

Vanderbilt University
Faculty Senate Meeting
November 6, 2003
4:10 p.m. Room 140 Frist Hall, Nursing School

.....

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes of September 11, 2003

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

Remarks by Chancellor E. Gordon Gee
Governance at Vanderbilt

Standing committee reports and recommendations

Academic Policies and Services (Senator John Oates, chair)
Recommendation on proposed new degree program at School of Medicine

Faculty Life (Senator Bart Victor, chair)
1. Report and recommendation on faculty awards
2. Interim report on benefits

New business
Motion to endorse statement on diversity and tolerance at Vanderbilt
Senator Michael Bess

Good of the Senate

Adjournment

Voting Members present: Barz, Bess, Casagrande, Conklin, Ellingham, Ely, Fleetwood, Gabbe, Greene, Hawiger, Heflinger, Heyneman, Innes, LeBoeuf, Link, McCarthy, McCarty, McGill, Morrow, Neff, Oates, Osheroff, Paschal, Peebles, Ramsey, Sasson, Sevin, Strauss, Swift, Tellinghuisen, Victor, Washington, Wcislo.

Voting Members absent: Adams (regrets), Benbow, Christie, Conway-Welch (regrets), Cummings, Eigen, Farran (regrets), Flake, Fogo, Galloway (regrets), Gay (regrets), Goldfarb (regrets), Griffin, Hodges, Horn (regrets), Hudnut-Beumler, Masulis, Perkins (regrets), Saff, Smith, Summar, Syverud, Thompson (regrets), Wait.

Ex Officio Members present: Brisky, Gee, Gherman, Shepherd, Zeppos.

Ex Officio Members absent: Barge, Goldring, Hall (regrets), Jacobson, Limbird, Outlaw, Perfetto, Schoenfeld, Spitz, Spruill, Williams.

.....

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

Chair Ramsey welcomed those present and quickly reviewed the agenda. He also requested any changes to the minutes of September 11, 2003. With none, he asked for a motion to approve the minutes, which was granted. After the motion was seconded, a voice vote was taken, and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Next Item on the Agenda – Report of the Executive Committee

Chair Ramsey gave a report of the Executive Committee after the Special Executive Session of Elected Faculty Senators on October 9, 2003. He reminded senators that there is a summary of the discussion at the meeting on the Senate website (View the [October 9 report](#)). He reported that the Executive Committee judged this experiment to be a success, and said that the consensus of the committee was that this is a useful device that helps the Senate to serve its dual role as both an advisory and a representative body. There will be another Special Executive Session held in January. There were no formal motions put forward as a result of the meeting, but the Executive Committee has embraced several proposals that enjoyed broad support at that meeting, including a recommendation that suggestions for the Senate agenda be solicited from the entire Senate and the faculty at large. Chair Ramsey also emphasized the role of ex officio members of the Senate, and welcomed their full participation in Senate discussions.

In response to a request from the Chancellor, the Executive Committee has submitted comments on the report from the ad hoc Committee on Committees. Faculty senators were given a chance to read and respond to that report before the committee drafted their comments. There is broad agreement on the need to reform the committee structure, to update it to meet the current needs of the university and to reform the committee selection process. The Executive Committee emphasized faculty service on committees as a form of faculty co-governance, and stressed a need for a strong standing Committee on Committees to oversee the appointment process and to periodically review the charges of the various committees. Chair Ramsey noted that the Chancellor will give the current Committee on Committees a chance to respond to these comments and will confer with the Executive Committee again before making further decisions. He stated that there should be more to report at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

The Executive Committee has met with University Counsel and Vice Chancellor David Williams to discuss intercollegiate athletics and the conflict disclosure form. The Senate has established a task force considering the conflicts policy that appears in the Faculty Manual, and any change in the policy would probably dictate a change in the form. On the design of the form, Chair Ramsey reported that there is consensus that the University adopt a more user-friendly web-based form modeled on the one developed at the Medical

Center. The committee also met with Vice Chancellor Harry Jacobson concerning Medical Center issues and ways to engage Medical Center faculty in Senate work. There was also discussion about increasing the number of senators from the Medical Center. Chair Ramsey noted that the Medical Center does have twice the number of faculty as the other schools combined, and while no one is arguing for a fixed ratio between the number of faculty and the number of senators, Dr. Jacobson spoke of a number somewhere between “the U.S. House of Representatives and the U. S. Senate.” The committee has referred this question to the Senate Affairs Committee.

