

Vanderbilt University  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
March 13, 2003  
4:10 p.m. Room 140 Frist Hall, Nursing School

---

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes of December 12, 2002 & January 20, 2003

Remarks by Virginia Shepherd, Faculty Senate Chair

Remarks by E. Gordon Gee, Chancellor

Scheduled Remarks:

Report & Recommendation from Academic Policies & Services Committee

Report overview from Senate Affairs Committee

Old Business

New Business

Good of the Senate

Adjournment

Voting Members present: Barz, Bess, Booth, Dobbs-Weinstein, Fogo, Gabbe, Galloway, Goldfarb, Goldring, Greene, Haselton, Hawiger, Horn, Innes, Kay, Knight, Lind, Masulis, McCarthy, McCarty, McGill, Neff, Osheroff, Outlaw, Paschal, Perkins, Pitz, Ramsey, Saff, Shepherd, Strauss, Summar, Swift, Tellinghuisen, Thompson, Ward

Voting Members absent: Benbow, Clayton (regrets), Christie, Conklin, Conway-Welch, Corbin (regrets), Denison, Farran (regrets), Fleetwood (regrets), Heyneman, Hudnut-Beumler (regrets), Link (regrets), Morrow, Oates, Retzlaff, Salisbury, Sasson, Simonett (regrets), Syverud, Victor, Wait (regrets)

Ex Officio Members present: Brisky, Gherman, Schoenfeld

Ex Officio Members absent: Gee (regrets), Hall (regrets) Jacobson (regrets), Limbird, Spitz, Williams

---

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Chair Virginia Shepherd. After requesting for changes, the Minutes of December 12, 2002 & of January 20, 2003 were approved.

**Chair Shepherd began the meeting by reviewing the agenda.**

She noted that Chancellor Gee would not be in attendance; therefore there would be no remarks from the Chancellor. Chair Shepherd then made the following remarks.

The April 7, 2003 luncheon featuring Frank Rhodes, President Emeritus of Cornell University, has been postponed indefinitely due to scheduling conflicts. The Senate executive committee will inform the members when this is rescheduled.

On May 1 & 2, 2003 Vanderbilt University Faculty Senate will host the SEC Faculty Governance Leaders Gathering. Representatives from all SEC schools are expected to attend. Chair Shepherd reviewed the tentative agenda for the two-day gathering. (View agenda within Chair Shepherd's presentation at <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/Ginny31303.pdf>) A steering committee of Vanderbilt senators and other interested faculty are currently meeting to plan the event. It will be co-chaired by Ginny Shepherd and a representative from the University of Arkansas. The planning committee is still in the process of determining which events will be open to the public.

Chair Shepherd briefly went over the tentative agendas for this semester's remaining Senate meetings – April 10: vote on Senate Affairs Committee recommendations, which will be discussed during this meeting (3/13); report and recommendation on Residential Colleges from the Student Affairs Committee; recommendation from PEAFC Committee on current grievance process; presentation and approval of degree programs presented by the APS Committee. May 5: final committee reports; any remaining voting on committee recommendations; officer elections.

Chair Shepherd also noted that all who currently serve on a University Standing Committee will be asked to remain on their committees while the Committee on Committees continues its review of the nomination/notification process associated with these committees. It is expected that the Committee on Committees will forward its recommendations to the Chancellor before the start of the fall semester.

**Next item on the agenda – APS (Academic Policies and Services) Committee Response to Graduate Education Task Force Report**

Senator Cynthia Paschal, serving in APS Chair Clayton's stead, was introduced by Chair Shepherd.

Senator Paschal noted that she will go over the main points of the response, ask for discussion, and then request Senate approval of response. She also noted that graduate education is central to the mission of the University and that the Task Force put together a tremendous report – one that was detailed, comprehensive, and action-oriented. She reminded the Senate that APS looked over the report and that the Senate held a special meeting in January to discuss the Task Force's recommendations in the report. She commented that though there is still much in the way of

details to work out and answers to questions still being raised, it is at this point that the APS Committee wishes to announce that it enthusiastically endorses the report. The report spotlights a lot of what APS brought to light last spring when it began looking into the issue of graduate education.

Continuing, Senator Paschal stated that APS wished to reaffirm that ultimately the faculty bear responsibility for this University's graduate education; therefore, faculty must be fully engaged at all stages of its modification and overhaul. Success will not be found any other way.

Senator Paschal then read through the bullet points of an APS prepared document. (View APS response at <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/APS31303.pdf>) Completing that, she turned to APS' recommendations for further attention. These are:

- The role of the Graduate Faculty Council (GFC).
- The role of the faculty in determining which programs are selected for enhancement.
- The relationship between undergraduate and graduate education.
- The role of department chairs.
- Provincialism and regionalism.
- Strengthen the libraries at Vanderbilt.

