

Vanderbilt University
Faculty Senate Meeting
March 18, 2004
4:10 p.m. Room 140 Frist Hall, Nursing School

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes of February 12, 2004

Report of the Executive Committee
Matthew Ramsey, Chair of the Faculty Senate

Task Force Interim Reports

Task Force on Classified Research, Senator Dan Fleetwood, Chair
Interim report can be found here:

<http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/classifiedresearchdraft.pdf>

Task Force on the Conflicts Policy, Professor James Blumstein, Chair
Final report can be found here:

<http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/conflictreport.pdf>

Old Business:

Senate Affairs Committee (Beth Conklin, Chair)
Recommendation to separate the offices of Senate Parliamentarian and Chair of the Senate Affairs Committee.

If this motion carries, the Executive Committee will introduce a motion to appoint Professor Kassian Kovalchek (College of Arts and Science) as Parliamentarian.

New Business

Good of the Senate

Adjournment

Voting Members present: Barz, Conklin, Conway-Welch, Ellingham, Ely, Farran, Flake, Fleetwood, Gabbe, Galloway, Gay, Griffin, Heflinger, Heyneman, Innes, Le Boeuf, McCarthy, McCarty, McGill, Morrow, Neff, Oates, Osheroff, Perkins, Ramsey, Strauss, Summar, Swift, Syverud, Tellingheuisen, Thompson.

Voting Members absent: Adams, Benbow (regrets), Bess (regrets), Casagrande (regrets), Christie, Cummings, Eigen, Fogo, Goldfarb (regrets), Greene, Hawiger (regrets), Hodges, Horn (regrets), Hudnut-Beumler (regrets), Masulis (regrets), Paschal, Peebles (regrets), Retzlaff (regrets), Saff (regrets), Sasson (regrets), Sevin, Smith, Victor, Wait (regrets), Washington, Wcislo (regrets).

Ex Officio Members present: Gherman, Shepherd, Spruill.

Ex Officio Members absent: Balser (regrets), Barge, Brisky, Gee, Goldring, Hall, Jacobson (regrets), Outlaw, Peretto, Schoenfeld, Spitz, Williams, Zeppos (regrets).

.....

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Chair Matthew Ramsey.

Minutes from 2/12/04 meeting were reviewed and a motion was made to approve them. Motion passed unanimously.

Next Item on the Agenda - Report of the Executive Committee

Chair Ramsey reported on the work of the Executive Committee since the last Faculty Senate meeting. The Executive Committee has been working most recently on the Senate resolution on faculty awards and expects the Chancellor to announce his final decision at the April meeting of the Senate.

The Executive Committee has been advising the Chancellor on the ongoing task of recommendations included in the report of the ad hoc committee or committees. Together with Bart Victor, Chair of the Faculty Life committee, The Executive Committee has also continued discussions about a possible survey of faculty benefits and other job related issues following up a proposal that was made at the October special Executive Session of the Senate.

The Executive Committee met in November with Kevin Myatt, the Chief Human Resource Officer of the university, to discuss this question, and we learned that Human Resources was planning a job satisfaction survey for both staff and faculty that would deal with benefits among many other questions. The Executive Committee raised the possibility, at that time, of having the Senate play a role in the design of that survey although the needs of faculty and staff seemed too divergent for a single, "one size fits all," survey to work well.

As it turned out, the administration had a similar reaction and has excluded faculty members from the H.R. survey. The Executive Committee has suggested that the Senate Faculty Life Committee work with the Associate Provost for Faculty, Tim McNamara, with Gerry Gotterer, Senior Associate Dean for Faculty at the School of Medicine, and with Linda Norman, Senior Associate Dean of the School of Nursing, to design a survey specifically intended for faculty to be conducted next fall. Chair Ramsey reported that the initial response to that suggestion was positive, and he hopes to have more to report to the Senate about this before the end of the academic year.

Chair Ramsey reminded everyone of the forum on the role of faculty in university governance that will take place a week from today in this room from 4:10 to 5:30. He outlined the format of the forum and announced the panelists who will include Dean

Richard McCarty of the College of Arts and Sciences, Professor Virginia Shepherd of the School of Medicine, the immediate past chair of the senate, Professor Arnold Strauss of the School of Medicine who is the Chair of the Department of Pediatrics and a current faculty senator and also a former senate chair at Washington University in St. Louis, and finally, Professor A.-J. Levine of the Divinity School who was chair of the faculty senate in 1997- 1998.

