

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 14, 2002

SUMMARY

PAGE

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes of December 13, 2001

Remarks of James Blumstein, Chair

Remarks of E. Gordon Gee, Chancellor

Standing Committee Reports:

Academic Policies and Services, Jay Clayton, Chair
Graduate Education at Vanderbilt

Adjourn

* * * * *

Senators present: Barz, Benbow, Blumstein, Bond, Clayton, Corbin, Denison, Dobbs-Weinstein, Ely, Farran, Fogo, Gilmer, Goldring, Gould, Haselton, Horn, Hughes, Kinzer, Link, Maneschi, McCarthy, McCarty, Mihalik, Oates, Parsley, Paschal, Pitz, Ramsey, Salisbury, Sasson, Schrimpf, Shepherd, Simonett, Smith, Swift, Syverud, Tarpley, Wilkes.

Senators absent: Bess, Bloome, Christie [regrets], Conway-Welch [regrets], Damon [regrets], Epstein [regrets], Gabbe, Galloway, Hazinski [regrets], Hudnut-Beumler [regrets], Innes, Johnson, Lind [regrets], Lowe, Newman, Osheroff, Outlaw [regrets], Strauss, Victor, Wait.

Ex Officios present: Brisky, Gee, Gherman, Hall, Limbird, Schoenfeld, Scott, Tuleen, Williams.

Ex Officios absent: Burish [regrets], Dowdy [regrets], Jacobson [regrets], Spitz, Zeppos.

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Chair James Blumstein. The Minutes of December 13, 2001 were approved as distributed. The Minutes of the Special Called Meeting of January 11, 2002 were also approved as distributed.

Chair Blumstein stated that, after a few remarks by Chancellor Gee, the remainder of the meeting would be led by Professor Jay Clayton, Chair of the Committee of Academic Policies and Services (APS) on the topic of graduate education at Vanderbilt. In the packet of materials circulated for this meeting, the APS Committee has prepared a set of recommendations to be discussed at today's meeting.

Chair Blumstein then mentioned the absence of the Senate secretary, Chris Scannaliato, due to a death in her family and expressed his appreciation of her efforts to have everything in order for this meeting prior to her leaving.

Chair Blumstein went on to thank the Chairs of the various Senate Committees for all of their diligent work this year. He then announced the Faculty Forum scheduled for the following Thursday, February 21 which will be concerned with "The Undergraduate Experience: The Residential College Proposal" with presentations by Professors Susan Ford Wiltshire, Matthew Ramsey and David Weintraub. He mentioned the transcript from the first Faculty Forum last October on Graduate Education, which was distributed via e-mail, and he hoped that everyone had had an opportunity to print it out and read it.

Chair Blumstein: I want to take this opportunity to talk about two issues very briefly before I introduce Chancellor Gee because it says a lot about what's been happening and the role of the Senate this year as a full academic partner and the responsiveness of the administration to the Senate's role on two very important issues that have come up over the course of the last month and the partnership that was forged. This is often done in private, these are often issues that are not always visible, but here are two very tangible kinds of consequences that have come from Senate initiatives this year of assuming the role of full academic partner--as the Chancellor's and this administration's responsiveness and receptiveness to and welcoming and embracing the Faculty Senate as a full academic partner in the academic planning process of the University. The first thing I want to talk about is graduate education which is on the agenda for today. This is something that Professor Jay Clayton and I have talked about. Jay, as Chair of the Academic Policies and Services Committee (APS), and the Committee have been discussing graduate education issues. The concern arose during the process that there has been a search committee started with a document drafted that defines the role of the Graduate School and the Graduate School Dean. The concern was that the process of the search was way ahead of the process of the dialogue about what the office should look like, what the structure should look like and there was a concern that these issues had not been fully and fairly aired in the Senate and by faculty overall.

