

Draft

Minutes

Graduate School Committee on Academic Staff Issues Meeting With the Working Group on Leadership Changes in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research/Dean of the Graduate School

1 – 2 p.m., Wednesday, Jan. 29, 2014

Present: GS-CASI: Judy Bauman, Alex Converse, Wayne Feltz, Kristin Harmon, Moira Harrington, Julie Karpelenia, Kristin Crosno, Julie Schears, Nicci Schmidt, Tom Zinnen. Working Group: Mark Cook, professor, Department of Animal Science; Mark Cook, professor, Department of Animal Science; Tim Donohue, professor, Department of Bacteriology (chair); Michael Gould, professor, Department of Oncology; Jan Greenberg, professor, School of Social Work; Daniel Kleinman, associate dean, Graduate School; Caroline Levine, professor, Department of English; Petra Schroeder, associate dean, Graduate School

Absent: GS-CASI: Jenny Hackel and John Richards. Working Group: Susan Babcock, professor, Department of Materials Science and Engineering;

Welcome and Introductions

Donohue: The GS-CASI is an important part of the conversation. We have an important charge and we want to be robust and inclusive. We've spent hundreds of hours with our charge. We would like to hear what you are thinking about, what your concerns are so we can integrate that as we begin to put together our recommendations. We don't want to just talk; we want to listen.

Overview of the Role and Function of GS-CASI

Schmidt and Karpelenia (on the figures related to staff and students): GS-CASI is a fairly new entity on campus for governance. We represent a diverse group of 758 academic staff members. We are an elected group that covers the full breadth of the school and its research centers; we have had an advisory role with Dean Cadwallader since the GS-CASI's inception—2002. The dean can better understand the climate of the centers through the GS-CASI. We have proximity to decision-makers. It's been a very successful group. It echoes the collaborative nature of the dean during his tenure. We estimate that less than 10 percent of those people are paid by 101 money. It is mostly a research-funded workforce.

Cook: What is the GS-CASI's relationship with other governance bodies?

Schmidt: I serve on GS-APC. Governance is most effective when there is a collaboration between academic staff, faculty and leadership. That's why it's so great that we're meeting today.

Donohue: How many grad students and post docs are in Grad School?

Feltz: The centers fund a lot of RAs.

Julie K: We have at least 200 RAs, PAs and fellows. There are approximately 100 post-docs.

Donohue: We want to embrace all the non-academic staff, post-grad trainees and get them involved.

Questions for the Working Group

1. What is the current timeline of events? How will academic staff and governance participate? With whom have you already met? Will all the input be gathered prior to submitting the report? (Asked by Harrington and Schmidt)

Donohue: The Working Group received its charge at the beginning of December. The charge would have the group deliver a report on Feb. 15. Since Feb. 15 is a Saturday, a report will be delivered on Feb. 14. The report will be discussed at the March Faculty Senate meeting.

Donohue and Cook: We have met with:

- The University Committee
- Dean Cadwallader
- Associate vice chancellors
- Associate deans of the Graduate School
- The Deans Council
- GFEC
- Academic Planning Council

The Working Group will request a meeting/schedule with these groups after the report is released:

- CSCC
- The Academic Staff Executive Committee

The group ensured that the university's official publication, Inside UW-Madison, contained a notice with an invitation to comment. The invitation for comment has appeared in many dept and unit communications. The response has been very limited, fewer than five e-mails to date.

All input will be gathered before the report's submittal on Feb. 14.

The Working Group has read all background material, all previous reports.

2. How do we preserve our access? (Asked by Converse, Schears)

Donohue: If we change nothing, nothing changes with that access. If we tweak the current structure, we will run those models against the principles that we want to retain, and engage the university to do better in its research enterprise. I don't know of any model that removes any governance bodies.

Cook: If there is a split—a vice chancellor for research and a dean of graduate education—where does GS-CASI want to end up? Who would GS-CASI like to report to?

Several CASI members and Zinnen in particular: We'd like access to both sides. There's a very strong integration between the education and the research. Our issues are more often aligned with research matters. To be true to our constituents, to our centers, however, we'd have to meet with both the dean of graduate education and the vice chancellor for research.

Gould: You are not necessarily unique with the joint research/education mission. Conceivably, the Graduate School centers could live within a certain department and still function well.

Donohue, Gould, Greenberg: If the Graduate School Centers' academic staff became parts of certain departments—aligning similar scopes of work with similar scopes of work—there is a greater weight academic staff could carry in those aggregated greater numbers. Perhaps we suggest a structure that involves the new vice chancellor for research having a CASI made up of academic staff from all over campus. The downside may be disruptive of the existing advisory relationships, such as within the School of Medicine and Public Health or College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

Gould: Centers are a critical issue if we are going to moving the research forward. We have a need: how do you address new opportunities in research? A new vice chancellor for research could help this campus be more nimble to take advantage of a new research endeavor.

Zinnen: A model to look at might be School of Medicine and Public Health Dean Robert Golden who has both an education and a research charge. That could be a precedent for the Graduate School and research functions.

3. Is the proposed split of the position being considered because something is broken with the current alignment? If this is not an effort to mend something, what are working toward? What does "success" look like in the next 3, 5 or 10 years? (Converse, Zinnen)

Gould: We don't want to fix anything that isn't broken.

Cook: This is about maintaining and looking at what we want to improve. This is not about repairing a situation.

Feltz: The prior Faculty Senate action on this topic said, nothing is broken so don't make a change.

Gould: What we are hearing from people – not that this is broken—but rather we hear it's not as rosy as we seem to be. If you look per capita, we are only in the 50-60% percentile for funding. The reason we get so much grant money is because of our size as an institution. And, you have to look in the rearview mirror. Who is chasing us? We're not doing as well in securing NIH grants, for example. Non-federal grants often don't pay the indirects, so we are missing that revenue. Other campuses are beating us in securing opportunities because they are more nimble. Here are things we are hearing need improvement.

Schmidt: What will success look like in 3 to 5 years?

Gould: Everyone has their own ideas

Cook: The Working Group has established a framework to consider and wants to build on it:

- Resilient systems that can rapidly respond
- Securing the ability to capture and create new research
- Responsibly serve campus
- Rules accountability
- Missed one here
- RSP
- Education and policy agenda
- Response to changing demographics
- Tech transfer in traditional and non-traditional areas
- Growth-informed agendas
- Career opportunities

Donohue: I won't fall into a trap of using real numbers, e.g. doubling graduate student enrollment. I want people around the world 10 years from now to say, "They did it right. They made a change (or they didn't make a change) and it made a difference." We can't say for certain what success will be because things are driven by externalities – Washington budgets, donors. We want to impact dialogue, to move forward.

Gould: We don't want to break what we have now. We don't want to disrupt the culture on this campus.

Greenberg: The landscape has changed very quickly. For example, NIH research funding streams are really changing, especially in the need to form a research team in a multidisciplinary way.

We do want to maintain these governance structures that work really well.

Donohue: Several groups have told this group that it will be difficult to recruit one person to do the job of dean and vice chancellor of research. That is the closest I have heard about a "broken" sentiment. I am not saying I agree with this thesis.

Donohue and Gould: The Working Group could conclude that there will be no change.

Minutes

Respectfully submitted by Moira Harrington