

Vanderbilt University
Faculty Senate Meeting
April 15, 2004
4:10 p.m. Room 140 Frist Hall, Nursing School

Call to Order

Introduction of Professor Kassian Kovalcheck as Senate Parliamentarian

Approval of Minutes of March 18, 2004

Note: the minutes can be found on the Senate Web site at:

<http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultySenate/files/31804facsen.pdf>

Report of the Executive Committee

Matthew Ramsey, Chair of the Faculty Senate

Remarks by Chancellor E. Gordon Gee

Standing Committee and Task Force Reports and Recommendations:

Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics/Committee on Student Life

Report and recommendation from the Task Force: Faculty Athletics Fellows Program
(Virginia Shepherd, Task Force member)

Motion to approve the Task Force Recommendation (Senator Robert Innes, Chair,
Committee on Student Life)

See the committee report at:

<http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultySenate/files/athleticsfellows.pdf>

Task Force on the Conflicts Policy/Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

Motion to approve the Task Force Recommendations (Senator James Ely, Chair, PEAFF)

See the Task Force final report at:

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

Task Force on Cross-School Initiatives/Committee on Academic Policies and Services

Report from the Task Force (Professor David Wood, task force chair)

Motion to thank the Task Force for its report and recommend it to the attention of the
administration (Senator John Oates, Chair, APS)

See the Task Force report at:

<http://www.vanderbilt.edu/facultySenate/files/AVCFfinalreport.pdf>

New Business

Good of the Senate

Adjournment

Voting Members present: Barz, Bess, Casagrande, Conklin, Conway-Welch, Ellingham, Ely, Farran, Fogo, Galloway, Goldfarb, Greene, Griffin, Hawiger, Heflinger, Hudnut-Beumler, Innes, Le Boeuf, Masulis, McCarthy, McCarty, McGill, Paschal, Peebles, Perkins, Ramsey, Retzlaff, Smith, Strauss, Summar, Swift, Syverud, Tellinghuisen, Thompson, Washington.

Voting Members absent: Adams (regrets), Benbow, Christie, Cummings, Eigen, Flake, Fleetwood (regrets), Gabbe, Gay (regrets), Heyneman, Hodges, Horn, Morrow (regrets), Neff, Oates (regrets), Osheroff (regrets), Saff, Sasson (regrets), Sevin, Victor, Wait, Wcislo (regrets).

Ex Officio Members present: Balsler, Brisky, Gee, Schoenfeld, Shepherd, Spruill, Zeppos.

Ex Officio Members absent: Barge, Gherman (regrets), Goldring, Hall (regrets), Jacobson, McNamara, Outlaw, Perfetto, Spitz, Williams.

.....

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

Minutes from 3/18/04 meeting were reviewed and a motion was made to approve them. Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Ramsey introduced Professor Kassian Kovalcheck as the new Senate parliamentarian, and reminded the Senate that he could be reappointed in this position in the fall.

Next Item on the Agenda - Report of the Executive Committee

Chair Ramsey reported that on March 25th, there was a Senate forum on the faculty role in university governance attended by about 35 people. Chair Ramsey mentioned that there was a lively discussion. Two of the suggestions that emerged from the discussion were to redesign the Senate website to make it more user-friendly and to have the Senate Executive Committee meet with the deans in addition to meeting with the Chancellor, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs. Chair Ramsey stated that both of these suggestions will be implemented this summer.

Chair Ramsey said that the Executive Committee has also been working with the administration on the final design of policy on faculty awards. The Senate initiated a much needed reform of procedures for making these awards and collaborated successfully with the administration to make necessary improvements. Chair Ramsey reminded senators that the participation of the faculty is very important in making nominations.

The Executive Committee has also continued to work with the administration on the new procedures for appointing faculty members to University Committees. Chair Ramsey encouraged senators to consider volunteering and to recruit others to serve.

Chair Ramsey then reminded senators that the last meeting of the year will be held on Monday, May the 10th to be followed by a reception. He also reminded senators that elections for new officers will occur at that same meeting. Under the Senate's rules of order, any voting senator may nominate any eligible person from the floor at the meeting at which the election is to take place. All current first-year Senators are eligible for Senate office, but the Senate may not elect a chair and a secretary from the same school or college. Chair Ramsey said that at the meeting of May the 10th, the Senate will also be voting on the new degree program at the medical school, and the final report of the fourth task force on intercollegiate athletics will be presented. The Committee on Senate Affairs will make an interim report on reapportionment of senators. Chair Ramsey stated that in order to make room for this business, the chairs will not read their final reports; instead, they will be posted on the website and the members of the Senate will have an opportunity at the meeting to make comments and ask questions. Chair Ramsey asked for questions or comments. Hearing none, he recognized Chancellor Gee and turned the floor over to him.

Next Item on the Agenda – Remarks by Chancellor Gee

Chancellor Gee opened his remarks by mentioning the forum on faculty governance. He said that he thought it was a good beginning, but that the university community needs to take this opportunity to expand that discussion so that we can make appropriate changes in terms of our shared governance model.

