

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY  
November 8, 2001, 4:10-5:30 p.m.

At the second meeting of the Faculty Senate in the 2001-2002 academic year, Chair of the Senate, James F. Blumstein, announced that Dr. James Duderstadt, President Emeritus of the University of Michigan, will speak with senators at a luncheon on January 11. A forum on Graduate Education and its Administration was well attended on October 11, and future forums are planned to focus on undergraduate education, professional schools, and, possibly, University connections with the community.

Chancellor E. Gordon Gee responded to the Faculty Senate actions of academic year 2000-2001. He enthusiastically supported all recommendations, which included:

- approving a Cancer Biology Graduate Program in the School of Medicine, an LLM Graduate Program in the School of Law, and PhD and MS degree programs in Biomedical Informatics in the School of Medicine.
- keeping the Executive Committee at full strength by electing an additional Senator to a one-year term on the Executive Committee should the Chair be re-elected.
- endorsing the revised Faculty Home Purchase Plan available to both tenured and tenure-track faculty.
- supporting the concept of research leave for nontenured, tenure-track faculty.
- establishing Cornelius Vanderbilt Professorships to be awarded on a university-wide competitive basis to deserving tenured full professors.
- increasing the stipend associated with the Sutherland Prize to \$5,000.
- establishing 5 annual \$1,000 Chancellor's Awards for Research to recognize outstanding research.

Three deans were invited to comment on their visions for the University and for their schools, and on their strategies for fulfilling those visions. Participants in the Panel of Deans were Dean William Christie (Owen); Dean Steven Gabbe (Medicine), and Dean James Hudnut-Beumler (Divinity). Presentations by the deans provided an overview of both successes and challenges facing their schools and the University. Future Faculty Senate meetings are set for December 13, February 14, March 14, April 18, and May 6.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
NOVEMBER 8, 2001

SUMMARY

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes of September 13, 2001

Remarks of James Blumstein, Chair

Remarks of E. Gordon Gee, Chancellor, Response to Faculty Senate  
recommendations of academic year 2000-2001

Presentation of Deans' Panel

William Christie, Dean, Owen Graduate School of Management  
Steven Gabbe, Dean, School of Medicine  
James Hudnut-Beumler, Dean, Divinity School

Discussion of Deans' Panel Presentation

Adjourn

\* \* \* \* \*

Senators present: Benbow, Bess, Blumstein, Christie, Clayton, Denison, Dobbs-Weinstein, Epstein, Ernst, Fogo, Gabbe, Galloway, Gilmer, Goldring, Gould, Haselton, Horn, Hudnut-Beumler, Innes, Lind, Maneschi, Mihalik, Newman, Oates, Parsley, Paschal, Pitz, Ramsey, Sandler, Sasson, Schrimpf, Shepherd, Smith, Swift, Tarpley, Victor.

Senators absent: Barz, Bloome, Bond, Conway-Welch, Corbin, Damon, Ely, Hazinski, Johnson, Kinzer [regrets], Link, Lowe [regrets], McCarty, McCarthy [regrets], Osheroff, Outlaw, Salisbury [regrets], Simonett, Strauss, Syverud, Wait, Wilkes.

Ex Officios present: Dowdy, Gee, Gherman, Scott.

Ex Officios absent: Brisky, Burish [regrets], Hall, Jacobson, Limbird [regrets], Schoenfeld [regrets], Spitz, Tuleen [regrets], Williams, Zeppos [regrets].

The meeting was called to order at 4:15 p.m. by Chair James Blumstein. The Minutes of September 13, 2001 were approved as distributed.

## REMARKS OF CHAIR BLUMSTEIN

In his opening remarks, Chair Blumstein referred to the recent horror in New York and Washington and told the Senate of his own personal involvement in the tragedy. On September 11, his mother was taken grievously ill and subsequently died on September 15. Due to the circumstances surrounding the last Senate meeting, Chair Blumstein was especially appreciative of Senators' attendance at the Senate meeting on September 13.

