

Vanderbilt University
Faculty Senate Meeting
December 12, 2002
4:10 p.m. Room 140 Frist Hall, Nursing School

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes of November 14, 2002

Remarks by Virginia Shepherd, Faculty Senate Chair

Remarks by E. Gordon Gee, Chancellor

Panel Discussion - AVCF Initiatives

Jeffrey Schall, Center for Integrative and Cognitive Neuroscience

Marshall Eakin, Center for the Americas

Don Welch, Program in Law and Business

Richard Haglund, Vanderbilt Institute for Nanoscale Science & Engineering

Scheduled remarks:

Reports from Standing Committee Chairs

Senator Jay Clayton: Graduate Education Task Force

Old business

New business

Good of the Senate

Adjournment

Voting Members present: Benbow, Booth, Clayton, Conklin, Corbin, Denison, Dobbs-Weinstein, Ely, Farran, Fleetwood, Fogo, Goldfarb, Goldring, Haselton, Hawiger, Heyneman, Horn, Innes, Lind, Link, Masulis, McCarthy, McGill, Morrow, Neff, Osheroff, Paschal, Perkins, Pitz, Ramsey, Saff, Salisbury, Sasson, Sevin, Shepherd, Simonett, Strauss, Summar, Swift, Tellinghuisen, Thompson, Ward

Voting Members absent: Bess (regrets), Bond, Christie, Conway-Welch (regrets), Gabbe, Galloway, Greene (regrets), Hudnut-Beumler (regrets), McCarty (regrets), Oates, Retzlaff, Sasson (regrets), Syverud (regrets), Thompson (regrets), Victor, Wait (regrets), Wcislo

Ex Officio Members present: Brisky, Gee, Gherman, Hall, Limbird, Schoenfeld, Williams

Ex Officio Members absent: Jacobson (regrets), Spitz, Tuleen, Zeppos (regrets)

.....

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Chair Virginia Shepherd. After requesting for changes, the Minutes of September 12, 2002 were approved as is.

Chair Shepherd began the meeting by reviewing the agenda.

Chair Shepherd then proceeded to make the following announcements. She introduced Danielle Mezera, Chief of Staff, Faculty Senate. Chair Shepherd noted the significance of the position and the role the position will play in advancing faculty and academic initiatives at Vanderbilt. The position will also serve as a liaison to University administrative officers and the deans of schools.

In recognizing the need for the Senate, particularly its officers, to maintain a pulse on issues affecting the faculty community, Chair Shepherd requested feedback on the role the Senate should have on University matters, as well as feedback on issues that the Senate should focus on. She asked that feedback be sent either to Danielle (Danielle.mezera@vanderbilt.edu) or her (Shephev@aol.com).

Chair Shepherd announced three upcoming events and urged Senators to place the events on their calendars. A special meeting of the Faculty Senate will take place on January 13, 2003 at 4:10 p.m. (amended location: Nursing Annex 165). The meeting will be devoted exclusively to graduate education and the efforts of the Graduate Education Task Force. On April 7, 2003, Frank Rhodes, Cornell University (president emeritus), will be the featured keynote speaker at a luncheon hosted by the Senate. More information will be forthcoming. Chair Shepherd also noted that the Senate will host a Southeastern Conference gathering of faculty governance leaders. The meeting will take place in early April and will focus on faculty governance, and academics and athletics. She mentioned the Big10 Coalition document, which is posted on the Senate webpage under "Upcoming Events." A steering committee will be appointed to begin planning the April gathering. (View PowerPoint presentation on Chair Shepherd's remarks at <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/121202present.pdf>)

Next item on the agenda – Remarks from Chancellor Gee

Chancellor Gee: Chancellor Gee spoke on several topics. Welcoming Danielle to her new role, he noted that it was a positive turning point in the relationship between the University administration and the faculty body. He then turned his attention to the Board of Trust Executive Committee that took place yesterday. The committee discussed changes to the current budgeting process and structure, noting that the structure is now being referred to as "ETOB light." This change will allow for more cross disciplinary initiatives and more freeing of finances for the various schools. Chancellor Gee noted that the committee was very supportive of this change.

Chancellor Gee announced the resignation of Bill Smith as interim dean of the Graduate School, thanking him for his service. As graduate education continues its transition at the University, Dennis Hall has been appointed acting associate provost for graduate education. Chancellor Gee mentioned that the Graduate Education Task Force has a January 15 deadline to submit a report, with recommendations, to the Provost.

Chancellor Gee announced that Larry Marnett & Dennis Hall have agreed to serve as co-chairs of the Committee on Committees task force. The group's first meeting will take place in January and will be expected to submit its report prior to the conclusion of the spring semester.