Chair Ramsey reported that the Senate will not hear from William Tierney, the specialist in issues of university governance from the University of Southern California. Chair Ramsey explained that the Senate had discussed hearing from him either this month or next Fall, but after learning that his fee is \$4000 per day, it was decided that this was not a fiscally-responsible use of monies.

Chair Ramsey emphasized that this forum will not be limited to the role of the Senate, nor to governance at the university level. Much of shared governance takes place at the school level, or in the case of the four large schools, at the department level. Yet the growth of interschool and transinstitutional initiatives has increased the need for new governance mechanisms at the university level in which faculty members can play a role. He asked senators to give some thought to the questions they would like to raise at the forum.

Chair Ramsey also reminded senators that the Division of Public Affairs is organizing a Vanderbilt University Day on the Hill, at the end of the month on the 30th of March. It will allow representatives of university organizations including the Faculty Senate to meet with members of the Tennessee General Assembly. Any faculty member will be welcome to attend. There is a one-hour workshop for participants on March 25th. The event on the 30th will begin with a breakfast with State Legislators at 7:30. A guided tour of the capitol building will be available for those who are interested. Chair Ramsey emphasized that this is an opportunity to show the flag for Vanderbilt. He added that if senators are interested in taking part, they should contact either him or Andrea Hewitt.

Chair Ramsey ended his remarks with a request for suggestions for an outside speaker for the upcoming academic year. He asked that all suggestions be sent to Andrea Hewitt. Chair Ramsey then asked for questions. Hearing none, he introduced the next item of business.

Next Item on the Agenda –Interim Report from Task Force on Classified Research

Chair Ramsey thanked all of the members of the task force, and particularly those who are not members of the Senate: Kathryn Edwards, of School of Medicine; Larry Churchill, School of Medicine; Charles Brau, College of Arts and Science, and Dennis Hall, the Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Education. Chair Ramsey explained that the Senate doesn't ordinarily ask ex officio members of the Senate to serve on Senate committees, but the Associate Provost very graciously agreed to join the task force and made some very important contributions to its group.

Chair Ramsey then turned the podium over to Senator Dan Fleetwood, Chair of the Task Force on Classified Research. Senator Fleetwood began his presentation (see full presentation at: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/classifiedresearchpres.pdf>) by giving a brief history of the task force and its meetings.

Senator Fleetwood explained that, at present, the Faculty Manual prohibits the acceptance at Vanderbilt of sponsored research that includes classified research. This is different than the procedures in place for proprietary research that are outlined in chapters three through five of the Faculty Manual, which allow this research under specified administrative controls. The issue brought before the Senate was whether it should be possible to allow classified research at Vanderbilt. The issue in particular is that the inability to conduct classified sponsored research or even to hold classified meetings at the Vanderbilt campus has limited some research programs with significant academic content in areas of significance to U.S. national security.

Senator Fleetwood spoke about the issue of academic freedom, and the strong arguments on both sides of this issue. He explained that the practices at other universities vary widely. He used five universities as illustrative examples of how different institutions deal with this issue. Harvard and Duke disallow classified research programs. MIT and Johns Hopkins and other universities have off-campus research laboratories that allow classified research, but disallow classified research on campus. He stated that the University of California is particularly interesting to look at because they have a general prohibition on classified research on campus, but exceptions are allowed for programs that have an impact on national security.

Senator Fleetwood added that the committee felt that this model of perhaps allowing classified research to be done in affiliated research institutes, but not on the main campus, might be a reasonable model to look at.

Senator Fleetwood allowed that there was some confusion at the beginning of the task force on the breadth of issues that needed to be addressed. One thing that we should point out is that many of the faculty at Vanderbilt and also professional staff, hold security clearances and can participate in classified research programs, just not at Vanderbilt. There are many faculty that have large federally sponsored research programs that could potentially benefit by being able to accept some classified research.

Senator Fleetwood stated that the clear consensus of the task force is that this idea merits serious consideration. He added that he believes that, in general, the task force members see some benefit to this proposal and the question is whether one can define a set of conditions and a set of areas and administrative controls under which this could be done in a practical fashion.

In general, Senator Fleetwood stated that the task force members believed that the best place to conduct classified research, if it were decided to do so, would be affiliated research institutes that are located off the main campus. It is recognized that the acceptance of sponsored research would have to come under strong administrative

control that is at a level that is at least equal to that for proprietary research and perhaps would require an additional level of administrative control.