Chair Blumstein announced that Dr. James Duderstadt, who was unable to attend the last Senate meeting due to the terrorist attacks, will be able to meet with the Senate on January 11, 2002. This is a Friday but was the only time available on both Chancellor Gee and Dr. Duderstadt's schedules. There will be a special scheduled lunch where Dr. Duderstadt will speak. Chair Blumstein expressed his gratitude to Chancellor Gee for facilitating this visit with Dr. Duderstadt whom he described as a very engaging guy and someone that the Senate would really value hearing from.

The Senate sponsored a the Faculty Forum on Graduate Education on October 11<sup>th</sup> and Chair Blumstein thanked those who were able to attend the event. He mentioned the lively discussion and very good feedback from those attending the Forum. The Senate office has received the draft of the proceedings from the court reporter. It will be prepared for distribution in the near future. There will be two more forums in the spring, with one on undergraduate education and one on professional education. The dates will be announced as soon as they are finalized.

Chair Blumstein mentioned his desire to meet for lunch with the Executive Committee and Chairs of the Senate committees soon. He issued an invitation to any Chair to contact him or the Executive Committee liaison, if they had concerns or questions.

Chair Blumstein then stated that the first item on the Agenda was a report by Chancellor Gee in response to recommendations made by the Faculty Senate last spring. This is a tradition that is normally fulfilled at the first meeting, but with the scheduled appearance of Dr. Duderstadt, the Executive Committee determined that it was appropriate to defer this to the November meeting. Chair Blumstein expressed his gratitude to Chancellor Gee for his receptivity to differing views and new ideas as well as for coming to the Senate meeting in the middle of a Board of Trust meeting.

## REMARKS BY E. GORDON GEE, CHANCELLOR

Chancellor Gee began his remarks by resoundingly concurring with Chair Blumstein's statements regarding the nature of the relationship between the

Executive Committee of the Senate and himself, that it is a first-rate, open and constructive relationship with nothing hidden in their candid discussions. He feels that he has learned a great deal in this process. Chancellor Gee stated that he appreciated the fact that the Senate lets him come on a regular basis to speak to the full Senate. He feels that he learns much more from the Senate by what the members want to know through their questions than anything he could impart to the Senate. He indicated, however, that he finds the formal method of reporting to the Senate awkward and would hope to establish a pattern of the Senate asking a question and getting his response without having to wait for this formality. The Chancellor's edited remarks follow:

It is a pleasure, as always, to return to the Senate for conversation and reflection on the life of the University –our University. It is also a privilege to have the opportunity to respond to the recommendations of last year's Senate, to reflect on the work that you, that we, have done together and to look forward to what things remain ahead of us.

In my conversations with you and other faculty colleagues in recent months I have been reminded of one important thing: that Vanderbilt will never become more than it is if the faculty and administration do not work together in partnership. There are a great many changes and innovations underway at Vanderbilt, things that I am convinced will help in our efforts at becoming the model of the research university for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, but none of them will take root if the faculty and the administration are not on the same page.

Why am I talking about this? Why now? No, I am not taking away anyone's parking sticker. And I do not have any other bad news to deliver today (although what could possibly be worse than losing one's parking sticker?)

I am talking about partnership today because I believe in it. And because I truly believe that our individual visions and efforts cannot take us where we want to go. I sincerely hope that each one of you in this room believes the same.

Now, let me take a few minutes to respond to the Faculty Senate 2000-2001 recommendations. First, I want to respond with enthusiasm to the Senate's approval of three new academic programs. My enthusiasm is due to the fact that these three programs will both advance the general goal of excellence in our professional and graduate schools and that they do so in ways that build upon our unique strengths. The programs include: The Cancer Biology Graduate Program in the School of Medicine, the LLM Graduate Program in the Law School, and the Ph.D. and M.S. Degree Programs in Biomedical Informatics in the School of Medicine.

Moving on, I concur with the Senate's motion to keep the Senate's Executive Committee at full strength in the event that the Chair of the Senate is re-elected.

I also concur with the Senate's endorsement of the revised Faculty Home Purchase Plan.