Senator Paschal noted that the second point was a "hot button" item for the committee. Because it was so encompassing, the committee provided greater detail in its recommendation.

After reading through the recommendations, Senator Paschal opened the APS response for floor discussion.

Question: (Marshall Summar) – The response is fairly general. What specific actions is APS recommending?

Response: (Cynthia Paschal) – The Task Force report is pretty specific, so we didn't feel that the committee needed to add anything within its response.

Question: (Michael Bess) – I don't recall the issue of libraries being in the report.

Response: (Paschal) – That is why we added that recommendation.

Follow-up response: (Provost Zeppos) – Let me add a few comments on libraries. Currently, the Divinity School and Peabody College are working to enhance their collections. We are also planning to bring in a consultant to look over the main library (Heard Library) to determine what it would take to make it a "library of the future." We don't simply want a library that just wants more shelf space, etc. This will be part of an overall strategic planning process for Heard. Our tentative thinking is to conduct a separate \$50-100 million capital campaign, which would kick off at the conclusion of the University's campaign. We expect to begin the planning phase of this campaign within 12-18 months. We are also looking at whether or not Heard should be transformed into simply a graduate or undergraduate library – creating another library focused on the other one.

Follow-up Response: (Bess) – This obviously would be a great recruiting device for faculty.

Question: (Patricia Ward) – Though the issue of space, buildings and technology are important, what priorities are being set that will strengthen the library collections?

Response: (Gherman) – As you know, each dean is responsible for building collections. Further strengthening will depend on what happens to the graduate programs – which strongly influence collections.

Follow-up comment: (Ward) – Obviously, the impact could be quite serious as programs come and go.

Response: (Zeppos) – Library collections are driven by current faculty and deans. Though there is a lot of belt tightening going on at the University, there is flexibility for the deans to continue making this a priority. The University’s investment in collections and the University’s overall holdings are continuing. Another avenue on collection activity that is occurring is what I call opportunistic collecting as a way to entice future faculty in the areas of recruiting and creating new studies and centers.

Question: (Chair Shepherd) – As a faculty member of the School of Medicine, I have a question related to the fourth recommendation – particularly the statement – “Consideration should be given to ways to enhance the effectiveness of chairs, including studying the very different model of the position common in the Medical School.” – What is the model that APS is talking about?

Response: (Paschal) – To be honest, I’m not quite sure.

Follow-up response: (Victoria Greene) – I think it came from the role that directors of graduate studies play (primarily in A&S) and the amount of task work they have. The Medical School spreads out the work and includes chairs in the decision-making process.

Comment: (Paschal) – I think it also has to do with the fact that some Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) positions go to people who are less productive than their peers – so there is less incentive to view the position as one of respect and worth.

Comment: (Shepherd) – Well, it is confusing to me, so I recommend that we seek better clarification on the meaning of that sentence. I also don’t think it is good to draw attention to just one school.

Comment: (Joel Tellinghuisen) – I would be interested to see what those differences are between schools and departments.

Comment: (Provost Zeppos) – My view is that in A&S, DGS positions are short-term with little authority. In the Medical School, the positions are longer term, given budget authority, and are partners in developing strategic plans for their departments and schools.

Comment: (Tellinghuisen) – At present, it implies that top-down model is superior to any other that is out there, and I am not sure that is an assumption we should make.

Comment: (Arnold Strauss) – The intent of the Medical School model is not to be top-down. The intent is to focus on developing stronger, broader graduate programs, using the resources available.

Comment: (Ellen Goldring) – I suggest that we strike the final sentence. I believe that the real intent of the sentence was to develop a common culture and shared purpose.

Comment: (Jacek Hawiger) – I am concerned about the path this discussion is taking. In the Medical School, some chairs also hold the position of DGS. It is important to note that chairs, as leaders, set the directions and the directors are then responsible for carrying it out. I am in favor of enhancing the role and authority of DGS, but be sure to involve chairs in the development instead of using them simply as administrators.

Comment: (Shepherd) – The APS response agrees with you. The role of the chair is important.

Comment: (Strauss) – I move to recommend that the sentence be stricken from the APS response.

Comment: (Chair Shepherd) -- Discussion is still open. At this time, I'd like to ask that Senator John McCarthy share what the Graduate Faculty Council is taking up at this time.