I e-mailed to the Provost. The Provost in conjunction with Vice Chancellor Zeppos and Vice Chancellor Jacobson discussed this issue. I spoke with Jay (Clayton) about this, and Chancellor Gee was involved and ultimately a decision was reached, I think very constructively, to hold off that search until the Senate

has had a chance to have a dialogue and discussion about graduate education issues. I see this not as a delay but as a recognition that the circle had not been fully rounded yet; that there had to be a continued discourse and that the Senate had to be a full partner in the process of the discussion. I think that's an example of where the Senate has had a very constructive role and Chancellor Gee, Vice Chancellor Zeppos and Vice Chancellor David Williams and Provost Tom Burish have been very responsive in a tangible way in getting the input of the Senate .

The second example of this is the compliance plan. This is one of those nitty gritty issues that most people kind of glaze over. It's not very interesting. Sad to say, for those of us who are lawyers, this is what we really worry about, what we really like to think about. The compliance plan came to the Executive Committee and we have some concerns. I have circulated the proposal to my colleagues on the Law faculty because again this is an issue that the Law School has a lot of competence in. I received several responses from the law faculty. Jim Epstein reviewed this and gave me his comments and in consultation with Jim Epstein I composed a letter on January 21. I had been told that on January 28th that this issue was going to be presented to the vice chancellors and the way it was presented to us was that there would be a decision reached on January 28th about adopting the compliance plan for the University. We put up a big yellow cautionary light in that letter of January 21. Six numbered paragraphs expressed in detail concerns about the draft. There were serious reservations that we had that needed to be more fully addressed. Procedurally, the Senate through the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF) Committee had not had a chance to really review this and comment on this and become a participant. I am pleased to say that nearly immediately Chancellor Gee, Vice Chancellor Jacobson, Vice Chancellor Williams, and Vice Chancellor Zeppos were very responsive in deferring any final consideration and implementation of this very important compliance plan until the Senate has had a chance to review and comment. This issue is now in the hands of the PEAFF Committee, which is in the process of reviewing this and a draft will be circulated later this week or the first of next week. The administration wants to hear from us and we want to respond in an expeditious manner. So, those are two very concrete examples of how the Senate is playing an instrumental role in my view. The compliance plan issue and the graduate education issue are two very important things that we as faculty are concerned about and in the case of the compliance plan, would have far-reaching potential consequences that I think no one really intended but certainly had that potential.

Chair Blumstein then welcomed Chancellor Gee to give his perspective on things at the University.

REMARKS OF CHANCELLOR GEE

Chancellor Gee: We are in the process of defining our role at this institution. Clarity and simplicity and accountability are all a part of that and certainly in my role as Chancellor of the University is one to make certain that it is made clear that you as faculty are not only a faculty in terms of what you do but a faculty in terms of wisdom and in terms ultimately having the responsibility for making the decisions of this institution. I believe that, I want that to be clear. I think that the role of the Executive Committee of the Senate is helping us to make sure that we have a momentary pause to come back and reflect on those issues that are important. When mistakes are made, they are made in the spirit of trying to do what is right and also when mistakes are made, they will be corrected. I welcome that. And in saying that, let me say that the discussion on graduate education is one of the most important to have. As I take a look at the goals that I outlined to the Senate when I first spoke with you I think we have made progress on almost all of them, some of them we have made significant progress. I would have to say that the one in which we have stalled is graduate education. Some of it is my fault, some of it the fact that we are trying to discover what we mean about improving the quality of graduate education.

So what is it we want to accomplish in improving the quality of graduate education? How quickly do we want to do it? What kinds of decisions will we make in that regard and how do we move forward in a way that brings people along progressively? I will be anxious to hear that conversation, but at the same time, I would say to the Senate that we need to move along. I think we have made clear progress but, in terms of the ultimate notion of a division of graduate education at this institution, I want to make sure we have a consensus view as to how we arrive at a vision and a process to allow us to move forward.

Saying that, in terms of the compliance issue, I would also state that I'm glad that we have that resolved and that we are moving that forward. We have been through a period of transition at this institution that will continue for a short period of time but I believe that much of our transition will soon be behind us and I look forward to the end of the semester to making certain that I will have no more announcements about the structure.

