

Vanderbilt University
Faculty Senate Meeting
May 5, 2003
3:45 p.m. Room 140 Frist Hall, Nursing School

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes of April 10, 2003

Remarks by Virginia Shepherd, Faculty Senate Chair
SEC Conference

Remarks by E. Gordon Gee, Chancellor

Presentation of Certificates of Service

Scheduled Remarks:

Year-end Reports & Recommendations from Standing Committee Chairs

Senate Affairs – Chair Horn

Vote on recommended changes to Constitution

Year-end Report

Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom – Chair McCarthy

Discussion on recommended changes to grievance process

Year-end Report

Student Affairs – Chair Haselton

Year-end Report

Academic Policies & Services – Chair Clayton

Vote on recommended new degree programs

Year-end Report

Business & Non-Academic Affairs – Chair Swift

Year-end Report

Election of Officers

Old Business

New Business

Good of the Senate

Adjournment

Voting Members present: Barz, Bess, Booth, Benbow, Clayton, Conklin, Corbin, Dobbs-Weinstein, Farran, Fleetwood, Fogo, Gabbe, Galloway, Goldfarb, Goldring, Greene, Haselton,

Hawiger, Heyneman, Horn, Hudnut-Beumler, Innes, Kay, Lind, Link, Masulis, McCarthy, McCarty, Morrow, Neff, Osheroff, Outlaw, Paschal, Perkins, Pitz, Ramsey, Shepherd, Simonett, Summar, Syverud, Tellinghuisen, Thompson, Ward

Voting Members absent: Christie, Conway-Welch, Denison, Knight, McGill, Oates, Saff, Salisbury (regrets), Sasson (regrets), Strauss (regrets), Swift, Victor, Wait (regrets)

Ex Officio Members present: Gee, Gherman, Schoenfeld, Zeppos

Ex Officio Members absent: Brisky, Hall, Jacobson, Limbird, Spitz, Williams

.....

The meeting was called to order at 3:45 p.m. by Chair Virginia Shepherd. After requesting for changes, the Minutes of April 10, 2003 was approved.

Chair Shepherd began the meeting by reviewing the agenda.

She then made the following remarks. On April 25th, Chair Shepherd presented to the Board of Trust Academic Services Committee. She provided an overview of goals and accomplishments for the current academic year. She also presented Jud Randolph with the resolution passed at the last Senate meeting. (View Board of Trust presentation at: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/BOTspring03.pdf>)

Chair Shepherd discussed the recently concluded SEC Faculty Leaders Conference, which was held at Vanderbilt on May 1 & 2. Conference participants represented all 12 Southeastern Conference institutions. The Conference covered general faculty governance issues, as well as academic reform within intercollegiate athletics. At the conclusion of the conference, a statement and recommendations were passed by the participants and released to the media. (View SEC Conference Statement & Recommendations at: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/SECconferencerecs.pdf>)

Chair Shepherd opened the floor for discussion on the Conference.

Question: (Senator Paschal) – Did the participants discuss issues surrounding Title IX?

Response: (Chair Shepherd) – No, but I strongly recommend that the Student Affairs Committee’s agenda for next academic year include the study of either Title IX or the overall academic reform movement in intercollegiate athletics.

Chair Shepherd noted the Conference’s four sub-committees: Academics, Governance, Student Welfare, and Cost & Commercialization. She further noted that Cost & Commercialization was and will continue to be the most complex to assess and reform.

Question: (Senator Heyneman) – Where is the SEC Association of Faculty Leaders heading?

Response: (Chair Shepherd) – After two days of discussions, there may be more in common with our SEC peers than initially believed; therefore, annual meetings will be based on common

issues of concern. However, I do believe that next year's meeting will also focus on intercollegiate athletics.

Question: (Senator Corbin) – Did Vanderbilt initiate this conference?

Response: (Chair Shepherd) – Yes.

Chair Shepherd then highlighted the results of the Traits Survey, which Senators were asked to complete at the April 10 Senate meeting. (View Traits Survey at: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/traitsurvey.pdf>)

Comment: (Senator Greene) – I may have misunderstood the survey. I wasn't sure if we were to score it based on what we have or what we rank as most important.

Response: (Chair Shepherd) – We will do the survey again next year with better directions.

Question: (Senator Hawiger) – Can we have a survey on effective senators?

Response: (Chair Shepherd) – Yes. I will defer the creation and implementation to Chair-elect Ramsey.

Next item on the agenda – Remarks from Chancellor Gee

Chancellor Gee extended his appreciation to Chair Shepherd and the Senate Executive Committee for their hard work over the academic year. He also thanked the Senators for helping push positive change. He noted his appreciation also to Chair Shepherd for taking the lead on the SEC Faculty Leaders Conference and on SEC faculty involvement in the academic reform movement.