Chair Ramsey also remarked that he will be giving a presentation on behalf of the Executive Committee to the Board of Trust the following week, and that his presentation will be posted on the Senate website. The Executive Committee—along with Senator Bart Victor, chair of the Faculty Life committee—will be meeting with Kevin Myatt, Chief Human Resources Officer, to talk about benefits later in the month. This effort will be coordinated, in part, with the staff councils at the Medical Center and University Central.

Chair Ramsey concluded his report, and then opened the floor for questions or comments. Hearing none, he moved on to the next agenda item, and introduced Chancellor E. Gordon Gee.

Next Item on the Agenda – Remarks by Chancellor E. Gordon Gee

Chancellor Gee introduced Matt Shank, an American Council on Education fellow, who was attending the Senate meeting as a guest. He then noted that the Board of Trust would be meeting the following week, and that this would be the first meeting under the new format of rotating members. As a result of this change, the format of the meetings has also been changed. The Board will now meet Wednesday-Friday, rather than Thursday-Saturday. The Chancellor observed that this will result in more involvement with the Board by the faculty.

The Chancellor then turned to the issue of restructuring graduate education. He recognized the work of Faculty Senate during this process, and pointed out that an additional \$35 million will be committed to graduate education at Vanderbilt. He then turned to athletic restructuring at Vanderbilt. He mentioned that the Executive Committee had asked him what the role of faculty was in this process, and he noted that the faculty will be very central since athletics is now a core academic function of the institution. He stated that there will be a series of conversations about the exact nature of this role, and that we are in the process of “deconstructing in order to reconstruct.”

The Chancellor then turned to the university organizational chart ([View this organizational chart](#)). He said that this presentation came about during a meeting with the Executive Committee about the structure of the university. The Chancellor stated that the reason he was asked about the structure was that no one understood it; he allowed that it is an unusual structure, and suggested discussing it further at a Faculty Forum. He then put this discussion in a historical context of his own experience as a university

president. He said that he had seen that universities were increasingly organizing themselves using a corporate model—very vertical with isolated functions. He said that he wanted to think differently about how to think of an institution in terms of administrative structures. He then pointed out several features of the chart: there are only three areas that report directly to the Chancellor (Faculty Senate, the Chief Information Architect, the Internal Audit function), then six Vice Chancellors. He emphasized that each Vice Chancellor is first a Vice Chancellor of the University, and then they have a particular responsibility. He said that he believes in the concept that we are one university, and that this integrated model is different from most universities. He then gave specific examples of integration at Vanderbilt; for example, the Provost is also the Chief Fundraiser (to his knowledge, this is the only university where this is the case). He explained that, usually, there is a powerful division between those who raise the money, and those who spend it; in Vanderbilt's model, those who spend it, raise it.

He continued by pointing out that Vanderbilt has six vice chancellors instead of ten, and it has one of the lowest administrative costs of any major university in the country. Finally, he explained that the drivers in this model are: 1) excellence, 2) agility and 3) the ability to work across university lines. He asked: is this model working? He believes it is. Since administrative costs were cut by 3 ½ %, Vanderbilt was able to avoid some of the measures being taken now by other universities across the nation. The Chancellor then opened the floor for questions and comments.

Question (Senator Jacek Hawinger): In your first address three years ago you said that you are not a CEO, so this is consistent with that statement. But I don't see any schools here except for School of Medicine and School of Nursing. Where are the other schools?