The Senate has made four important recommendations in the areas of faculty recognition, retention, and professional development:

1. I am in agreement with the Senate's support of the concept of research leave for non-tenured, tenure-track faculty. As the PEAf committee's recommendation indicates, these leaves should be defined and awarded in a manner consistent with the priorities of each school. It is vitally important that we do all that we can to insure the professional and academic development of our junior faculty.
2. The Senate recommends the establishment of the Cornelius Vanderbilt Professorship for outstanding tenured full professors. I approve of this proposal and recognize the need to increase our ability to recognize and reward our most outstanding senior members of the faculty. I must, however, look to implement this proposal over time and must also do so in a manner that is consistent with our attempts to increase the number of endowed chairs at the University.
3. Finally, the Senate offers two suggestions for the "Recognition and Support for Faculty Research and Professional Development." These suggestions are to double the stipend for the Sutherland Prize in recognition of the cumulative nature of this important award, and to establish five annual \$1,000 prizes or "Chancellor's Awards" for outstanding research. I support the first suggestion and will instruct that the award for the Sutherland Prize be increased from \$2,500 to \$5,000 effective beginning with the 2002 awarding of the prize. I am aware, however, that in doing this we may be sending a signal that the University values research above other work of the faculty. In order to assure that this does not happen, a full and careful review of our faculty reward structure will be undertaken in order to assure that all aspects of faculty work are appropriately recognized and lauded.
4. Finally, and keeping in mind the need to review the overall award structure, I support the recommendation to create the "Chancellor's Awards for Research" for work done on an annual or one-time basis. All university faculty members are to be eligible for these awards and every effort should be made to recognize the wide range of research done in the schools and colleges in giving these awards.

Chancellor Gee then indicated that the Board of Trust was indeed currently meeting. He mentioned that the Board met twice a year and that there had been a retreat in June which granted an opportunity to really talk about the nature and the relationship of the University and its Board. The first of that was

to make sure that we had a Board that simply did not come enjoy themselves for two days, have a nice dinner in the evening and then go on to a football game. That is a pox in our house when that happens because a disengaged Board is one that is not energizing and energized on behalf of the university. This Board is energized, they are very engaged and we are very grateful to them for their work. I think Mrs. Ingram has done a very wonderful job.

The Chancellor mentioned the book that Mrs. Ingram had recently written about her husband, Bronson Ingram, who was very significant in the life of this institution. He also noted that the Board will soon be going through a process of appointing new members to the Board over the next several years, somewhere between six and eight new members, which will result in a number of new faces on the Board. They hope to look very widely in search of people who will join the Board across this nation and around the world.

Thankfully, let me note that the reorganization of Student Life continues to move ahead very successfully. David Williams and our team have done a wonderful job and let me say that I think that the life that they've breathed into our student affairs, whether it be the fact that we had a wonderful homecoming to the energized nature of our students in terms of their programs, we're moving from process to program, and I think that is very important. By the way I'll note, and I'll take full credit for this, that our retention rate has moved quickly, to come to a level which I think worthy of a great institution, our retention rate with the latest figures are at 95%. They had been down in the 80's, high 80's and that for an institution that is highly selective is unacceptable. We will finally reach nirvana when it is at 98 or 99%, which very few institutions have, but we have now moved into that level which speaks highly of the efforts of all of us, particularly the faculty, to make that happen.

Finally, a question was asked where are we in terms of the Provost and what we're doing. Remember my last time with the Senate I said that I was going to spend a lot of time in meetings asking a very interesting question, "what do we expect out of academic leadership at this institution?" How do we formulate an academic leadership role for the Provost that makes sense for this institution this time in terms of what we're doing? And frankly, what makes sense for an institution that has, I think, a very active and a very very compelling group of peer officers and, I will just note, a Chancellor who does not see himself as a provost but who will not be disengaged from academic life and wants to be fully engaged in the life of the academy here? I heard in many conversations that there is an expectation that our deans be given much more opportunity to be academic leaders rather than budget officers. That is my expectation -- that we empower our deans and our department chairs so that they have a leadership role. That role should be more clearly defined in terms of the opportunities for our deans and our department chairs. They should have a powerful role in academic decisionmaking of this institution and engagement of the faculty.