Senator Fleetwood stated that a particularly difficult issue that the task force has struggled with is whether or not graduate students should be allowed to participate in any classified research programs. One of the issues that was discussed: would students feel pressured to work on programs in order to get funding? Senator Fleetwood also mentioned that the task force had discussed the issue of graduate students and classified research as it pertains to their thesis or dissertation. The task force agreed that this issue needs to be addressed. On the other side of the issue, many classified research programs are at the cutting edge of science and technology and graduate students would be able to be a part of this research. Senator Fleetwood also reminded senators that students can get access to special purpose facilities at national labs much more easily, if they have clearance, and that this can help these students in the job market.

Senator Fleetwood also discussed the issue of having designated classified areas off-campus and the ramifications of this kind of set-up. He mentioned the need to be clear that classified research should be fully funded by external sponsors so that there is no question where the money is coming from, and the need to have written security plans in place that are agreed upon by all parties to the sponsored research. He emphasized that the task force continues to be divided on whether or not graduate students should be included in classified research.

Senator Fleetwood also touched on another category of information that is somewhat intermediate between classified information and proprietary information. This is the so-called sensitive but unclassified information. There is no such provision to handle sensitive but unclassified information. Senator Fleetwood pointed out that this is a related issue to the discussion on classified research.

Senator Fleetwood said that the task force believes that whatever decision is made, it is very important to protect the spirit of openness and equality of the members of the university community. But the task force recognizes that there are many training grants and many research programs that are restricted by citizenship already. It is important to minimize restrictions on the freedom to publish, but delays are already allowed in certain cases, for example proprietary research. He stated that the task force believes that it may be possible to bring administrative controls for classified research more closely into line with administrative controls on proprietary research.

Senator Fleetwood then opened the floor for discussion and questions.

Question (Senator LeBoeuf): My first question is related to the security plan itself. If classified research was allowed at an external site, and all the funding of that project were at that facility off site, when the project ends, what is the disposition of the classified material that was produced?

Response (Senator Fleetwood): That is a standard issue to be covered in the security plan. There are accepted methods for destroying such classified information, also accepted ways for mailing that kind of information back to a sponsor and documenting the disposition of materials.

Follow-up Question (Senator LeBoeuf): Could you expand a little bit on experience from proprietary research of how administrative controls are used and what is meant by strong administrative controls and how would that be exercised in this case? As far as stronger administrative controls, how would we ensure that we can somehow guarantee graduate students the opportunity to publish?

Response (Senator Fleetwood): For proprietary research, it is specified in the Faculty Manual that the P.I. have a plan approved by the dean of the school responsible that outlines how the student will be able to participate in the program without having his or her progress inhibited by that.

Graduate students that are funded on an RA sometimes will be working on more than one project and so one can be developed as part of the thesis, one can be basically complementary, but wouldn't be critical to them. This is one way that that can be handled.

Another way that that can be handled is if the proprietary information is only particular to a few elements of the program. All that may be required is sponsor review to insure that the paper does not include information on those elements and then the paper can go on out.

Question (Senator Doug Perkins): Can you talk about why Harvard, Duke and presumably other institutions have decided to steer clear of this, when they, obviously, have off campus subsidiary research—or they could. What is their rationale for avoiding it entirely?

Response (Senator Fleetwood): One of the chief arguments that is frequently made is that they don't want to accept sponsored research in which any member of the university community would not be free to participate. They want everyone to be seen as equal in the eyes of the university.

In reality, we frequently do handle some categories of students somewhat differently. There are some programs through the National Science Foundation for example that are eligible only for U.S. citizens. One could argue that exceptions are already made.

There are arguments that if the mission of the university is to provide information that is open to unlimited discussion, then classified research can never be considered to fit within that boundary. That is one reason that places like MIT and Johns Hopkins will separate things that are done on campus from things that are done off campus. Faculty with assignments on campus cannot accept these programs unless they are also affiliated with the off campus facility. They divide those two responsibilities.

We have some affiliated research institutes at Vanderbilt that are not as well developed perhaps as MIT's Linden lab or John's Hopkins Applied Physics lab. But certainly within the School of Engineering we have the institutes that have off-campus facilities that already include personnel access restrictions at present. It's possible to imagine putting those sorts of administrative controls on facilities that would be off campus.

Question (Senator Volney Gay): How much of the research is applied and how much is basic science?

