

Vanderbilt University
Faculty Senate Meeting
November 14, 2002
4:10 p.m. Room 140 Frist Hall, Nursing School

Minutes

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes of September 12, 2002

Remarks by E. Gordon Gee, Chancellor

Scheduled Remarks:

Reports from Standing Committee Chairs

Discussion of the Academic Venture Capital Fund: Dennis Hall & Lee Limbird

Report on "History, Memory, and Confederate Hall." A 10/18/02 lecture and panel discussion co-sponsored by the History Dept. and the Faculty Senate: Don Doyle & Matt Ramsey

Old Business

New Business

Good of the Senate

Adjournment

Senators present: Booth, Clayton, Conklin, Conway-Welch, Dobbs-Weinstein, Ely, Farran, Fleetwood, Gabbe, Galloway, Goldring, Greene, Haselton, Heyneman, Innes, Knight (for Bond), Link, Masulis, McCarthy, McCarty, McGill, Neff, Osheroff, Paschal, Perkins, Pitz, Ramsey, Salisbury, Sasson, Shepherd, Simonett, Smith, Swift, Tellinghuisen, Wait, Ward.

Senators absent: Benbow, Bess, Bond, Christie, Corbin (regrets), Denison (regrets), Fogo (regrets), Goldfarb (regrets), Hawiger (regrets), Horn (regrets), Hudnut-Beumler (regrets), Lind, Morrow, Oates, Retzlaff, Saff, Summar, Syverud, Thompson (regrets), Victor, Wcislo.

Ex Officios present: Brisky, Gee, Hall, Limbird, Zeppos.

Ex Officios absent: Gherman, Jacobson (regrets), Schoenfeld, Spitz, Tuleen, Williams.

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Chair Virginia Shepherd. After receiving a request that minutes be placed as PDF files online and a request to let the record show that what was presented by Patricia Maret at the last meeting was not what was actually distributed to faculty, the Minutes of September 12, 2002 were approved as is.

Chair Shepherd began the meeting by reviewing the agenda.

Chair Shepherd then highlighted the increased role the Senate is currently seeking in the overall decision-making process of the University. This was expressed before the recent meeting of the full Board of Trust on November 9, 2002. She noted the executive committee holds monthly meetings with Chancellor Gee, as well as meetings with Provost Zeppos and Vice Chancellor Jacobson. Chair Shepherd also mentioned the increased faculty presence on University committees, such as the Graduate Education Task Force. In addition, Chair Shepherd stated that the executive committee now meets monthly with all senate committee chairs.

Next item on the agenda – tribute to Christine Scannaliato

Though not listed on the agenda, Chair Shepherd stated that the Senate would like to recognize the dedication and work of Christine Scannaliato who transferred recently to Undergraduate Admissions. Chair Shepherd read brief statements from previous chairs on Chris' lasting impact; she then introduced Jim Blumstein, immediate past chair, who said a few words. Following his remarks, Chair Shepherd introduced Chancellor Gee who also provided remarks on behalf of Chris' work. Chair Shepherd then presented a Vanderbilt University pictorial book and gift certificate to Chris.

Next item on the agenda – report from committee chairs

Business & Non-academic Affairs: Chair Swift highlighted the committee's continued discussions with Patricia Maret on the issue of healthcare costs, as well as proposed healthcare options, such as the Cafeteria Plan. Chair Swift also noted that Senator Neff, a member of the BNAA committee, had been appointed to the Health Care Cost Containment Committee, and another member of the committee would be appointed to the University Benefits Committee.

Academic Policies & Services: Chair Clayton highlighted three issues that the committee is currently addressing: (1) graduate education – The task force has met seven times already to discuss issues on the agenda. A preliminary report will be presented at the December meeting; (2) Academic Venture Capital Fund – The committee is looking at ways to become more involved in the decision-making process. Chair Clayton noted that Dennis Hall was going to address the subject in more detail later in the meeting; and (3) Provost Zeppos' Strategic Plan – The committee is looking at ways in which the Senate can become more involved with the discussion and implementation of the plan. Chair Clayton noted that the committee was waiting for Provost Zeppos' feedback.