Second of all, it seems very clear that what we want to have in the provost is someone who is given clear responsibilities. The first responsibility is to set a vision for the institution. A vision is important. We all are a part of that and clearly a provost has to be able to understand, articulate and develop a vision that we can all be a part of. A second responsibility of the provost is to hold us to the highest standards in terms of the academic mission both collectively and individually. That is a significant part of that role.

A third part of provost's role is that the provost has to make certain that we are engaged in encouraging and nurturing and developing the very best talents within the institution and securing the best talents to come and join with us. The search for talent, the war for talent (a term I sometimes use, I've got to stop using that quite so aggressively as I do), is enormously important. Saying that, where are we? Within the next month I'm going to make the decision precisely how I think we ought to move ahead. After further conversations, we have a variety of ways – one is, of course, to have the traditional nation-wide academic search; the other is to take a look at some of the very talented people we have internally through an internal search process; the third is to think about a different organizational structure. I haven't made up my mind. I won't make up my mind until I have further conversations. I am right at that process and I think it is very healthy to have a discussion with a number of our colleagues about where we are. I intend, by the way after Ellen's [Goldring] urging, to send out a general e-mail to all the faculty after this meeting, indicating what I have just said and I expect to hear from you ([gordon.gee@vanderbilt.edu](mailto:gordon.gee@vanderbilt.edu)) because this is an important decision both in terms of person and structure that we will make for a long time.

Senator Sasson: That was good news about the rise in retention rate. Can you tell us what we did? Chancellor Gee: I think we took that as a serious admonition that we had to do something. Through the orientation program, onboarding, if you will, we tried to develop a core program last year that enabled students to feel that there was not just one way to salvation either by joining a fraternity or sorority, but that there were a number of activities that exist out there that are affirming. Our goal is making sure that every student who comes to Vanderbilt finds their place immediately. Second of all is that, in so doing, we attract a wider array of students – tall and short, black and white – and indeed I'd like to see a few kids with pink hair and nose rings, it would be interesting. Our retention rate is going up but we also need to make sure that we have more passion about issues which I also think will help.

#### PRESENTATION OF DEANS' PANEL

Chair Blumstein: I asked the deans to structure their presentation around their particular institution and around the core of the Vanderbilt University community.

William Christie, Dean, Owen Graduate School of Management:

- I have the distinction of being both one of the newer Deans but also being one of the youngest. I have heard, on more than one occasion, Vice Chancellor Zeppos refer to me as Duggie Howser! I continue to interpret that as a compliment!
- I also have a different background in that I began my academic career at Vanderbilt in 1989. Thus, the Owen school is the only academic home that I have known as a full-time faculty member. I feel blessed to be a part of Vanderbilt, and it is a distinct honor to serve the school as Dean.
- I would like to use the few minutes that I have to provide some comments on the University at large, but spend most of my time talking about Owen. My focus on Owen is predicated on the impression that the school has not traditionally reached out to other academic units at Vanderbilt. That has changed, and the pace of change is accelerating.
- First, let me make one observation about the intellectual life of the university. We have outstanding faculty, to be sure. I am very proud of those that I have worked with at Owen and throughout Vanderbilt. But I notice a tangible difference between the intensity of the intellectual dialogue at Vanderbilt relative to the University of Chicago where I earned my graduate degrees. I have heard the word complacency used to describe our faculty. I believe that is too strong a word for it implies indifference. From my perspective, comfortable might be a more appropriate description.

If true, why might we be comfortable?

First, we are geographically isolated from our competition. I suspect that this gives us, to some extent, a sense of reassurance since we can't see those nipping at our heels.

Second, we already are a very successful institution. We are fortunate to have a number of internally renowned scholars, and we are nationally ranked as among the best in our respective disciplines. We have come a long way in the few short decades that we have a stated goal of being a top Research I institution. I am concerned that in some ways, we might have exceeded our expectations, and that we need to use this success as leverage to attain even greater success.