Response (Chancellor Gee): The other schools are under the Provost, and they are just not specifically mentioned on this chart. But we also encourage cross-institutional initiatives that involve more than one school.

Comment (Senator John McCarthy): The tendency to abbreviate would lead one to say that the "CIA" reports to you (referring to the Internal Audit function).

Response (Chancellor Gee): Duly noted.

Question (Senator Stephen Heyneman): How far do you want to go with this integration issue with respect to decision making on appointment, salary, strategic planning, etc.?

Response (Chancellor Gee): It's impossible for us to do away entirely with the current practices (ETOB). Instead, we asked what was working about the current system and what do we want to change? The results are that we now can invest centrally and have flexibility at the college level. I am most proud of the Academic Venture Capital Fund, and I think that it will have an important impact on this university for years to come.

Follow-up Question (Senator Stephen Heyneman): Would you allow exploration of the possibility that there may be additional areas of commonality between the schools?

Response (Chancellor Gee): Yes, in fact on the administrative side, there is an initiative called STOP (Simplifying the Operating Processes) and the purpose of that is to integrate across our various units.

Comment (Dean Steve Gabbe): I would like to point out that there are many programs in the Medical Center that encourage cross-discipline initiatives.

Response (Chancellor Gee): I would like to point out that this model is in process, and will continue to evolve over time.

Chancellor Gee concluded his remarks and thanked the Senate for this forum. Chair Ramsey then mentioned the possibility of organizing a Faculty Forum on this issue early next semester that will include several Vice Chancellors and others.

Chair Ramsey introduced the next portion of the meeting devoted to standing committee reports.

Next Item on the Agenda – Standing committee reports and recommendations

Chair Ramsey called on Senator John Oates, chair of the Academic Policy and Services Committee.

Senator Oates presented for the Senate's consideration a proposal for a graduate program for a Master in Laboratory Science (View the [proposal](#) and accompanying [letter](#)). Senator Oates explained that a proposal was presented to the Senate last year and was not approved. A new proposal was submitted to the committee in the fall that addressed a number of the concerns expressed last year by the Senate: concerns that the threshold for GPA was too low (this has been raised); that the number of academic hours needed to be increased to 36 (this was increased); that there should be a title change (it has been changed); and that entry into the program was restricted to Medical school employees (that has been changed to open the program extramurally). The proposal with these changes was submitted to the APS committee, and further changes were made. Senator Oates reported that the APS committee has unanimously approved it and now recommends it for the Senate's approval. Chair Ramsey asked for a motion to approve, which was seconded. Chair Ramsey then opened the floor for discussion.

Comment (Senator Jacek Hawiger): All concerns were properly addressed and I move to approve it.

Chair Ramsey then asked for a voice vote, and the motion was approved unanimously.

Chair Ramsey then recognized Senator Bart Victor, Chair of the Faculty Life Committee, to present two reports on the faculty awards process and health benefits. Chair Ramsey explained that the Executive Committee submitted a report this summer to the Chancellor regarding faculty awards. The Faculty Life Committee was asked to examine the report and make a recommendation to the full Senate.

Senator Victor gave a summary of the faculty award process's history. The FL committee reviewed the recommendations, and agreed with them, therefore they are presenting them to the Senate as written (View a full list of the [recommendations](#)). Chair Ramsey explained that this is a committee motion and it requires no second. The

full report of the Executive Committee is available on the website. Chair Ramsey then opened the floor for discussion.

Question (Senator Stan Link): The awards here do not include teaching awards, correct?

Response (Senator Bart Victor): Yes, that is correct.

Question (Senator Cynthia Paschal): How are schools involved? And can you tell me why must there be a letter of support from the dean?

Response (Chair Ramsey): The concern was to coordinate and streamline the process of recommendations. The idea was not that every candidate would need to have the full support of the dean.

Comment (Dean Richard McCarty): I share this concern, I'm not sure this is something I want to be involved in because I think it sets up an additional roadblock for candidates.