Chair Blumstein: Thank you Chancellor Gee for your comments. It's not a question of accountability or responsibility, we appreciate the partnership that you and Vice Chancellors Jacobson, Williams, and Zeppos have afforded us.

Now we move forward to the discussion on graduate education. This is really not a decision-oriented meeting, it's a discussion-oriented meeting as Jay (Clayton) talked about. It is important to recognize that there are different customs and practices across the Schools. Chair Blumstein then introduced Professor Jay Clayton, Chair of the Committee on Academic Policies and Services.

Senator Clayton: Thank you, Jim, we appreciate all of your support on behalf of our endeavors. I also appreciate the fact that you have taken most of my introduction away from me so I don't need to make a good part of it. I will say a word about our procedure. We did not try to re-study the whole question of graduate education. One of our former senators, Howard Sandler, was on the CRGS (Committee to Review the Graduate School) and that Committee worked very hard to prepare their study. Our job was to respond to the work that they've done. And further on, we decided to focus on the principle rather than structure. We thought it important to formulate the goals for graduate education so that we could have a vision of our aspirations before us before we entered into a debate about the means of reaching those goals. Let me emphasize this committee as a whole is not recommending either a centralized or a de-centralized model for Vanderbilt. Individual members of the Committee had views on this question, but we want to concentrate on the logically prior question of the goals our University should embrace for graduate education.

So what are our goals for graduate study here at Vanderbilt? First, we think a re-orientation of the culture at Vanderbilt is needed to affirm the centrality of graduate education to our mission. At present, graduate education is not central to our mission. It is the stepchild of the university, something we turn to when undergraduate needs for courses or for advising have been met. Chancellor Gee refers to our graduate program as the short leg on the tripod of this university. This re-orientation in culture will need to address the incentive structure for deans, departments, and individual faculty to put more emphasis on achieving excellence in training graduate students and conducting the research that brings good graduate students to our university in the first place. This re-orientation will also have to encourage administrators, departments and faculty to make difficult decisions – decisions about the size of graduate programs, about cutting programs, or merging them with other stronger initiatives, about concentrating resources where they can do the most good, about the direction of programs within their own disciplines, and about rewarding research as fully as teaching.

Second, whatever structure we choose--and let me say again that the Committee is neutral on this point--the office or offices in charge of graduate education need to have several features. These offices need to be proactive rather than merely reactive and to do more than just oversee or evaluate pre-existing programs. They need to be active in roles such as faculty recruiting and supporting of research. They need to initiate or be able to initiate inter-disciplinary or trans-institutional programs. The offices in charge of graduate education need to eliminate barriers, not block progress, need to work to remove disincentives to research and graduate training and be a positive facilitator of faculty and schools to reach their highest goals.

Third, and finally, to make all this happen, we think Vanderbilt needs to put its money where its mouth is. Graduate education needs strong financial backing

from the university. There are, of course, different models for funding research, some more appropriate for Natural Sciences and the Medical School; others for the Humanities, Social Sciences, parts of the Education, the Engineering and the Law Schools, but without institutional investment in the graduate education all the talk of striving for excellence will ring hollow.

Funds can be administrated in many different ways, and whether the funds come through a centralized structure or were administered through a decentralized model, does not matter as much as gaining a strong financial commitment to graduate education. We believe that either of these models could work. What's needed at first is a strong commitment from all of us here at Vanderbilt to the importance of graduate education. One thing that won't work is a weak Graduate Dean's office. If graduate programs are going to be directed by the individual schools, then we'll have to abolish the Graduate Dean's position entirely and keep only a small administrative office. If graduate education is going to be run through a centralized office then let's give the Graduate Dean real authority and real resources.

Finally, whatever model we choose, there must be a strong principle of accountability. The Provost and the Vice Chancellors for Medical Affairs should hold us all responsible for obtaining the goals we set for ourselves in graduate education. With that, let me open the floor for questions, reactions, statements.