With Chair Shepherd's assistance, Chancellor Gee then distributed certificates of appreciation to those senators whose terms were ending. These included: Greg Barz, Jay Clayton, Jackie Corbin, Mark Denison, Idit Dobbs-Weinstein, Ellen Goldring, Frederick Haselton, Douglas Knight, Christopher Lind, John McCarthy, Robert Pitz, Michele Salisbury, Virginia Shepherd, Gieri Simonett, and Patricia Ward

Next item on the agenda – Chair and Executive Committee Appreciation

Chair Shepherd extended her appreciation to Mary Ann Horn, John McCarthy, Jay Clayton, Rick Haselton, and Larry Swift for their leadership as committee chairs. She also recognized the service of Matt Ramsey, Ellen Goldring and Dale Farran as officers of the Senate's executive committee.

Chair-elect Ramsey recognized the leadership of Chair Shepherd and Secretary Goldring, thanking them for their service to the Senate. Senator McCarthy then read a poem in honor of Chair Shepherd, presenting her with a Vanderbilt pennant at its conclusion.

Next item on the agenda – Senate Affairs Committee – vote on changes to the Constitution and Rules of Order

Chair Shepherd called on Senator Mary Ann Horn, chair of the Senate Affairs Committee.

Chair Horn thanked her committee for the work and guidance they provided over the year. She then reviewed the Committee's charges for the year and recommended changes to the Constitution as discussed during the April 10th Senate meeting.

Charge 1: Senate Committee Structure

Recommendations:

- Basic committee structure remain the same
- Executive Committee should increase the membership of committees which have a particularly heavy burden during an academic year

She noted that based on the Committee's discussions, the following was recommended for vote:

[The recommended changes read as follows.]

1. A change to The Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate of Vanderbilt University; Rules of Order, Section IV, sub-section A:

CURRENT STATEMENT:

- a. Academic Policies and Services. To be concerned with new schools, new programs, and new degrees. To consider policies regarding academic honors, leaves, grants, promotions, departmental and divisional chairmanships, programs abroad, the academic calendar, career planning and placement, Vanderbilt University Library, the Computer Center, bookstore, and the University Press.

RECOMMENDED REVISION:

(Bold type denotes additions or modifications.)

- a. Academic Policies and Services. To be concerned with new schools, new programs and new degrees. To consider policies regarding academic honors, leaves, grants, promotions, departmental and divisional chairmanships, programs abroad, the academic calendar, career planning and placement, Vanderbilt University Library, Information Services, the bookstore, and the University Press. **To examine university strategic plans and initiatives.**

Chair Horn asked for any further discussion. Having none, she called for a vote. Voice vote taken. Motion passed.

Chair Horn proceeded to the next recommended changes.

2. A change to The Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate of Vanderbilt University; Rules of Order, Section IV, sub-section A:

CURRENT STATEMENT:

- b. Business and Non-academic Affairs. To be concerned with policies relating to wages and salaries, fringe benefits, management of investments, employment of non-academic

personnel, copyrights and patents, buildings and grounds, furnishings, campus communications, traffic, parking, food services, and campus security.

RECOMMENDED REVISION:

(Bold type denotes additions or modifications.)

- b. **Faculty Life**. To be concerned with policies relating to wages and salaries, fringe benefits, management of investments, employment of non-academic personnel, **faculty intellectual property including copyrights and patents**, buildings and grounds, **space**, campus communications, traffic, parking, food services, and campus security.

Chair Horn asked for any further discussion. Having none, she called for a vote. Voice vote taken. Motion passed.

Chair Horn proceeded to the next recommended changes.

3. A change to The Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate of Vanderbilt University; Rules of Order, Section IV, sub-section A:

CURRENT STATEMENT:

- e. Student Affairs. To be concerned with policies relating to non-academic student matters including rules and discipline, future composition of the student body, fraternities and sororities, intramurals, varsity and club sports, the Honor System, faculty-student relations, religious affairs, and the student health service.

RECOMMENDED REVISION:

(Bold type denotes additions or modifications.)

- e. **Student Life**. To be concerned with policies relating to student matters including **residential colleges**, rules and discipline, future composition of the student body, fraternities and sororities, **intercollegiate athletics and club sports**, intramurals, the Honor System, faculty-student relations, religious affairs, and the student health service.

Chair Horn asked for any further discussion. Having none, she called for a vote. Voice vote taken. Motion passed.

Chair Horn proceeds to review the Committee's second and third charges for the academic year.