Chancellor Gee briefly highlighted his December 8, 2002 opinion piece in the Tennessean, which addressed academic freedoms. The piece was written in response to recent discussions held on behalf of Professor Farley's comments concerning the Civil War and the Confederacy. He also mentioned the opening of the pedestrian bridge, connecting Peabody College to the main campus. In addition, he noted the recent announcement of the "National Scholar Athlete" award from the National Football Foundation and College Football Hall of Fame to Vanderbilt senior middle linebacker Hunter Hillenmeyer.

Next item on the agenda – Academic Venture Capital Fund

Chair Shepherd noted that discussion on this subject concluded too soon at the last meeting; therefore, the Senate decided to revisit the issue through a panel discussion. She then listed those projects currently funded and near final approval for funding. Chair Shepherd also shared a list of questions posed to each panelist. Following the review of questions, she introduced each panelist.

First panelist – Jeff Schall, Center for Integrative and Cognitive Neuroscience

Professor Schall provided a brief history on the Center and how it came into existence. He also noted the various disciplines and departments involved in the Center and the overall focus of the Center. Professor Schall noted that the project was developed hand-in-hand with the Provost's office and nearly all faculty involved with the Center are currently Vanderbilt faculty. (View Professor Schall's speaking notes and progress-to-date on the Center at

[http:// www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/CICN121202.pdf](http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/CICN121202.pdf))

Professor Schall opened it up for questions.

Question: (Jacek Hawiger) – How many faculty members were recruited or are being recruited for the Center?

Response: (Professor Schall) – Thirty to 40 people.

Follow up Question: (Hawiger) – How many are new faculty members?

Response: (Schall) – Most are existing faculty. Only 4-5 faculty members involved with the Center are new.

Follow up Question: (Hawiger) – Do you have plans to recruit more than the current count?

Response: (Schall) – No. There are no plans to expand. We are interested in looking for the right set of people not quantity.

Question: (Michael Goldfarb) – What are your plans for external support?

Response: (Professor Schall) – For us, the Vanderbilt Brain Institute is charged with obtaining funds for neuroscience studies, so we are working with them to seek out funding for the Center. We are working with the Institute and with Institutional Planning and Advancement to gain donors and funds.

Second panelist – Marshall Eakin, Center for the Americas

Professor Eakin provided a brief history on the Center and how it came into existence. He too noted that the project was conceived hand-in-hand with the Provost's office, as well as the Dean of the College of A&S' office. Professor Eakin mentioned that difficulties arose due to the changing leadership at the deanship level. He stated that the numerous changes affected the overall structure and focus of the Center (as well as the name), noting that what was first discussed as the Center's focus is not what it is now.

Professor Eakin stated that for the humanities and social science disciplines it is extremely difficult to raise long-term capital from grants or other self sustaining measures. In nearly all cases, which is the case for his center, the centers are required to raise an endowed budget. For the Center for the Americas, it is estimated that an endowment of \$10 million will be required. Professor Eakin noted that presently his funding needs are being revisited by the AVCF. (View Professor Eakin's speaking notes on the Center at [http:// www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/eakin121202.pdf](http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/eakin121202.pdf))

Professor Eakin opened it up for questions. None were raised.

Third panelist – Richard Haglund, Vanderbilt Institute for Nanoscale Science & Engineering

Professor Haglund conveyed Leonard Feldman's regrets that he could not address the Senate. Professor Feldman is the director of the Institute. Using a detailed PowerPoint presentation, Professor Haglund described what nanoscale science is and its overall application. (View Professor Haglund's PowerPoint presentation within the Senate's PowerPoint presentation at <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/121202present.pdf>)

Professor Haglund also noted that the impetus for the formation of this Institute came from the faculty already working in this area, aided in an organizational sense by the formation of the Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Materials Science. With encouragement and feedback from the Strategic Academic Planning Group, the proposal was formulated and by the core faculty and the iterative AVCF process began in the summer of 2001. Two important developments outside Vanderbilt are important in this connection: One is the National Nanotechnology Initiative (NNI), the multidisciplinary, inter-agency umbrella program for focusing and stimulating research in nanoscience and nanotechnology. The other is the connection the Institute has with Oak Ridge, noting that several faculty members who are tied to the Institute also have ties to Oak Ridge, where a major Department of Energy nanoscience facility is under construction. This connection is very helpful to the Institute faculty, graduate students and postdoctoral scholars.