Third, we have been fortunate to have been relatively unaffected by economic conditions. While faculty at state schools faced years of zero percent raises, we always had a raise pool. We haven't had to restrict our use of copy



paper for exams to the extent that questions had to be placed on overheads and students forced to buy bluebooks.

- Thus, a challenge facing the university, if it aspires to the highest ranks of research I universities, is how to increase the intellectual environment at Vanderbilt.

One solution relates to Dean's Syverud's contention that we need to attract and retain top faculty. These "reach appointments" are intended to stimulate the intellectual life of the university through the attraction of world class faculty.

We need to reward research with the same fervor that we acknowledge teaching. For example, I am in complete favor of retaining the Chairs of Teaching Excellence. But to award the Sutherland prize with a check of \$2,500 while the Chair of Teaching Excellence receive \$10,000 per year for 3 years skews the emphasis too much away from the public recognition of research. These awards need to be brought into line.

I would also encourage investment (either central or school funded) in the creation of additional research centers, conferences, and as I will mention shortly, a conference center to house these activities.

Finally, I would like to offer one other observation related to faculty retention and compensation. Fixed percentage increases do not reflect market conditions.

- Since I know that Jim is going to hold me to a deadline, let me briefly offer a few comments about the direction and challenges facing the Owen school.

We are a school that was founded in 1969, nearly closed in 1976, and then flourished under Deans Richmond and Geisel to become an internationally recognized graduate school of business.

In the most recent BW rankings, we placed 22<sup>nd</sup> in our day MBA program and 17<sup>th</sup> in the world for our executive MBA program. In the exec ed survey, we ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> in strategy and 2<sup>nd</sup> in finance only to Chicago!

Let me spend a moment commenting on the challenges we face, and then address the strategic initiatives we are pursuing.

- First, we are one of the few businesses whose fortunes are determined by the rankings of non-academic publications. We must deal with rankings from U.S. News and World Report, Business Week, Forbes, Financial Times, and the Wall Street Journal. Fortunately, we fare well in all.

But this comes at a price. In the words of one business school professor, we at Owen are likely guilty of the same crimes that I mentioned with respect to Vanderbilt at large. Let me read the abstract to Professor Zimmerman's paper from the University of Rochester.

"U.S. Business Schools are locked in a dysfunctional competition for media rankings. This ratings race has caused schools to divert resources from investment in knowledge creation, including doctoral education and research, to short-term strategies aimed at improved rankings, such as placement offices and public relations campaigns. Curriculums are narrowing and training students for their first jobs, not their entire careers. Faced with a prisoner's dilemma, deans select short-term strategies that reduce research and doctoral education. The result is a looming critical faculty shortage and ultimately the demise of the pre-eminence of American management education."

- Of the many intriguing statements in this abstract, what caught my attention was how closely the strategic plan at Owen is intended to overcome these shortfalls, even before reading this article!

Specifically, Owen is

Intent on training students not just for their first job, but for their fifth. This will involve increased emphasis on developing skills in leadership, communication, entrepreneurship and strategic planning.

Focusing our doctoral education in areas of strength. Rather than admit a small number of students (sometimes 0) across a large number of disciplines, we are restricting admission to finance and organization studies as these two functional areas have been successful in moving their students through the program and placing them in very good schools. This also has the benefit of attracting students to enroll in our Ph.D. courses from other areas of Vanderbilt related to these two fields.

Setting a goal of becoming a beacon of resources for Nashville in the same light as the Medical Center! How? By not looking beyond our borders. Ten years ago, 35% of our students were placed in Nashville. In our mission of becoming an international school, we might have forgotten, or at least overlooked, our local friends. Not any longer. Gaylord Entertainment has been the home to several teams of Owen students who are assisting Gaylord with its current restructuring. While the typical Owen student has 4.5 years of work experience, the ability to parachute into a business and help with their business plan development, strategic planning, financial modeling, etc. is a tremendous learning opportunity. We are getting the word out to local businesses that they can avail themselves of highly skilled labor at zero cost (as the students receive academic credit), and the response has been overwhelming.