Comment (Dean Steve Gabbe): I think we could be copied on the letter of nomination so that we can be aware, but I don't think the deans need to provide a letter of support.

Chair Ramsey recognized a motion to amend (to strike the requirement of a dean's letter) and a second. He asked for a voice vote, and the motion to amend was passed unanimously. He then opened up the floor again for further discussion.

Question (Senator Cynthia Paschal): How are the schools involved?

Response (Senator Bart Victor): It's a diversity issue to make sure that all of the schools are represented in the nominations.

Comment (Chair Ramsey): The spirit of the proposal was to try to generate as many nominations as possible from all schools.

Chair Ramsey asked for further discussion.

Question (Senator Neil Osheroff): Does this include the diversity of the committee?

Response (Chair Ramsey): The committee that makes the nominations at this point is in most cases the Senate Executive Committee or the Consultative Committee, which includes the Executive Committee plus Senators in the final year of their term and the chairs of the standing committees. Apart from the committee chairs, these are elected positions, so we have little direct control over the balance of the committee.

Follow-up question (Senator Osheroff): Which awards are we talking about?

Response (Chair Ramsey): All awards except for the teaching awards.

Question (Senator Jason Morrow): This is independent of awards given by the School of Medicine, correct?

Response (Chair Ramsey): Yes, these are university awards only.

Chair Ramsey then called for a voice vote on the motion as amended, which was carried unanimously.

Senator Victor then gave an interim report on faculty benefits. He reported that he will be meeting with Kevin Myatt Chief Human Resources Officer, and that his committee is trying to get a broad sense from the faculty about concerns in this area. His committee will be collecting information via a survey, and will also be concentrating on emeritus faculty issues. There will be a report on this issue sometime at the end of the year.

Comment (Senator Arnie Strauss): Cost containment is critical, especially for mental health issues.

Response (Senator Bart Victor): Please share your concerns with the Faculty Life Committee.

Comment (Senator Jacek Hawiger): Perhaps this should be a transinstitutional issue.

Response (Senator Bart Victor): We will look into this.

Comment (Dean Richard McCarty): As a member of last year's Health Care Cost Containment, I can tell you that we had two motivating forces: 1) to protect the health benefits of our employees and 2) to prevent the institution from going bankrupt. One of the positive things to come out of that committee is an emphasis on wellness.

Response (Senator Bart Victor): The Faculty Life Committee will be focusing on making the faculty voice clearer and more articulate in these discussions.

Comment (Dr. Paul Gherman): As we have done with athletics, Vanderbilt can also lead the way in restructuring health care. Also, when people are put in charge of their own health care, they control costs because it is their costs.

Response (Senator Bart Victor): Perhaps one of the things we can do as we talk about the structure of the survey is to not just solicit expression of wants and needs, but also ideas from the faculty as well so that they can become part of that process.

Comment (Dean Steve Gabbe): There was a very successful plan at Ohio University when Chancellor Gee was there. Also, I have met with Kevin Myatt and I believe that he is working hard to help with these issues.

Comment (Chancellor Gee): Quality and containment are the two biggest issues with healthcare.

Chair Ramsey thanked Senator Victor for his presentation.

Next Item on the Agenda – New business

Chair Ramsey noted that there was a motion under new business. Chair Ramsey recognized Senator John McCarthy (standing in for Senator Michael Bess who was unable to make the presentation) who presented a diversity statement drafted by Carolyn Deaver and vetted by other faculty members (view the [proposed diversity statement](#)). He gave a brief summary of the history behind the need for this statement, explaining that there was an editorial and subsequent exchange of letters in The Hustler that prompted the discussion. There was some concern by faculty that the tone of the discourse was not entirely appropriate. When it was realized that the Senate did not have a stance on

diversity issues or freedom of expression, a group of faculty members decided to draft a statement that could be adopted by the Senate in an official capacity. Senator McCarthy elaborated that despite the diversity of opinions at the university, it is important to emphasize the common ground of mutual respect in such exchanges. Senator McCarthy then read the text of the statement. Then, Senator McCarthy made the motion for the Senate to adopt this statement. After the motion was seconded, Chair Ramsey opened up the floor for discussion.