Senator Mihalik: I'd like to have a clearer picture of where our graduate controls are going to be as opposed to saying something vague like we want the present programs to be as good as they can be. What specifically are going to be our benchmarks? What about accountability?

Senator Clayton: I think there are others in the room more suited to answer that than I am, but the kinds of issues of accountability the Committee had in mind were improvement in recruiting to graduate programs, improvement in placement of our graduate students. If additional resources were devoted to graduate programs then departments and schools would need to show that they had met the goals down the line in various measurable areas from that initial investment. I think that there is a certain amount of vagueness about accountability because each individual school is going to have its own standards for what qualifies as excellence.

Senator Schrimpf: Assuming the possibility of centralized model, how would we be reconciled to a central committee of the graduate school funded and the distribution of funds with the kind of decentralized model of funding that is fairly strong in schools already?

Senator Clayton: Howard [Sandler] do you want to take that one?
Senator Sandler: I don't think that's incompatible in the least but I don't imagine a graduate dean in conjunction with a school dean agreeing that the math

department needs an infusion of funds will be held accountable to get the students in better schools five years from now, whatever, and perhaps pay for some scholarships, or commit to buying out part of faculty time for brief periods. All very brief, but that would be an infusion of funds into the school with, obviously, consultation and consent of the school dean in a way that would meet university needs as well as school needs and department needs, and you couldn't do that for every department but I don't see those as incompatible, I see it as win-win.

Unknown Senator: One thing that was discussed in the Committee that perhaps needs to be emphasized is the infrastructure of how and when the students are recruited, and how they are placed after they leave. The real essence of excellence of the graduate program is that Vanderbilt has the leading scholars that attracts the very best graduate students to this institution and will give them a personal experience while they are here. In terms of accountability of goals, it seems to me that part of this is for the university to identify, through an analysis, what the needs are at the departmental level to achieve that level of scholarship in the departments where the university feels that it is important to develop graduate education, and this is going to take a major effort to achieve this excellence in the targeted areas. I don't think we can achieve excellence in graduate education as we wish to if it's not going to be gained at all levels. I think it requires a significant effort on the part of the university. It's fairly important now and we have a golden opportunity for multi-disciplinary programs across the campus to take advantage of this.

Unknown (possibly Senator Denison): In many disciplines graduate education and externally funded research are inextricably linked and when that money is obtained, it's usually already designated for a particular allocation.

Senator Clayton: Right, the money for graduate training and what we on the Committee began to call the "Medical School Model" tends to operate that way. The CRGS recommended ten to one that we have a strong centralized model. It gave its reasons for that recommendation in the document that we've all had time to study. The Committee is not endorsing or arguing against it either. That's the kind of structural issue that we're trying not to take a position on but I think it is important to answer your question because thinking about principles inevitably gets things intermixed with thinking about how things would work. If one were to choose a central Graduate Dean who would have at his or her disposal independent funds, that person or that office could use the money to initiate programs that were not going on in individual schools already, that person could use those funds to create links between schools. Many of us have experienced frustration in trying to get inter-disciplinary or trans-institutional initiatives off the ground, and it would be a good idea for someone to be in charge of a budget that could help make those things happen. On the other hand, we think that some of those goals could be accomplished in different ways in a decentralized model.

Senator Sasson: I think one of the notions about deans of graduate schools being empowered, I don't like to use centralized but empowered, to do various things, I think one of the acts that they will be pursuing is to see if they can go outside of this university and sell to people who don't even know what graduate studies is about. In the Medical School and in School of Engineering and other places, normally a faculty raises their own funds to run whatever project they have. It doesn't work like that in Arts and Science, it doesn't work like that in the Divinity School where I am. What you need is some type of an officer who has a clear sight for what graduate education is about to go out there and sell whether it's to a corporation, whether it's donors, the notion that funding graduate students, especially people who come in to make the study not only practical aspects but let us say on management, on enlarging our knowledge about the ancient world, about middle ages, those people are also very much worthwhile of their support. And you are not likely going to get any other officer at this university who would have the time and also would have the focus to try to sell specifically just that. We need somehow, some person whenever they appear, people will know they are coming out to get from our pocket for a specific purpose and that purpose is funding graduate education. We don't have that as far as I know right now.