Correct a flawed business model. How? Exec Ed. This ties into our need for a place to house academic conferences in a first class manner. It also provides opportunities for all schools to emphasize research conferences. This may require central funding, in the same manner as residential colleges. But it clearly speaks to a major need of the university.

Play to our strength. One of the hallmarks of the Owen program is its culture of both cooperation and competition. Recruiters continually remark on the outstanding skills our students developed in team-based learning. This aspect of our program dictates that to a large extent, we will not be expanding the size of our incoming classes as we don't want to risk losing this unique characteristic. However, we are continually looking for ways to attract even brighter students. Our average GMAT scores, while high, need to rise if we are to compete with schools such as Cornell, Dartmouth and Northwestern.

Finally, focus on corporate relations and fundraising.

We all have our work cut out for us to make our individual schools, and hence the university, first rate. I am delighted to have had the chance to share my views of both.

Steven Gabbe, Dean, School of Medicine:

I am really honored to be a part of the Vanderbilt community. I find there's not a day goes by that I don't meet someone or learn about a program that makes me even happier to be here. I can say that after eight months. I am only the tenth dean in the 126 year history of the School of Medicine and I am the first new dean in 25 years. I follow in John Chapman's footsteps and John was nationally recognized, in fact just honored this week as one of the most important leaders of medical student education in the country.

My responsibilities are different though. Harry Jacobson, Vice Chancellor for Health has asked me to be the Chief Executive Officer of the faculty. So my responsibilities include not only medical student education but resident, fellow, post graduate, and doctoral education, research and clinical practice.

What I'd like to do is review some of the exciting changes ongoing in the School of Medicine, touch on our strategic plan, the highlights of our plan for the next five years and then put those goals and objectives into the context of the Chancellor's objectives for the University.

This is a period of incredible change in the School of Medicine. This time next year more than half of our 29 chairs will be new. Just in the past year we've appointed Jeff Baler as the Chair of Anesthesiology, Bob McDonald from Michigan to be Chair of Oncology, Dan Beauchamp to be the head of Surgical Sciences. Dan is a noted investigator as well as a highly respected surgeon,

Heidi Hamm to Chair the department of Pharmacology and Wright Pinson in General Surgery. What all of these individuals have in common is that they are nationally and internationally recognized in their fields and they are very strong investigators as well as excellent teachers and clinicians.

We have four relatively new chairs: Eric Neilson in Medicine, Arnie Strauss in Pediatrics, Martin Sandler in Radiology and Dennis Hallahan in Radiation-Oncology. Again, the prototype is someone who is an excellent clinician and excellent teacher, but is also recognized as a leading investigator.

We have two new departments – Biomedical Informatics chaired by Randy Miller and Cancer Biology, chaired by Lynn Matrisian. These are attracting national attention. We've a new center for stem cell biology led by Brigid Hogan one of the few women in the world who is a member of the Royal Society in England. And we just appointed, as you know, Pat Levitt as the Director of the Kennedy Center. Pat is a noted neuroscientist.

I think you get a sense of a pattern of activity and where our emphasis is. We're recruiting new chairs in four of our departments. Right now we are recruiting for chairs in psychiatry and ophthalmology. We'll start soon for pathology and cell biology and we're looking for the same types of individuals that we've recruited in the recent past. We are also recruiting a new position, an associate dean for diversity. One of my primary objectives is to, as the Chancellor said for the University as a whole, increase diversity in the School of Medicine. An associate dean for diversity is unusual across the country. These individuals may chair committees or a unit but to have them at the associate dean level makes a very important statement to our students and faculty which is very important to us in the School of Medicine.

We have gone back to review the strategic plan that was put in place five years ago. This has been a very inclusive process with all the faculty at all levels holding faculty meetings, meetings with faculty leaders, meetings with the School of Nursing dean and associate deans. That strategic plan brought us great success especially in the areas of research with discovery grants that support new investigators, research reward programs to reward investigators as their research programs expand, growing our inter-disciplinary graduate school programs and developing research cores. There was somewhat less emphasis on education and clinical practice in that plan, but those are some of the things that we are going to emphasize in our new plan.