Charge 2: Voting Status of Deans

Recommendations:

- Deans should retain voting rights
- Recommended revisions to Constitution and Rules of Order passed during last session
 - one special executive session per year
 - revisions to voting procedures

Charge 3: Ex Officio Membership

Recommendations:

- Updates to Constitution and Rules of Order to reflect current ex officio membership

- Consideration of new members on a case-by-case basis

She noted that based on the Committee's discussions, the following was recommended for vote:

A change to The Constitution of the Faculty Assembly, Article II, section 1, sub-section b; and Rules of Order, Section V:

CURRENT STATEMENT:

Ex officio members of the Senate include the following: The Chancellor, the Provost, the Vice-Chancellors, the Deputy Provost and Dean for Academic Services, the Associate Provost for Student Affairs, the Director of the Library, and other administrative officers as the Senate may invite and persons listed as such in the Senate Rules. Ex officio members may participate fully in the deliberations, but they have no vote. [For corresponding language in Rules of Order, please refer to Section V.]

RECOMMENDED REVISION:

(Bold type denotes additions or modifications.)

Ex Officio members of the Senate include the following: The Chancellor, the Provost, the Vice-Chancellors, **the Associate Provosts, the Associate Vice-Chancellor for Research, the University Librarian**, and other administrative officers as the Senate may invite and persons listed as such in the Senate Rules. **In addition, the past Chair and Secretary of the Faculty Senate hold ex officio status for one year following the end of their term.** Ex officio members may participate fully in the deliberations, but they have no vote.

[These recommended changes will correspond to the Rules of Order, Section V – where appropriate.]

Chair Horn asked for any further discussion. Having none, she called for a vote. Voice vote taken. Motion passed.

Next item on the agenda – Business and Non-academic Affairs & Student Affairs– year-end reports

Noting that no recommendations or new business from BNAA and Student Affairs needed to be discussed, Chair Shepherd called the Senate's attention to the year-end reports of BNAA and Student Affairs on the Senate's Website. (View year-end reports at: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/minutes.html>)

She then proceeded to call on Senator Jay Clayton, chair of the Academic Policies and Services Committee.

Next item on the agenda – Academic Policies and Services Committee

Chair Clayton thanked his committee for the work and guidance they provided over the year.

Chair Clayton noted that his year-end report was posted on the Senate's website. (View year-end report at: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/minutes.html>) He proceeded to review the two new degree programs for Senate vote.

1. New Motion. The APS Committee moves that the Faculty Senate approve a proposal for a joint master of arts in Latin American studies and master of law. The joint M.A./LL.M. program would allow law students interested in international law in Latin America to gain the cultural, political, and economic background that they need to work there. The proposal has been approved by the Graduate Faculty Council.

(View proposal at: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/APSLAS-LLM.pdf>)

2. New Motion: The APS Committee moves that the Faculty Senate approve a proposal for a master of science degree in Laboratory Science. The program is designed for Vanderbilt or Meharry staff who are nominated by a faculty mentor in whose lab they work. The proposal has been approved by the Medical School.

(View proposal at: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/APSMSlabscience.pdf>)

Following his review, Chair Clayton opened the floor for discussion on the first proposal (joint M.A./LL.M. program).

Question: (Senator Hawiger) – Is there really a need for this program?

Response: (Dean Syverud) – The program is not driven by the Law School - more by Latin American studies program. It is for students who are already coming to attend law school.

Question: (Senator Paschal) – I noted this earlier in our APS committee meeting, but this program excludes U.S. citizens from applying. Could the program's qualifications be reworded to more accurately explain and define who can and cannot apply for this program?

Response: (Dean Syverud) – The current LL.M. program is already defined for non-U.S. citizens who received a law degree from another country.

Point of Clarification: (Senator Heyneman) – Isn't that really more the issue – under the program, U.S. citizens cannot apply.

Question: (Senator Hawiger) – Is the program exclusionary?

Response: (Dean Syverud) – Yes. By its nature, it is.

Point of Clarification: (Provost Zeppos) – The LL.M. program was a strategic decision by the University to reach out to international lawyers and assist them in getting American training and education in American law.

Comment: (Senator Heyneman) – I recommend that the program description for this new degree program be revised to show that it is for people who have received a law degree from outside this country.

Response: (Dean Syverud) – Since I cannot arbitrarily make any changes, I will ask the law faculty to take up the recommendation next year.

Comment: (Senator Paschal) – Though I find the new program’s wording objectionable and heartily recommend the Law School change it, I believe the program is worth supporting.

Chair Shepherd concluded discussion on the proposal and asked for a floor vote. Committee Chair Clayton Jay called for a vote. Hand vote taken. Motion passed with two dissents.

Chair Clayton opened the floor for discussion on the second proposal (MS Laboratory Science program).