Senator McCarthy: It seems to me that we are in agreement. What I want to stress is the emphasis you wish to place on the principle of the structure. I think that there might be a way to address the differences. It seems to me that we can agree that graduate education is centered upon faculty who are intellectually active, productive as scholars, people who can in turn attract the best qualified students. Possibly the third element would be what other structure is best suited to facilitate the interaction of faculty to students in the realization of their fondest hope to the extension of knowledge and ultimately the placement of the student in a wonderful job. Accountability must reside in the faculty, but at the same time there has got to be an accountability on the part of the administrators as facilitators. So the accountability has to be in terms of the individual disciplines represented or the inter-disciplinary context involved. Time is also crucial. It would be a mistake to think that we could take money and throw it at a problem and assume that within two to three years the problem will be solved. No, it's going to take longer, particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences where the work for a Ph.D may take six years or even longer. And then usually it takes a couple of years before the student can find a permanent, tenure-track position. So it seems to me that the notion of accountability has to be seen not as a one-way street from above to below or below to above but rather as an interactive, proactive response among equals, all of whom are working for the same thing. Seen in this light, we're all in the same boat and a boat has to have a captain, the group can't run the boat but on the other hand the captain can't reach his or her goal if the crew is not willing to sail in the same direction.

Senator Clayton: Vanderbilt has a long tradition of not offering research professorships on the University Central side. Our campus has taken pride in the fact that every faculty member, regardless of eminence, teaches a full load every semester. Some of our rival universities offer packages to the most eminent researchers that include greatly reduced teaching responsibilities. I'm ambivalent about that as an individual committee member. I think it is an admirable aspect of our university that everyone on University Central side teaches as well as does research. But I know that it puts us at a competitive disadvantage to other universities that say to prospective faculty members, "Come teach one course a year not four courses a year like Vanderbilt." In our department, every member of our faculty is required to teach freshman composition. And I'm in favor of that. I think it's an ethical commitment to teach the most elementary subject. But it's a recruiting dis-incentive, I'll tell you.

Senator Sasson: There are other quaint things that go along here. When I first came here I discovered, for example, that for you to fit in somewhere you cannot teach a class that has less than such a number of students. Now if you had a notion that you have also graduate research which you can allow a fewer number of students because your practicing students becomescholars, it can change the mentality but you are not going to have it unless you have a graduate notion about what education and about what scholarship and about what teaching is about too. It is just not a matter of how many students can we afford to have for each faculty member. On another matter, when I first came here to Vanderbilt, one of the most impressive things about Vanderbilt is that this has an extremely good faculty and it has faculty here and there and everywhere but you won't be able to find it out. You have to go out on your own to discover it, there is nobody here right now that makes it as one of his main tasks to go beyond the small circles that we have, the small departments that we have, and look across the university and think, hey we have the potential of creating something very worthwhile, something new, something not being done on the graduate level someone who thinks of it as being precisely their business to try tous a bit and get us to talk to each other. I discovered someone in Peabody who turns out to be an absolutely great resource for the Divinity School but it had to be done through e-mail, no where, anywhere could I find that out. So there is a problem here, a problem of balkanization and you are not going to break it by just saying stay with it and we'll do better. Not going to happen. We're going to get stuck with it.