Our new plan which we will present in the spring has five major objectives. First, to continue to grow our clinical and basic research. It's been increasing over 15% a year, it's growing as fast as any of the top ten medical schools are growing. Second, to recruit and retain outstanding students and faculty. We're going to develop a \$50 million scholarship fund for our students. We know that the average indebtedness of one of our students upon graduation is \$95

thousand. So when you see the students march across Langford stage to get their diplomas, that represents over \$8 million in debt. That influences whether students come here because we don't offer as much scholarship money as other top schools, and it influences their career decisions. We must, therefore, increase the scholarship money.

In terms of recruiting and retaining our faculty we are developing programs to enhance faculty development. Mentoring, how to succeed in research, time management, stress management – those are some of the programs we are planning. We are going to do something that was called for in the last strategic plan and that is to develop a teaching reward program. As I noted, we have a program that rewards research. In clinical practice you are rewarded for your efforts. But, we want to identify our teaching efforts and especially our outstanding teachers. We are also going to create an academy of clinical educators. With all of the pressures today to see more and more patients, there is less and less time to teach in the clinics, at the bedside and in the operating room. We are going to provide salary support for very carefully chosen faculty members who can be role models, mentors, and teachers in the clinical setting.

We're going to expand our activities in the Meharry-Vanderbilt alliance. It has been a great success especially in the area of research, but we are going to be working with our colleagues at Meharry to coordinate better our medical student education, resident training and clinical practice.

The initiatives I have described will require increased funding. Most of this will come from our clinical activity which continue to grow, through the \$1 billion development campaign, and also through technology transfer.

Finally I just wanted to go over the goals that the Chancellor noted in his strategic plan and how what we're doing will support them. The first was to review our commitment to the undergraduate experience. We'll be working more actively with our undergraduates in terms of pre-med counseling, and in developing opportunities for them to come across campus to work in research laboratories in hopes that when they join us in the Medical School, they can carry on this work. This is part of our program to identify and nurture our students to become leaders and scholars. Next, re-inventing graduate education – I mentioned our interdisciplinary graduate programs – we're going to expand that. We also plan to expand our M.D.-Ph.D. program. Third, re-integrating professional education with the intellectual life of the University. Here, we participate in many activities across campus such as the Vanderbilt Brain Institute, the Kennedy Center, the Center for Biomedical Informatics, and a new program in chemical biology. Fourth, renewing Vanderbilt's covenant with the community, Ginny Shepherd is here and has been our leader in those areas as we try to work with the community to expand teaching programs, including community educators and bringing them onto our campus. I also think this is a very important part of our diversity program. All of us are competing, all of us

being the top medical schools throughout the country, are competing for the same students and the same potential faculty members. The pool is very, very small. The only way we're going to improve on this is to increase the number of qualified students. To do this, we're going to have to go into the communities, into the grammar schools, in the high schools, and at undergraduate school level and encourage and support these students to enter careers in medicine.

James Hudnut-Beumler, Dean, Divinity School:

Let me begin with an observation that I suspect is common to the experience of many of you. When I introduce myself and tell what I do anywhere in greater Nashville, someone invariably will ask me if I know so-and-so, who teaches at Vanderbilt. Usually it's not someone in the Divinity School, and often I don't, in point of fact, know the other faculty member.

How could I? How could we? Vanderbilt has thousands of faculty. We are balkanized into schools, into fields of study, into zones of the campus. But people on the outside of our system don't know that. They want to think of us as *one single faculty*. I think their intuition is an important one to listen to, for it is my further observation that at our best we want to be part of one real faculty.

We must of course have departments. Strong departments support us in our work, they hold us accountable as scholars, organize our work, and put human faces on the word "colleague." But when strong departments have impermeable boundaries they don't serve the ideal of the university very well. They get in the way of ideas that are bigger than any single discipline; the valuable reason why we bring our fields together under one roof in the first place.