Response (Senator Fleetwood): I have, for example, published eleven classified refereed technical journal articles. There are peer-review journals that cover classified research. It depends on the sub-field and its maturity as to whether basic research can be classified. There are intense debates in emerging fields such as virus research, for example, that could be of interest to bio-terrorism. There are significant debates on how to protect some of that information. I am not as familiar with that. There may be others in the room who can speak to that.

Follow-up Question (Senator Gay): How would a junior faculty member use classified research when coming up for tenure?

Response (Senator Fleetwood): That is a very good question. As department chair, I would probably not encourage an assistant professor to do all of his or her research in a classified facility. It is very difficult to build up an external reputation there. You raise a very good point.

Comment (Dean Richard McCarty): I would just like to stake out an extreme position and I say that I think that this gets us off of our central mission at the university and I don't think we should do it.

I think if you look at some of the principles of Vanderbilt that have been articulated over the past four or five years this gets us away from that core mission. You've already started describing some of the complications that arise with graduate students and junior faculty and it really does concern me greatly that we are going to be bending over backwards trying to accommodate all of these special issues. I know it is probably not the right thing to say, but I don't think we should be doing this.

Response (Senator Fleetwood): I think that is a reasonable opinion to discuss.

Comment (Senator Robert Innes): I would be inclined to think "proprietary" is not that different around some of these issues from "classified" and would vote that way.

Question (Senator John McCarthy): I am wondering to what degree is the question being raised driven by financial considerations, to what degree is it truly intellectual?

Response (Senator Fleetwood): I think this issue has both a financial and an intellectual component. Financial issues cut both ways because classified research is more expensive to do than unclassified research because of the security and the administrative controls that have to be put on.

Some faculty members have told me directly that they are unable to participate in some programs because they are unable to accept sponsored research that includes classified research. Whether this is accurate or whether it is not, I can't judge, but I can just say in my own career, I have seen breakthroughs in fundamental research start inside classified research programs.

Comment (Dean Colleen Conway-Welch): I think that in today's world, a university has the responsibility to bring the best science to bear in terms of what is going on in the world and what's troubling our world. I don't think we should dispense with that responsibility. I understand the issues in terms of tenure and publication, etc. I believe there are ways of appropriately addressing those issues. A number of major universities in the country have done that relative to off-site facilities, etc.

But let me tell you another reason that this is very important. Some of you know that the School of Nursing has been involved in starting a national center for emergency preparedness here at Vanderbilt.

Our focus is on teaching technology—how you deliver content so that over time and under stress, people can recall it later on.

I received a call about eight or nine months ago from a federal agency and they wanted us, the School of Nursing to train civilian nurses to care for detainees in Afghanistan, Guantanamo and Iraq because the military does not have enough nurses to take care of this. And these are very special patients—number one, they are sick, and number two, they may want to kill you.

The way you address nursing here, for these folks is somewhat different than you would at Vanderbilt Hospital. It was a five million dollar grant that carried 56% indirect costs. What we were going to teach was not classified. But the persons whom we might teach might be classified and some of the examples that might be used in terms of interrogation, etc., and how the response from nursing and health care perspective might have to be addressed would also be classified.

And so because we fell under the classified research rubric, we had to turn that down. I think that nursing has a responsibility to be able to deliver care across the country and across the world, and I think that Vanderbilt should be a leader in this. The point is that under the rubric of classified research comes classified training. Under classified training comes a subset of the faculty that don't have to be classified because of the content they are delivering, but because of the people who are receiving it. There is another dimension to this, and I would really hope that we are very thoughtful about how to go

forward with this. This is not just research, this is classified training and there is an enormous need for this type of training.

Comment (Secretary-Elect Marshall Summar): Just a comment as a pediatrician. One of the critical issues in pediatrics is the tremendous need over the years for vaccine development. Unfortunately, some of the information that we are going to need to know about in order to protect the kids and adults and everybody else, probably is from classified research.

Response (Senator Fleetwood): Yes, I think that the point that folks like Dean McCarty would make there is, yes, this research needs to be done, but does it need to be done at Vanderbilt? I recognize that that's a valid point of discussion.

Comment (Secretary Farran): We are a somewhat smaller group than we often are, and I think this is the kind of issue that our role as representatives of our faculties is very important. So I really applaud Dan and his committee for bringing this up to us in an introductory way so that we have some time to go back and talk to faculty in our units. I don't know how much power we will have to affect this one way or the other but I know we will have none if we don't talk to people about it and bring forward opinions.