Professor Haglund stated that the Institute has not focused on a single project, but instead has emphasized the development of shared infrastructure that will stimulate collaborative efforts by the faculty and create much needed on-campus capacity for materials synthesis, fabrication and characterization. Of course, this infrastructure will be used to attract stellar junior and senior faculty in the participating departments. He refers to his PowerPoint presentation as he discusses critical development issues for the Institute, including attracting stellar faculty and top notch graduate

students, as well as a strategy for identifying, acquiring, and maintaining major equipment. He concluded by stating that the Institute wants to be major player in the National Nanotechnology Initiative; based on recent successful proposals in intense national competitions from several agencies, we are increasingly recognized as an important center for nanoscience and technology. This success is underscored by the recent appointment of Peter Cummings as the first faculty member tapped for the Institute; Professor Cummings holds an endowed chair in Chemical Engineering.

Professor Haglund opened it up for questions.

Question: (Ginny Shepherd) – What major departments are involved with the Institute?

Response: (Professor Haglund) – There are several, including nearly all engineering disciplines, as well as physics and chemistry.

Question: (Jacek Hawiger) – Will the graduate students teach or be used strictly for research?

Response: (Professor Haglund) – The students will be research-oriented; however, there will be an educational component. The program is not structured to provide a 100% support; therefore, the University investment will be leveraged by existing research funds from faculty involved with the Institute.

A question was raised about whether or not new faculty lines would be created for the Institute. To this, Professor Haglund responded that the nanoscience/nanoengineering positions are being made within the envelop of current faculty searches.

Point of Clarification: (Dennis Hall) – Could you talk more about the new course associated with the work of the Institute?

Response: (Professor Haglund) – This current semester a new course was created (IMS 320), and it is unusual. There are 22 students, representing all the departmental players in the initiative; the course was taught by 16 faculty members. Kane Jennings (Chemical Engineering) organized and administered it. It is a multi-disciplinary course, covering nanomaterials synthesis, characterization and applications.

Fourth panelist – Don Welch, Program in Law and Business

Professor Welch conveyed Deans Christie and Syverud's regrets, as well as Professor Randall Thomas (director of the Program), that they could not address the Senate. All have played major roles in creating the program and continuing it. Professor Welch noted that the Program is in its second year and is a relatively focused program. The overall development of the Program was smooth because both deans had already been in discussions on closer collaboration between the schools. Professor Welch stated that currently there is a need for more integration between law and management in the academic community.

In the Program's first year, five new co-taught courses were developed. This year, there are 11 co-taught courses. The program also provides summer funding for faculty who are doing research in the area or developing new cross-disciplinary courses. The program also sponsors a law and business conference each spring, as well as a Judge in Residence program. In addition, the program has a regular workshop series focused on law and finance. The Program is currently working on developing a director college with the New York Stock Exchange. Professor Welch noted that like

Professor Eakin, his program will be dependent on an endowment, \$1 million of which has already been secured. (View Professor Welch's speaking notes on the Program at <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/Welch121202.pdf>)

Professor Welch opened it up for questions. None were raised.

Chair Shepherd opened it up for a general discussion on AVCF.

Point of Clarification: (Ginny Shepherd) – One issue that has been raised already is how to generate initiatives in the humanities and social sciences. Chair Shepherd asked for ideas and feedback from the Faculty Senate. She noted that the Senate will be researching humanities and social science centers at other universities to study their organizational structures and funding models.

Point of Clarification: (Jay Clayton) – APS will be looking into this matter in the spring. The committee hopes to meet with Dennis Hall and Lee Limbird.

Question: (Ellen Goldring) – How is each initiative hoping to maintain sustainability? Will it be through donors, grants, other forms?

Response: (Professor Schall) – For us, some funding is one-time to cover certain immediate needs of the Center. Less than half is being covered by AVCF. Once the five-year AVCF funding limit concludes, then the Center will need on-going money for support staff costs. It is our hope that we will have an endowment created to cover that expense.

Response: (Professor Eakin) – For us, it's pretty simple – no endowment, no center. We are looking for soft money through grants and donors.

Response: (Professor Haglund) – We look for funding largely from research grants. Some AVCF money is earmarked for facilities to house collaborative efforts between schools. At some point, however, the Institute will need its own building. When that time comes, we will need to raise capital.

Response: (Professor Welch) – Our situation is the same as Professor Eakin's. We need an endowment.

Question: (Patricia Ward) – What is the commitment to current faculty lines?

Response: (Professor Schall) – Our center is comprised of nearly all current faculty.

Response: (Professor Eakin) – We are not suggesting any new faculty for the center; however, we are looking at endowed chairs.

Response: (Professor Haglund) – We also hope to draw from existing faculty.

Response: (Professor Welch) – Our program uses existing faculty. Our faculty salary money goes to visiting professors and speakers.

Question: (James Booth) – This is directed to Professor Eakin. If you do add new faculty, what would be the potential make up, and how would that make up maintain the mission of the Center?

Response: (Professor Eakin) – We plan to create two endowed chairs, 3 post-doctoral positions to teach new courses, and through persuasion, we hope to leverage new hires into center. The endowed chairs and post-doc positions would be focused on sustaining the mission of the Center.