Comment (Senator Jacek Hawiger): I think this is an excellent statement and reflects what a university should be about. I propose that we add the word “tolerance” at the end of the statement, as well.

Comment (Stephen Gabbe): I suggest using “debating” rather than “arguing” since it has a more positive connotation.

Question (Senator Dan Fleetwood): As a pragmatist, I am wondering what the relevance of this statement is in the particular instance of the discussion that was going on in The Hustler? Does the fact that we insist on tolerance mean that we don’t tolerate such a discussion or that we must tolerate such a discussion? Is this a stance or a statement?

Response (Senator McCarthy): I think that the intent of the resolution is to be both a stance and a statement. The stance is that we acknowledge the importance of open and unencumbered expression of ideas, however, there is a clause that restricts the unencumbered freedom, namely that the expression of ideas and difference of opinions must be expressed in such a way as to allow debate to occur.

Follow-up Question (Senator Dan Fleetwood): I was trying to ask a simpler question: if we had such a policy, would the Faculty Senate take action in this specific case (referring to the letter writer in The Hustler) or would we have simply pointed out that we have such a policy?

Response (Senator McCarthy): I am not sure what action we could take, but we could respond and insist upon certain ground rules in a discourse.

Comment (Senator Vickie Greene): I agree with the sense of the letter, but I strongly disagree with the statement that there is not a conflict between freedom of speech and preservation of diversity. There are certain things you cannot say politely nor have a reasoned discourse about.

Response (Senator McCarthy): Within a community that emphasizes rational discourse and dialectical interaction, we can find ways to respond to these sorts of views.

Question (Senator Neil Osheroff): To follow up on Dan’s question, I think the real issue is: if this statement appeared in The Hustler right after that exchange of letters, how would it have been viewed? Would it have been viewed as a chastisement of the letter writer or the participants in the subsequent discourse?

Comment (Dean Richard McCarty): When you responded to Dan, you lost my vote, because you suggested something that’s counter to what you just said. You used the article in The Hustler as an example of something that shouldn’t have been published and I can’t agree. The Hustler should have published this letter exactly as the student wrote

it. But to get to the core of this problem, we have gay students on our campus who fear for their safety. This is not going to address this; this is window dressing. If you want to do something helpful, make a statement that says we strenuously oppose any effort to suggest or convey harm to any of our students.

Response (Senator McCarthy): We are on the same page about the tone of the letter; I didn't mean to suggest that it should not have been published. Second, I'm not sure that the framers of the statement wanted to go that far, as regards harmful speech against students.

Comment (Dean Gabbe): I don't think that what we have here is a statement on diversity, but what we're looking for is a statement on the nature of discourse. It would seem to me that we ought as a faculty to say what we expect on the nature of discourse, including that it is not alright to threaten someone's life. With some editorial changes, I think I could support this, but currently, I would agree it is window dressing.

Comment (Senator Jack Sasson): We must go beyond tolerance in this statement, since tolerance is not strong enough.

Comment (Senator Arnie Strauss): I suggest a revision by the writers of this statement.

Comment (Senator Jim Ely): I move to table the motion and have it resubmitted at the next meeting.

Comment (Senator Joel Tellinghuisen): There are real limits to free speech, and we need to acknowledge that fact.

Chair Ramsey reminded the senators that there was a motion in order to table the statement and bring it up at the next meeting. The motion was seconded. A voice vote was taken, and the motion was passed unanimously. Senator John McCarthy asked any who were interested in contributing to the revision of this statement to send an email Senator Michael Bess.

Next Item on the Agenda – Good of the Senate

Chair Ramsey then called for business under Good of the Senate. Hearing none, he adjourned the meeting at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dale Farran,
Secretary