison. A task force prepared the current proposal, which is intended to resolve various issues surrounding curriculum (such as reducing obstacles for students seeking to study across school/college boundaries), as well as to create a structure for better advocacy for the Arts on campus. The proposal (which was requested by former Chancellor Martin) includes budget estimates developed in consultation with the budget offices in L&S, Education, and central campus administration. A CotA structure would afford the Arts a dean-level advocate in campus decisions about resource allocation, will ensure that more decisions are made with the interests of the arts in mind, and will improve relations with donors who support the arts. Professor Saldivar noted, too, that a CotA will foster interdisciplinary studies involving
the arts, and that a key part of its mission will be to advocate for arts literacy among all students.

Senators asked several questions, to which Professor Saldivar responded (answers provided in parentheses below):

- Would students completing degrees in their college also be able to complete majors in L&S? (Currently, it is perceived as difficult for arts students to complete multiple majors across colleges; in theory, it will be easier and more fluid.)

- Will this proposal affect departments outside L&S? (Yes, Art and Dance, in the School of Education, would be affected too.)

- If the division among faculty is between research and performance, would it not make more sense to have a School of Performing Arts? (It will be more inclusive to involve Art, too, and this is of great interest to artists who want to cross boundaries.)

- Would the new college facilitate interdisciplinary study via joint appointments? (The faculty hope so.)

- Many students already pursue studies across the boundaries of schools and colleges (for example, Engineering and CALS students take L&S courses, and L&S shares academic programs with CALS). Why is this more difficult with the Arts? What specifically have they been able not to do? What are those obstacles? (Dance, Art, and Theatre have undergraduates who need to take courses across these departments, and there is currently no cross-college curricular coordination and degree requirements for the school/college differ - for example, L&S does not accept for degree credit many courses offered outside the college. In addition, Theatre could expand its offerings if it could appoint Dance faculty.)

- What will this cost? Where will the funds come from? (Professor Saldivar noted that infrastructure to establish a dean’s office and IT support were estimated by the task force to cost about $2.6 Million; Dean Sandefur added that Vice Chancellor Bazzell’s office would conduct an audit, too, to verify cost estimates. If approved, the initial funds would come from university wide discretionary funding, and ongoing costs would be from the shared base budget. It will not come from the L&S budgetary allocation.)

- What governance models informed the proposal? What peer institutions have similar structures? (The governance model is not yet known, but would likely be similar to Education, CALS, or Business; admissions, however, would likely be competitive and based on student application with portfolios, auditions, etc. This is highly variable across the founding departments, and CotA would encourage more consistency. Other Big-Ten institutions, notably Michigan and Illinois, have colleges of fine arts. Within the UW System, the superior competitor is UW-Milwaukee.)
Could UW-Madison compete with UWM? (Yes; Madison can offer them a well-rounded and strong education.)

Is CotA needed to foster interdisciplinary studies in the arts? Would it work to have, instead, a “sort of central artistic place that would attract students and get people talking with each other in a productive way”? Is a college necessary for this? (CotA will create an artistic environment that is the first step in helping to develop the vision for the arts on campus. Also, interdisciplinary studies exist in tension with core studies – both are important.)

Will CotA make it more difficult for some departments (e.g., Art and Art History) to work together? What about reaching out to departments outside the arts? Is this not easier within L&S? (There will still be ties to departments across campus; in particular, departments in the sciences have expressed great interest in working more with the arts.)

What happens if the Faculty Senate (or any other governance group) does not approve this proposal? (Dean Sandefur noted that it would be difficult to imagine a proposal moving forward without necessary endorsements; he reminded Senators that they would have at least two other opportunities to vote on the proposal, first as members of the L&S Faculty, and later as members of the university Faculty Senate.)

There were no further questions. Dean Sandefur and the Senators thanked Professor Saldivar for attending and for responding to their questions.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45.

Submitted by Elaine M. Klein, Secretary
Assistant Dean for Academic Planning