Question: (Patricia Ward) – What are the most salient topics of graduate education?
Response: Chair Clayton noted that it is a very complex matter; each task force meeting has included discussion of a white paper topic. Clayton listed the topics already discussed, which included: (1) vision of Vanderbilt graduate education, (2) creating a new culture of graduate education, (3) apprenticeship – mentoring of graduate students, (4) recruitment, (5) investments in graduate education, and (6) information and data needs. Chair Clayton then listed those topics yet to be discussed, which included: (1) trans-institutional programs, (2) diversity and international issues, (3) structural arrangements, and (4) shared governance.

Senate Affairs: Neil Osheroff, reporting on behalf of Chair Horn, noted three issues the committee is currently addressing: (1) committee structure in the senate; (2) voting status of the deans; and (3) ex officio membership of the senate.

Student Affairs: Chair Haselton presented an overview, including PowerPoint slides, on the University's current residential colleges strategy. Chair Haselton recommends that faculty who will be selected to participate in the first college should be selected soon in order to be fully engaged in the planning of the college. (See PowerPoint presentation at <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/SA11142002.pdf>)

Point of Clarification: Robert Innes asked for clarification about the location of the first college's Master (head faculty member) residence.

Response: Chair Haselton noted that the first one is tentatively set to be located between the Vanderbilt/Barnard residence hall and Alumni Hall.

Question: Ellen Goldring inquired about the selection criteria for faculty.

Response: Chair Haselton noted that he was not sure and hoped that the Senate would be made privy to that information.

Point of Clarification: Provost Zeppos noted that the selection process had not been decided and he recommended that the Student Affairs committee propose a process.

Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom: Chair Ely noted that the committee has conducted a grievance hearing and that the decision is pending. Chair Ely also shared several matters that will be taken up by the committee following the conclusion of the hearing. These included the University's conflict of interest statement and review of the current two-committee, two-track grievance procedures and the reasoning for their separation.

Next item on the agenda – Remarks from Chancellor Gee

(Note: Chancellor Gee's remarks were given out of order from the stated agenda.)

Chancellor Gee: Chancellor Gee addressed three topics. First, He provided an overview of the recent Board of Trust meeting, which occurred November 8th & 9th. Chancellor Gee noted the changes of BOT membership, including term-limits. He also listed the four new BOT members. Second, Chancellor Gee then mentioned that the Committee on Committees has a final list of names to serve on the committee. He hopes that the committee will be finalized very soon. Third, Chancellor Gee discussed the University's current financial health, reminding the group that the bottom line is still very sound and

the pre-campaign fundraising is progressing very well. He noted that the University's endowment is down \$10-\$12 million, and that there may be modest layoffs at VUMC. He concluded that though the budget is tight, the University will continue to focus on academic and student-related matters.

Question: (Jack Sasson) – What is the BOT's membership policy?

Response: (Chancellor Gee) – A BOT committee makes recommendations for new members, keeping in mind what each candidate "can bring to the table." This includes intellectual as well as monetary capacity.

Follow up Question: (Sasson) - Is there any role for faculty in the process?

Response: (Chancellor Gee) – Yes. Faculty should contact their respective dean and provide names of faculty or others who would be strong candidates for board membership.

Next item on the agenda – Presentation by Dennis Hall (Academic Venture Capital Fund)

Dennis Hall: Associate Provost Dennis Hall presented an overview, including PowerPoint slides, on the University's Academic Venture Capital Fund (AVCF). He noted that the presentation will cover the approval process, a description of initiatives that have been approved thus far, and initiatives that are under considered. (See PowerPoint presentation at <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/AVCF.pdf>)

Question: (Rick Haselton) – Can you provide a rough breakdown of the percentage of funding that goes towards facilities?

Response: (Dennis Hall) – Not too much goes towards facilities. The funding is focused mainly on research and academics, not the building of new facilities.

Question: (Jack Sasson) -- How does the approval process verify that the submitted proposals are original and not duplicative of efforts elsewhere?