Senator Denison: What I realized is that we are trying to workculturally within the school. In the Medical School I have been worrying and troubling about centralized and de-centralized and how do we block and prevent obstructions. Something that I heard for the first time today about release from teaching for opportunities for doing graduate educationthat there is no positive incentive.....for getting that, I was actually shocked to hear that becausesome of my colleagues. I think that, in some ways, at the medical center in some ways what we are are a lot of entrepreneurs and it kind of shocks

that are supported by a central structure but we have in lots of ways very strong incentives and very strong dis-incentives at a very fundamental level. So my question is, is it possible to introduce people or to introduce that kind of incentive to individuals at the other schools so that they can obtain those same incentives or dis-incentives because they are very practical and I think many of them, given human nature, would like to see the money.....

Senator Fogo: I think it is very interesting that the last couple of comments talked about removing teaching loads, being able to bargain people into teaching, and it strikes me as inherently very contradictory that teaching is viewed as a negative and something that we are trying to remove ourselves from, having incentives and dis-incentives to teach. I believe that if you are in the university whether in the medical center or outside the medical center, that an inherent component of being in the university is to be a scholar who tries to gain knowledge and to share knowledge. It strikes me as utterly strange to be talking about trying to remove oneself from teaching. I think that that is a fundamental part of being a university and I think that we should be in a position where we are striving to see how we could share and gain more knowledge. Not teaching to the extent that we cannot gain more knowledge ourselves, but that we have more to share. But if our structure is such that we are trying to avoid teaching, then I think the university itself is terminally ill.

Senator Denison: I'm not saying that at all. I think graduate education is a critical aspect of teaching, a different kind of teaching with a different kind of priorities and commitments. The only reason I'm saying this is because of the nature of what I do and I got a university research teaching award last year for my teaching of medical students and primary teaching not based on my graduate education. I'm highly committed to that but I think that we can't do everything all the time at the same time and still hope to achieve all those goals so that it may be that everybody tries to do it equally, they have to be centralized in different ways. I agree that teaching is fundamental but there are different ways of achieving that goal.

Senator Dobbs-Weinstein: I think that there is a misperception of the relation between teaching in entry level and research. I think that in order to be a first-rate teacher, an excitingly inspiring teacher, even to undergraduates you have to have support and some relief occasionally to be able to come back renewed. Otherwise, you rely on your old notes, we have all known people like this, we've all had teachers like that with people repeating the same jokes again and again and again so that even the cues are the same. That is not a first-rate teacher, that is not an inspiring teacher.

Senator McCarthy: That's why I took my notes originally on yellow paper. But that's not my comment. I want to come back to this notion of what is involved in teaching and that there are different kinds of teaching. And something that I've noticed here at Vanderbilt is that advising dissertating students is not highly

valued and what I've heard is that "well, that's something you do as advising." But advising a dissertating student involves an enormous amount of energy, additional reading, and particularly if you are in a field where the students coming into it are not necessarily the most competitive in terms of GRE scores, you end up spending more time working with them so that the final product is marketable. And the success that programs are able to achieve is due to this enormous amount of energy invested in this individualized kind of teaching in terms of a masters thesis or the dissertation.

Senator Clayton: Here at Vanderbilt there is a very distinctive campus culture in which teaching is highly valued, highly emphasized. We are a good teaching campus. I don't think that neglecting teaching is what we have to worry about right now. I don't think that the people here who are already good teachers, who have already won awards for their teaching like Mark (Denison) has, are going to change just because we do put some more weight on the side of research, I don't think we will stop being good teachers, and I think that some adjustment needs to be made at Vanderbilt towards research as a matter of culture.

Dean McCarty: Faculty members can in fact get course relief through grant support and I'll be happy to help them. Secondly, it is recognized that small courses are inevitable in a place this small. At least in the College of Arts & Science and I dare say it's true elsewhere and I'd like anyone to show me a course that was cancelled due to small enrollment.

Senator Sassor: It was done in Women's Studies Dean McCarty: It was done on the departmental level not by the Dean's office, and it's been made clear to the program directors and department chairs that this is a necessary consequence of the way we do business. Many of our graduate programs cannot meet the minimum enrollment and that's been recognized. We can't be oblivious to the fact that the competitive issues right now in recruiting the best faculty require that we be competitive so we may give reduced teaching but we require the very best out of everyone who's in the classroom. If we aren't mindful of this, we are not going to be able to recruit most of the senior faculty we are going after this year.