Point of Interest: (John McCarthy) I hold the position of secretary of the executive committee of the Graduate Faculty Council. We met as a council yesterday to discuss the Task Force report. Associate Provost Dennis Hall asked that the council review the report and provide any comments or recommendations, noting that the report is still open for faculty input. All members acknowledged the tremendous amount of effort that went into the report and lauded many parts of the document. Half the conversation was philosophical in nature, addressing big issues. One of the first points raised was that the institutions we highlight as ones we want to compete with already have a head start on us and they will not be standing still; therefore, how realistic is it to base our efforts on these select schools in terms of recruitment and placement of students? A second point raised was the time table associated with this transformation, which was 10-20 years.

Funding for these recommended endeavors occupied the remainder of the discussion – how far would the money identified in the report get us to realizing the listed desires? The GFC questioned whether or not the \$10 million in additional funding, as identified in the report, would actually be enough to achieve our aspirations for excellence. Some members of the council wondered whether or not \$40-50 million might be needed instead. The council expressed concern about the proposed review of program viability within the new configuration. Who will determine which programs stay and which will be dissolved? When the report talks about governance and oversight functions it spotlights the function of the DGS and the department chair; however, if faculties are being held responsible for the programs they participate in and administer, consideration should be given the creation of an oversight committee comprised of faculty who can scrutinize programs and determine which are strong and which are weak. In conclusion, the council plans to continue discussing the report and will provide comments and recommendations to Associate Provost Hall.

Comment: (Doug Knight) – I would like to see more clarification provided for the last half of report which lists out the recommendations. I look forward to when theory becomes reality because I don't think that the structural issues of the report were as detailed as they need to be. Having said that, what is the Senate really voting on?

Response: (Chair Shepherd) – We are voting to approve APS' formal response to the report, which will be forwarded to Provost Zeppos. If we don't approve it, it can go back to APS for more clarification and detail.

Follow-up response: (Provost Zeppos) – The structural questions are really the next steps for people to talk about. We need to look at the faculty structure and how it will interact with administrators, etc. These are things that we are struggling with. But let me provide assurances that nothing will be acted upon without first communicating with the faculty body, getting feedback, and reconstituting where necessary. Let me also assure you that there will be accountability throughout whatever new structure is developed. The Senate would obviously be included in all discussions, and it is my expectation that the deans will also talk to their faculty for feedback. We need to come up with options that we can work with – maybe a council or another body to help oversee this effort.

Recommendation: (Arnold Strauss) – I recommend the APS response be approved and forwarded to Provost Zeppos with the recommendation that the last sentence in recommendation four be stricken.

Response: (Matthew Ramsey) – Instead of striking the sentence I propose the following revision – “Consideration should be given to ways to enhance the effectiveness of chairs, including studying the different models of the position that exist at Vanderbilt.”

Chair Shepherd calls for a 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> from the Senate body for the APS response with the revised sentence. Both are received.

Comment: (Patricia Ward) – So, we are going on faith that structural and monetary issues will be worked out, right?

Follow-up comment: (Idit Dobbs-Weinstein) – How much input will faculty really have?

Response: (Provost Zeppos) – I am eager to have faculty participation and engagement on this – no matter how minute.

Chair Shepherd called for a vote. The response was approved and will be forwarded to Provost Zeppos with the revised sentence.

**Next item on the agenda – Senate Affairs Committee – review of recommendations, which will be voted on by the Senate at the next meeting**

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

Senator Horn noted that the committee had a lot of issues to consider and resolve this year. One issue was on the voting rights of deans. That issue led to the present document that specifically looks at two changes to the Senate’s Constitution and Rules of Order. (View document <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultysenate/files/SenAff31303.pdf> )

Senator Horn stated the committee recognized that there were positives and negatives to allowing voting rights to deans. The committee also recognized that the relationship between elected members and deans has been fairly collegial. Given that, the committee decided that deans should retain their voting rights. Senator Horn then proceeded to read the first recommendation and open the floor for questions from the Senate body.

Question: (Cynthia Paschal) – Does closed ballot mean written ballot?

Response: (Horn) – Yes.

Clarification: (Neil Osheroff) The committee went into great detail about closed vs. open vote. In the end, we felt electronic voting was a solid option to provide privacy.

Senator Horn then read the second recommendation, which would add a special executive session for elected members. The recommendation also noted that the chair of the Senate would have authority to call such meetings. She then opened the floor for questions from the Senate body.

Question: (Robert Innes) – Would the Senate be able to vote during these meetings?

Response: (Horn) – No. We would only be able to vote when the full body of the Senate was in session.

Comment: (Robert Pitz) – Going back to the first recommendation, if we don't get electronic voting, then voting and counting could really drag down.

Response: (Horn) – Right. This would not be used for all votes only those deemed contentious.

Chair Shepherd concluded discussion on this and reminded the Senate that both recommendations will be voted on at the April meeting.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Goldring,  
Secretary