Comment (Dean Steven Gabbe): I support Dean Conway-Welch's position. This is going to happen; it's happening as she described. We're one of the big institutions for one of the regional centers that deal with infectious disease agents that could be used in bioterrorism. Our faculty, because they are renowned, are going to be asked more and more to participate in this kind of research. Unfortunately, as Dr. Conway-Welch explained, we have to turn down these opportunities, and they may seek to go to institutions where they can carry out this work. So I support a position that allows our faculty to pursue this research. It is a very complex issue—where it's done, who supports that site, what students are allowed to participate, and how participating might affect their academic career. I think the committee has raised some important questions. I think it is something we do need to be looking into.

Comment (Chair Ramsey): Thanks very much. Let's have one last question and then if there are no objections, I would like to suspend the discussion until we hear the final report from the task force.

Comment (Senator Kathleen Flake): I represent the Divinity School and we will never lose any opportunities under this issue, I only raise my voice because moral arguments have been made by the Dean. It seems to me there's a moral counter argument to the position. This needs to be taken into consideration.

Chair Ramsey strongly urged senators to read to the draft report from the task force carefully and if they have questions or concerns, to send them directly to Senator Fleetwood.

He then recognized Professor James Blumstein, chair of the PEAFF task force on the conflict of interest policy. He also recognized Professors Mark Cohen and Frank Parker, external appointees to the task force that were in attendance.

Next Item on the Agenda –Interim Report from Task Force on Conflict of Interest Policy

(See full presentation here:

<http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/conflictsides.pdf>)

Professor Blumstein gave the history of the task force and the reasons behind its formation. He stated that two years ago, when he was Senate chair, senators spoke with Chancellor Gee about the Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment Policy and the need to rethink in broad terms how the university deals with these issues. There was a sense that there needed to be some recognition not only of the concerns which had been the traditional university view, but also to acknowledge that certain extramural faculty activities had virtues and benefits to the faculty member and to the institution itself.

He continued by saying that at that time, the university adopted an interim revised Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment policies. Under this policy, the Senate has the prerogative under our system, to approve matters that go into the Faculty Manual. The leadership of the Senate decided to provide interim approval with the understanding that there would be a review of the revision and a rethinking of the broader issue.

Faculty concerns arose last year, triggered by the disclosure forms which had a certain degree of complexity and raised a certain degree of controversy. The concerns reflected the highly regulatory, enforcement-oriented approach—not the more balanced approach that would be characteristic of a partnership.

This past July, the Executive Committee prepared a memorandum commenting on the disclosure forms. In that memorandum, the Executive Committee believed, and certainly we shared that belief, that the problems associated with the disclosure forms were really problems associated with the underlying policies themselves. The disclosure forms were really just the tip of the iceberg—there was a broader set of issues that needed rethinking, which, of course, had been the understanding back in 2002 and with the interim approval itself.

Professor Blumstein then stated that the Senate Executive Committee announced it was appointing a task force and that task force was appointed effective September, 2003. He explained that the task force has gotten consensus on some principles, but doesn't have a report that all task force members have agreed on. He explained that in his interim report, he will touch on some of these basic areas of agreement.

The first point he brought out was that it was important that the policy provide better balance in how the university views conflict of commitment issues. There are benefits as well as concerns associated with many activities that are extramural and there are now seen almost entirely in the negative.

The goal is to develop a more nuanced understanding of what the array of opportunities is and how to manage conflict of interest and conflict of commitment issues.

Professor Blumstein stated that the task force strongly believes that the primary commitment of all faculty must be to teaching and research. But there are some aspects of consulting opportunities that have much in common with research, and the task force members think it is important to facilitate and to accommodate that kind of activity and partnership.

Professor Blumstein said that task force members also thought it was important to distinguish carefully between conflict of commitment issues and conflict of interest issues. A higher level of oversight may be needed for conflict of interest issues. For example, members of the faculty may be involved in resource allocation choices where they may be making the decision about what opportunity is shared between faculty and university. There are tensions that arise in that regard. He emphasized that we need to be sensitive to that, and we need to put in place procedures and to retain procedures that maintain the proper oversight to retain the integrity of that decision making process so that the interests of the university are adequately dealt with.

Professor Blumstein said that task force members agreed that we should simplify the policies and the disclosure forms. It should be less regulatory in character. Simplicity has its virtue, but it is more than just simplicity. He explained that in a complex regime, his experience is that there will be technical violations that will crop up at all junctures and there are always civil liberties to consider. If you have a system that is so complex that people fall over themselves and violate it unintentionally or accidentally, then that just transfers enormous amount of discretion and authority to those who enforce the rules.