Question: (John McCarthy) – I am struck by the enthusiasm of the deans in the development of these centers. Obviously, each of you was able to get on the train early due to the interest and desire of the administration; however, there are only so many seats left on the train. There is only so much

money left. Georgetown University was able to attract \$10 million to endow a center for the study of Europe. Could our Center of Americas lead to other geographical centers?

Response: (Professor Eakin) – Our Center was created on an existing strength in this field. This strength is what led to discussions to formally create a center. Not sure if others will be created since it really is based on existing strength.

Question: (Robert Innes) – AVCF is obviously identifying those areas that the University excels in. Are we comfortable with what is being created?

Response: (Professor Schall) – Again, it's building on pre-existing strengths.

Point of Concern: (Innes) – I feel that some faculty are getting worried that some disciplines or interests are getting left behind – particularly in the humanities. Is someone 'watching' out for the total enterprise?

Response: (Chair Shepherd) – That is an important point and should be a concern that the Faculty Senate examines – The Senate needs to look at whether there are disciplines that are being left behind?

Point of Opinion: (Dan Fleetwood) – I want to share that critical to the existence of nanoscale science and biosystems is a need for initiatives and resources that cross disciplines and interests. That is where we should be looking for new proposals.

Question: (Idit Dobbs-Weinstein) – Looking at the various budgets, how do you plan to generate money?

Response: (Professor Eakin) – We plan to set aside money for an annual conference. It is our hope that the conference will provide visibility that in turn will help raise money.

Point of Opinion: (Jacek Hawiger) – Those of us who are reviewing proposals in the Medical Center feel that this is a laudable initiative. AVCF helps identify new intellectual leaders and the quality of the intellectual leadership is essential. It is a very positive and transforming initiative.

Point of Concern: (Joel Tellinghuisen) – I am concerned that these centers may leave out some potential faculty for consideration in certain disciplines because they may not be able to contribute to the focus of the centers.

Chair Shepherd ended the discussion.

Next item on the agenda – report from committee chairs

Academic Policies & Services: Chair Clayton noted that he needs to leave shortly and therefore cannot comment on APS matters or present on graduate education.

Business & Non-academic Affairs: Chair Swift noted that the committee met with Patricia Marett and Jane Bruce to discuss the Cafeteria Style Benefits Plan. At this time, Human Resources has no specific plan under consideration. The committee reviewed the options associated with the cafeteria plan. It was pointed out by Patricia and Jane that not all of the current benefits that faculty and staff enjoy would be included in the plan due to pre-tax options. This would include the tuition benefit. This revelation dampened the committee's enthusiasm for a cafeteria plan. The committee expects

more discussion on this issue when the new HR director comes on board in the spring. The committee has also begun looking at the issue of post retirement benefits. Concluding his remarks, Chair Swift announced that Senator Joel Tellinghuisen has agreed to serve on the University Benefits Committee.

Student Affairs: Chair Shepherd stated that Chair Haselton had to leave early, but that the committee is in the process of preparing an interim report on graduate students and residential colleges.

Academic Policies & Services: (Chair Clayton agreed to talk briefly about the Graduate Education Task Force.) Chair Clayton stated that he will try to provide an 8-10 minute abbreviated presentation. He notes that serving on the Task Force has been an exhilarating experience. Using a PowerPoint presentation, he proceeded with his discussion. (View Chair Clayton's PowerPoint presentation at <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/APS121202.pdf>)

Chair Clayton highlighted the Task Force members and noted that the Deans have been very receptive to faculty contributions. The remaining meetings will be geared to concluding discussion on specific issues and drafting a report for Provost Zeppos. Chair Clayton then talked briefly on one of the issues already discussed by the task Force – Culture of Graduate Education. (Refer to PowerPoint presentation for complete overview on this issue.)

Chair Clayton concluded by voicing his hope that the Senate will have an opportunity to review the various white papers created by the Task Force prior to the special Senate meeting called for January 13.

Senate Affairs: Chair Horn provided an overview of the committee's efforts, which included the ongoing debate centered on voting status of the University's deans. The committee will also begin an examination of the current Senate committee structures.

Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom: Chair Ely noted that this was his "swan song" as Senator McCarthy will assume chair of the committee in the spring. The committee recently concluded a hearing and a report has been filed. Tomorrow, the committee will meet to consider a resolution from the September Senate meeting to examine the current separation of grievance procedures.

Chair-elect Ramsey quickly noted that the Student Affairs and APS committees will hopefully be working together on future matters concerning residential colleges and the role of graduate students. The Senate will hear more on this subject at a later meeting.

Chair Shepherd then called for any old or new business or good of the Senate. Hearing none, the meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Goldring,
Secretary