Question: (Dean Galloway) – Is the program for research assistants or graduate students?

Response: (Chair Clayton) – It is for University employees who are currently serving as lab assistants.

Comment: (Dean Galloway) – I am concerned that we are generating programs for people who are currently employees instead of students.

Response: (Ann Richmond) – We believe this program will not only increase their training and theoretical learning, but also their work incentive, motivation, and retention. The program is viewed very much like an exec MBA program.

Follow-up Comment: (Dean Galloway) – If that is the case, the program should offer a professional degree.

Follow-up Question: (Ann Richmond) – Something similar to a master of laboratory science?

Response: (Dean Galloway) – Yes, better.

Question: (Senator Fleetwood) – Is this program patterned after one that is successful elsewhere?

Response: (Ann Richmond) – No, not really. It is fairly creative.

Question: (Senator Farran) – The program would be open to Vanderbilt employees. Will there be a time when it is opened to people who are not employees?

Response: (Ann Richmond) – Our goal is to start out small and then move to recruit outside the employee base. However it is mainly for employees.

Comment: (Senator Hawiger) – I enthusiastically support this program.

Question: (Senator Corbin) – What is the program’s theoretical and practical components?

Response: (Ann Richmond) – [Proceeded to go over the various courses and hours associated with the proposed program. These may be found at:

<http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/APSMSlabscience.pdf>] Discussion centered on the number of hours required for the degree, which were less than traditional masters of science degree programs or other professional degree masters programs and the GPA required for admission.

Question: (Senator Osheroff) – When would they do their independent research? On nights and weekends?

Response: (Ann Richmond) – Yes.

Question: (Senator Paschal) – Under this program, participants would not be required to be admitted to our graduate school. What if they want to take courses outside of program?

Response: (Ann Richmond) – They would not be able to do that.

Chair Clayton concluded discussion on the proposal and asked for a floor vote. Hand vote taken. The vote was a tie: 17 for the proposal, 17 against the proposal. The motion failed.

Next Item on the Agenda – Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom (PEAF) Committee – a review of recommendations for vote next year.

Chair Shepherd called on Senator John McCarthy, chair of the PEAFF Committee.

Chair McCarthy thanked his committee members for their hard work over the academic year. He noted that PEAFF's year-end report is on the Senate's website. (View year-end report at: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/minutes.html>) Over the course of the year, PEAFF heard two grievances. In addition, PEAFF was able to resolve a 3rd potential grievance before it reached the formal stage of filing.

Chair McCarthy proceeded to review the PEAFF Committee's recommended changes to the current grievance process.

(View the recommendations at: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/PEAF2.pdf>)

Chair McCarthy drew the Senate's attention to PowerPoint slides 8-12. He reviewed the recommended changes on each slide and asked for questions or comments.

Question: (Senator Dobbs-Weinstein) – Does the process (current or proposed) make any provisions for a faculty member who was notified late in a semester or in summer?

Response: (Chair McCarthy) – PEAFF did not discuss the timing for issues during the summer.

Follow-up Response: (Chair Shepherd) – The current process doesn't address that concern. It would be wise for PEAFF to address it.

Question: (Senator Paschal) – I have a question about the time consistency associated with notification and the 30 day rule. How is that applied?

Response: (Chair McCarthy) – Everyone involved with a grievance would receive a letter.

Receipt of this letter begins the 30 day clock. A faculty member can file during this time.

Question: (Dean Hudnut-Beumler) – The current grievance process provides for conflict of interest between the grievant and the process chair. How would the new process address this?

Response: (Chair McCarthy) – Your point is well taken and is indeed a serious matter. We need to retain the provision that would address a potential conflict of interest between a potential grievant and the chair of PEAFF. However, at this stage the process is informal and its goal is to seek a resolution without having to grieve. As far as PEAFF is concerned, it is restricted in what it can declare as a grievable offense.

Comment: (Senator Foggo) – I don't believe that conflicts of interest will play a role at this initial stage.

Chair McCarthy concludes discussion on the recommendations, noting that they will be taken up next academic year.

Next Item on the Agenda – Election of Chair- and Secretary-elect positions

Chair Shepherd initiated the election of the office of Chair-elect. Candidates were Beth Conklin and Bob Thompson. Once written voting is taken and collected, she initiated the election of the office of Secretary-elect. Candidates were Marshall Summar and Michael Goldfarb.

The 2002-2003 Faculty Senate elected Bob Thompson (21-18) as Chair-elect and Marshall Summar (22-16) as Secretary-elect.

Chair Shepherd then called for any old or new business or good of the Senate. Thanking the Senators for their service, she adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Goldring,
Secretary