He continued by saying that within the family of the university, there should be a notion of presumptive compliance by the faculty. We should assume that the faculty is maintaining their responsibility and their primary responsibility to the university.

The task force agreed that if there is need for administrative reasons that reporting is required, the faculty member should be allowed to file a simple statement that they are in compliance without all the detail that we have under the current system.

Professor Blumstein also addressed issues of academic freedom with regard to consulting tasks. He said that the task force agreed that the administration should not put controls on these sorts of activities that would limit a faculty member's academic freedom. He said that this suggests several things: that we eliminate the need to report on the magnitude of commitment for individual clients; and that we eliminate the requirement for a disclosure of the identity of clients in the absence of conflict of interest so that, as faculty members, we don't have to disclose who our clients are.

And thirdly, he stated that the task force believes that we should eliminate the advance disclosure and approval process. Again, this speaks to academic freedom. He said that

the task force's view is that that type of higher authorization, higher approval and advance disclosure gives too much authority and too much potential for abuse to administrators.

He said that the task force believed that the focus should be on whether a faculty member is appropriately performing his or her obligations to the university in teaching, research, and service or patient care. The goal is to make sure that despite any distractions or, in this case, enhancements, the core obligation of faculty member is to perform the teaching, research, service or patient care to a level of excellence.

Professor Blumstein stated that the task force believes that before conflict of commitment policy comes into play, there should be a threshold inquiry or some kind of triggering device suggesting that the faculty member is not appropriately performing his or her obligation to the university in teaching, research and service or patient care. Therefore, our task force believes we need to rethink the role of this rule we have now of one day a week, 40 days for those on academic contracts, 50 days for those on administrative year contracts.

He said that the task force recommends saying that the 40 day and 50 day rule should serve as a yardstick for enforcement when there is an independent basis for concern and that that independent basis is established with appropriate and safe procedural safeguards.

Professor Blumstein mentioned two final points. He stated that it is important in any regulatory review, especially in a conflict of interest area where we accept a higher level of regulatory oversight, that there be a time-sensitive decision making process. There needs to be a procedure in place in which a rapid response can be achieved so that these opportunities don't get lost because they are ignored or cannot be responded to appropriately.

And finally, he said that the task force is representative of many different schools. The task force came to understand that we have different norms and different special needs within the schools and so we would allow schools to fine tune their policy within the broad frame of the university policy—to fine tune these rules and regulations for the special needs of the schools that that flexibility be allowed and permitted.

After Professor Blumstein finished his remarks, Chair Ramsey opened the floor for questions or comments. Hearing none, he thanked Professor Blumstein and his task force for their report.

Next Item on the Agenda – Recommendation to separate the offices of Senate Parliamentarian and Chair of the Senate Affairs Committee

Chair Ramsey then reminded senators that at the last Senate meeting, the Senate Affairs Committee presented a recommendation to separate the office of parliamentarian from the position of the Chair of Senate Affairs. He stated that this motion must now be voted on. He reminded senators that under Senate rules, a motion that amends Senate rules

cannot be voted on at the same meeting at which it is presented. He called on Senator Beth Conklin, Chair of the Senate Affairs Committee, to present this motion.

Senator Conklin went over the proposed changes (link to changes here: <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/Parliamentarianrec.pdf>). She reminded senators that the proposal is to separate the two functions—that of Parliamentarian and Chair of the Senate Affairs Committee.

The motion was made to separate these two functions. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Ramsey then said that the Senate Rules of Order state that the Executive Committee shall appoint with the advice and consent of a majority of the Senate, a Parliamentarian whose duties shall be to become familiar with Rules of the Senate, Robert's Rules of Order and the Senate Constitution. The Senate Executive Committee recommends appointing Professor Kassian Kovalcheck from the College of Arts and Sciences as Parliamentarian. He would serve for the remainder of the Senate year, then he could be reappointed in the Fall. Chair Ramsey reminded everyone that a link to Professor Kovalcheck's CV was sent out with the agenda. After asking for discussion or questions, Chair Ramsey asked for the Senate's consent. Consent was given unanimously, and Professor Kovalcheck was appointed as Senate Parliamentarian.

Next Item on the Agenda – New Business

Chair Ramsey called for new business. Hearing none, he moved to business under Good of the Senate.

Next Item on the Agenda – Good of the Senate

Chair Ramsey then called for business under Good of the Senate. Hearing none, he declared the meeting adjourned. Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dale Farran,
Secretary