Response: (Dennis Hall) – We have a fairly rigorous review and approval process that goes through several channels before being approved.

Associate Provost Hall highlighted on his PowerPoint presentation the URLs for the campus and Medical Center AVCF websites, noting that each site goes into detail not only about the application process, but also about who is involved in approving submitted proposals.

Question: (Idit Dobbs-Weinstein) – Do faculty investigators get feedback on their proposals if they are declined?

Response: (Dennis Hall) – Yes. But the approval process is also set up to allow for all reviewing bodies at every level to ask the investigator for clarifying documents. No proposal is rejected due to a simple lack of information.

Follow Up Question: (Dobbs-Weinstein) – Can faculty members get detailed information about what the reviewing bodies are looking for prior to submitting a proposal?

Response: (Hall) – Yes. Refer to the websites.

Question: (Ellen Goldring) – What was the number of proposals you received this past year?

Response: (Dennis Hall) – I can't determine that presently, possibly six for the campus and six for VUMC. Of those, two were approved with two expected to be approved later.

Point of Clarification: (Jack Sasson) – Can you address the low number of submissions from the humanities?

Response: (Dennis Hall) – I'm not sure. I hope that when all the currently funded proposals from the humanities are formally announced, the publicity will spur others to submit proposals.

Question: (John McCarthy) – Does a guide exist that outlines what a proposal should or should not look like? Is there more than one manner by which a proposal can be submitted? A sciences proposal will look very different from a humanities proposal.

Response: Associate Provost Hall noted that they are still looking at these matters, but hopes that one discipline is not being preferred over another simply because of the proposal format and focus.

Associate Provost Hall then spotlighted the key elements that every proposal must address: (1) sustainability, (2) role of teaching & curriculum, and (3) role within the University structure.

Both Chancellor Gee and Provost Zeppos reiterated the hope and expectation that the humanities are not being slighted in favor of more science oriented proposals. They also agreed that there is something intellectually different about humanities. They recommend that there be more cross discipline proposals that blend both humanities and exact sciences.

Point of Clarification: John McCarthy noted that one of the criteria is sustainability. For the humanities, this may be difficult since often the product being created cannot be marketed and sold for revenue in the humanities.

Chair-elect Ramsey ended the discussion, but noted that this topic will be discussed further at the next meeting.

Next item on the agenda – Presentation by Don Doyle

(Report on “History, Memory, and Confederate Hall” a lecture and panel discussion co-sponsored by the Department of History and the Faculty Senate; held on October 18, 2002)

Don Doyle noted that the Civil War is one memory that still remains strong in the views of people. He also commented that several members of the University community received hate mail following the University's announcement that it was dropping the word “Confederate” from the University's building's name, particularly Vice Chancellor

Schoenfeld. Professor Doyle also shared that the University has been and continues to be demonized on various neo-Confederate websites.

Professor Doyle listed the panelists who participated, including Karen Cox, a guest speaker, who recently wrote a book on the history of the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC). Panelist Conklin spoke about the history of Peabody College and the UDC. Editorial comments were made by Richard Dickerson and Richard King. Vice Chancellor Schoenfeld talked about Vanderbilt's decision to drop the name in order to bring more inclusiveness on campus. Professor Doyle commented that following the panelists discussions the event was opened for questions. The audience comments came mainly from UDC members who were there and sitting in the front rows. Except for one male UDC supporter, the questions and comments by the audience were respectful.

Question: (Jason Morrow) – What is the current UDC membership?

Response: Matt Ramsey commented that they were few in members, roughly 20,000.

Question: (Jack Sasson) – Have other names for the hall been considered?

Response: Chancellor Gee responded that the University is willing to consider alternatives. He mentioned "Tennessee Memorial Hall" as a way to honor all Tennesseans who passed away during times of conflict. Gee noted that the UDC has not really responded to the University's request for alternatives.

Suggestion: (Jack Sasson) – How about "Conciliation Hall?"

Chair-elect Ramsey then called for any old or new business or good of the Senate.

Hearing none, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Goldring,
Secretary