Chancellor Gee gave an example of shared governance in action by mentioning several issues that he has been working through with the Senate Executive Committee. The first issue has to do with the faculty awards for research. Chancellor Gee said that he did sit down with the Executive Committee and had conversations about this issue. What resulted was a very effective model.

Chancellor Gee stated that another issue that demonstrates shared governance is the process that occurred while working on the restructuring of University Committees. Chancellor Gee said that the oversight committee has been appointed, and the committee charges will be finalized soon. But, he reminded senators that the purpose of the oversight committee is not to create more work; rather it is an opportunity to make certain that we do not have the gaps that had appeared in some of our committee structures. Chancellor Gee also noted that the oversight committee in athletics has now been appointed and that, Virginia Shepherd, will be the chair of that committee. He continued by saying that this committee is the university's committee that will oversee the policy and function of the athletic restructuring at Vanderbilt.

Chancellor Gee mentioned other changes having to do with commencement. Commencement has been restructured so that it is a three day event rather than a one day event. He said that one of the changes was to invite a speaker for Senior Day. The first speaker chosen was Condoleezza Rice. Chancellor Gee encouraged all of the Senate to come and to celebrate the accomplishments of the university this year. He then opened the floor for questions.

Question (Senator Doug Perkins): I was wondering how Dr. Rice was chosen?

Response (Chancellor Gee): Dr. Rice was chosen as our first speaker because we wanted to bring someone to campus who had a sense of academic initiative and someone who was a major national figure. She qualifies on both accounts.

Comment (Senator Jacek Hawiger): You told us that at the Faculty Assembly in the spring that you just turned sixty years old. I want to wish that your exuberance continues unabated for many years.

Response (Chancellor Gee): Thank you very much.

Chair Ramsey thanked the Chancellor for his remarks, and added:

Let me just say something briefly about the question of faculty reports. There remains one small difference between the Senate recommendation and the policy that is going to be implemented. The Senate motion calls for the Consultative Committee of the Senate to recommend candidates to the Provost for all the non-teaching awards and that is not going to happen in the case of the two research awards: the Chancellor's Research Award and the Sutherland Prize. In the view of the administration, these recommendations would have more credibility if they come from an appointed committee of faculty who are themselves distinguished researchers rather than an elected body. But out of deference to the Senate's views, the decision was made to appoint a separate committee on research awards representing the different schools of the university just as the Senate Consultative Committee represents the different schools of the university. And, also, in the interest of transparency, the roster of that committee will be published.

Chair Ramsey mentioned that the code of bylaws of the university provides for cases in which the Chancellor rejects a Senate recommendation. This typically includes a written explanation from the Chancellor, a written response from the Senate and a report to the next meeting of the Board of Trust. But in this case, Chair Ramsey said that the remaining differences are so small that it hardly seems worth invoking this cumbersome machinery.

Next Item on the Agenda - Report of the Senate Task Force for Intercollegiate Athletics

Chair Ramsey then reminded senators of the model for Senate task force reports. First, the task force report goes to the parent standing committee of the Senate, and if the committee then approves the report it is the standing committee that will introduce an appropriate motion at the next meeting of the Senate.

Chair Ramsey then recognized Professor Virginia Shepherd, immediate past Senate Chair, who is also a member of the Senate task force on intercollegiate athletics.

Professor Shepherd stated that she would briefly summarize this proposal for the Faculty Fellows program from the Intercollegiate Athletics task force. She said that this program was devised to involve faculty more in the lives of student athletes and athletics in general. Essentially, at least two faculty members will be appointed for every Vanderbilt athletic team, depending on the size of the squad. The goal of this is to interface more with the team, and to provide faculty guidance,

faculty presence for the team, and work with the coaching staff and the faculty advisors to assist in any issues related to graduation and other academic matters.

Professor Shepherd explained that the faculty athletic fellows (FAF) will travel with the team when possible to away contests. Their appointment will last for two years and the first appointments will be staggered so we will have overlap. The call for applications will come very soon. The FAFs will be selected by the oversight committee on athletics, which has just been appointed. Professor Shepherd then opened the floor for questions.

Question (Senator Mark Ellingham): This sounds like a lot of work for the faculty members involved. Is there some kind of compensation program?

Response (Professor Shepherd): There is no compensation, except for the joy of attending the events, but in reality, I think this will certainly attract those faculty who do go to a lot of the events, and we are hoping that this will be a volunteer program.

Question (Senator Cynthia Paschal): I am wondering how many people total are you talking about? Is this for varsity teams only or also for club sports?

Response (Professor Shepherd): This is for varsity only. We are talking about 32 faculty members for sixteen teams.

Comment (Senator Hawiger): Let's clarify the thinking about this question, because this commitment will include more than simply attending games.

Response (Professor Shepherd): This has to be something that somebody is going to want to do, and it will take time. I think there is a lot of help that faculty can give in terms of majors and advising.

Question (Senator McCarthy): I am assuming that it would include some kind of academic advising but does it mean you have to work out with the team too?

Comment (Senator Farran): I don't think it can include individual academic advising.

Response (Professor Shepherd): No, there are individual academic advisors who specifically interact with the athletes. We would not be doing advising on a day-to-day basis.