We must, of course, have schools. The schools at Vanderbilt provide a way to budget, but more than that they divide the many things that are knowable, ponderable, and researchable into neighborhoods where students can enter into meaningful discourse that leads to emergence as an educated person in a particular profession, or into adult life itself.

But when strong schools become an impediment to the learning of students and faculty, one must wonder whether we've built the educational equivalent of gated neighborhoods. Any time we're gating something, we need to ask what are we afraid of and what have we shut out of our experience that greater openness might have allowed. As a dean, I know that sometimes the gates help to keep us from going broke, from giving away the store while we're doing great education. But other times, like this week, I think we're in love with gates.

Take this week, for instance. It's registration week, and Monday morning brought an e-mail message from the administrative assistant for our graduate program telling faculty to remind graduate students in religion that they could not

register for Divinity courses. What she was trying to say was that they had to register for appropriate graduate level courses amongst divinity offerings under the graduate school's designator "REL." What she communicated, in truth was that there are barriers to learning at Vanderbilt; some trivial, some not.

I think I care so much about removing barriers to learning within and beyond the University for two reasons. First is because I have experienced enough collegiality in this and other universities to know what a good thing it is and to hope for more and more of it. Second, I believe that it is a good thing for the Divinity School, for the study of religion and culture more generally, and that, if I may be so bold, that having the Divinity School is potentially and in fact a good thing for this university.

Let me say a word about the Divinity School for those who may be less familiar with what it does at Vanderbilt.

The Divinity School at Vanderbilt began as one of the original four departments of the University. The School has grown to enroll students from more than 35 religious bodies and to feature a faculty of 24 full-time professors. Each year approximately 200 students study in one of two professional Masters degree programs that educate women and men for a wide range of ordained ministries and specialized forms of service. Another 100 students are in residence in the Graduate Department of Religion (GDR), pursuing academic work leading to the Ph.D. The Divinity School faculty is joined by faculty from other parts of the University to form the GDR, a program ranked by the National Research Council as being in the top ten of all graduate programs in religion or theology.

The opening lines of our strategic plan state a goal for the School:

To build upon existing areas of excellence to become a premier center for the education of religious leaders, including scholars who can interpret religious traditions, beliefs and actions as they bear upon the far-reaching aspects of life which this University takes as its domain.

Everything we do or propose to do then is related to two things: Religious Leadership and Religious Understanding. But more than that, what we seek to do we do in relation to things that you study and care about and research.

In the United States, most theological education is done in church-sponsored schools. Vanderbilt Divinity School is one of only four non-denominational, university divinity schools in the nation. (The others are Yale, Harvard, and Chicago Divinity Schools.) Most students come from various Protestant Christian groups, but the School is proud to welcome students from Catholic, Jewish, Buddhist, Muslim and other faith groups. Excellence in critical academic inquiry mark the School's faculty and its programs. The School is also

distinguished by its shared values, which include respect for religious traditions, and commitments to ecumenicity, to the inclusion of all kinds of people in the leadership of religious bodies, to the pursuit of justice among people and for the created order.

Religion is one of the human cultural phenomena that refuses to stay where it belongs. Just as soon as you assign it to the private domain, it pops up in a book of Mark Jarman's poetry, or Tony Earley's *Jim, The Boy*, or in the waiting room at the Ingram Cancer Center, or in the juxtaposition of Islamic terrorists blowing up the World Trade Center, while our own Muslim students tell us "that's not true Islam," and Americans discuss "can this war be just?" What we do in working with religious leaders to become something more than narrow pleaders for narrow viewpoints is and can be enhanced taking advantage of this University—by relating outside the gates of the temple. But at the same time, this University is one of the few great ones where people who study politics, economics, literature, art, medicine, law, and the chemical engineering can relate to scholars of religion. We may be living in a time when having a divinity school is a more distinct advantage to a university. Our gates are open, come pay us a visit.

Chair Blumstein then opened the floor for questions and or discussion, and a lively interactive discussion ensued.

After expressing his appreciation to the members of the Deans' Panel and to the members of the Senate for their active involvement in the discussion, Chair Blumstein adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

MaryJo Gilmer,  
Secretary

MJG/cs