Senator Fogo: I think it is absolutely essential to have a balance. If you only teach and you do not have something that you have profound knowledge of, you really are reading the textbook, you might as well get audio cassettes. The main point that I hoped that I made and I'll restate is that we have to be able to be gaining knowledge and also to share the knowledge and I think it is extremely important to be able to have that balance. I was reacting to comments that sounded as if we wanted to remove teaching responsibility so that we could have excellent faculty come here. That might be terrific for recruitment of such faculty but it's not going to be so terrific for recruitment of the students. And I think the balance of those competing loads is extremely important. It could be what Mark

[Denison] said - it is obvious that people like Mark are going to keep on doing excellent teaching, but there are other people closely related to the teaching effort that resigned their teaching from a core medical school course because of the demand for clinical work load and bringing in money for other needs. This accountability of money versus time available for teaching is also out of balance.

Dr. Limbird: I was just going to say that one example of the inextricable link between teaching and research is the people who win the Earl Sutherland Prize, they are inextricably linked and people who are excellent tend to be excellent. The more they learn in their research the more they have to share with enthusiasm.

Chair Blumstein: On the third bullet point regarding the proposal to transfer \$40 million, and I hate to be mercenary about this but it is one of the most far-reaching proposals here and to give guidance to the APS Committee as they go back and discuss this, if we're going to see this in the Senate to be voted on in the future, we need to get some sense of what the Senate really thinks about that issue because that's a very far-reaching proposal. We've talked a lot about the academic venture fund, which is an important cross-disciplinary initiative of the administration. This is a statement that says these are bigger priorities – a big chunk of that, now my understanding is that it is not over one year, this \$40 million can be phased in over a period of years which would make it easier. But still it's a big chunk of change and it's a statement that this is a priority over and above trans-institutional, cross-institutional research ventures. So I would like to hear some discussion about that. That's a very basic, core, very practical proposal and I think APS needs to know what we think about it.

Senator Clayton: Let me say one thing about that. If a centralized model is chosen, then that money needs to be raised by the development office for graduate education. It would go to the Graduate Dean to give that person some clout. But Vice Chancellor Jacobson proposed this morning that if we were using a de-centralized model that the five deans that have large graduate programs might band together to request that money. In other words, band together to make a proposal to the Venture Fund. That would be a mechanism by which the deans could ask for that money on behalf of a de-centralized structure of graduate programs.

Senator Dobbs-Weinstein: It occurred to me, when you said that the deans would band together, its tough to get people working together with conflict of interest to a great extent. In other words, I'm not sure how whoever administers the Venture Fund is going to be made given the very different models of excellence. How do you see the decentralized model being able to address that?

Senator McCarthy: You started your remarks by saying that graduate education has been treated like a stepchild and I concur with that. A stepchild

does not have any monetary funds, therefore I believe that it is imperative that funds be earmarked for graduate education. How those funds are to be administered will depend upon the ultimate structure selected, obviously. But nevertheless the funds should be clearly earmarked for expenditure on graduate education initiatives, scholarships, whatever it takes. I want to point out the history – we once had a premiere graduate school but it disappeared with the endowed fund.

Senator Schimpf: I'm concerned that a fund like that would address only the specific needs of perhaps A&S and a couple of others because \$40 million would not really address the problems that we have in engineering, and sciences or in the medical center. We by and large fund graduate education from internal funds as it is. We have funds to build new buildings and that sort of thing and I don't imagine that that's what its going to be spent on.

Senator Oates: I just wanted to say that it is extremely important that those funds be applied to Arts & Sciences. Arts & Sciences really needs that kind of additional support which will then benefit all of us in the professional schools. Senator Clayton: That is the perfect ending.

The meeting was then adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

MaryJo Gilmer
Secretary

MJG/cs