Comment (Senator Innes): I am in favor of this proposal. I have a personal concern that the academic support program in the department is insufficient, even though it is the best one in the country. My hope is that these people would not just be, as I am, fans of several teams, but be kind of hard nosed about trying to help these students. I think if this whole thing is going to work it is going to take a lot of faculty involvement and I don't think we have been sufficiently recruited to be involved.

Comment (Senator Agnes Fogo): One of the things that I think is very positive with the athletic department, especially in the last year, is that the athletes are being integrated into the whole

school. While this program sounds very wonderful on the face of it, it is another instance in a way of special treatment for athletes. What about other students with special gifts who play in band? What about students who have other extracurricular activities that are very time consuming? Do we have similar mentoring opportunities for them? I think it is a wonderful beginning step, but I sense that this will add to the feeling of “specialness” in the treatment of athletes.

Response (Professor Shepherd): I think that first of all this part of a national movement that is trying to integrate academics and athletics on university campuses. Having said that, I understand your point, but I think if you look at campuses across the country, you will see that athletics is typically furthest removed from the academic mission of the university and this is a necessary step in the right direction.

Follow-up question (Senator Fogo): What about the special treatment, the special resources, special faculty bonding, special attendance, and special mentoring? Do we have similar resources available to other student groups?

Response (Professor Shepherd): I certainly would be behind those also.

Comment (Dean McCarty): I think that is a great point. We, in fact, pay some faculty to support some of our programs. Debate would be a case in point and we also provide tremendous support for travel in other activities. I think what this program does, and I applaud it, is to complete the circle that Chancellor Gee started. We’ve got the students, I think, in the process of reintegrating with the life of our student body, but we haven’t completed that other part of the circle, and that is to get the faculty intimately engaged with student athletes. And I don’t think we are privileging them given what we already do on a volunteer basis for many of our student organizations. I think this is a great first step and I support it wholeheartedly.

Chair Ramsey recognized the motion to amend, and the motion was seconded. Chair Ramsey read a written statement from Senator Jack Sasson:

“I am totally opposed to the faculty athletic fellows programs. Experience has shown that we will be asking for trouble in instituting it as it creates athletic groupies. Moreover, once instituted it will be hard to stop it as it creates its own synergetic symbiosis. Far better is it to have athletes go with faculty to their professional meetings. At least it will give them a sense that academics are serious to the point of boredom. I am sorry I cannot come to the Senate meeting, I teach at that time.”

Comment (Senator Farran): I would like to amend the proposal so that no one can serve two terms concurrently. You can be a FAF a second time, but you have to wait out a term. There is a danger of not broadening into the whole faculty, if you get people who are just there for years and years and years and really become sort of part of the team. So I would like to amend your motion that no one can serve consecutive terms.

Chair Ramsey asked for discussion of the motion to amend.

Comment (Senator Michael Goldfarb): My concern is that there was initial concern expressed about having 32 people able to do this so now your saying that we need 64, correct?

Response (Professor Shepherd): Every four years

Follow-up comment (Senator Goldfarb): So, we will need to address this issue.

Question (Senator Ellingham): Why don't we try it with one or two teams first instead of with the entire athletic department? Was that discussed in this subcommittee?

Response (Professor Shepherd): I think we start with what we start with. I mean, I don't think we need to legislate that we start a pilot program. I think we just start with however many we get.

Comment (Senator Stokes Peebles): Our task force has begun discussions with coaches trying to integrate them into the wider university and they are all welcoming any faculty interaction, because many of them don't know a single faculty member. They want to have interaction where they can go to a particular faculty member of particular schools and discuss individual problems on a personal basis.

Chair Ramsey called for a vote on the amendment to prevent people from serving two consecutive terms as a Faculty Athletic Fellow.

The amendment was carried with 22 votes for and 5 votes against. Chair Ramsey asked for further discussion.

Comment (Senator Paschal): I fully agree with you and, yes, all student organizations do have faculty advisors. I have been one and, indeed, went to lots of meetings, traveled with the group, etc.

Comment (Senator Helmut Smith): I very much can see why this is good for the athletic department and for the student athletes. It is not so completely clear to me that it's the best use of faculty time at a top research institution.

Comment (Senator Shepherd): I have looked into that. I believe it is a good use of my time as a faculty member. I look at it as assisting a part of our university. You are assisting student athletes who I think, right now, need faculty involvement.

Chair Ramsey called for a vote on the motion as amended. The motion carried with 23 votes for and 7 votes against.

Next Item on the Agenda - Report of the Senate Task Force on Conflicts of Interest

Chair Ramsey then turned the floor over to Senator Jim Ely, chair of the PEAFF committee.

Senator Ely said that his remarks would be brief, since this report was previously presented and discussed at the last Faculty Senate meeting. He said that in fall of 2002, the university adopted a modification of the conflict of interest and conflict of commitment policy. This was adopted on a provisional basis and was to be subject to review by the Senate. In the summer of 2003, the Senate established a task force to start the process of rethinking these issues. The task force was an independent body, but under the jurisdiction of PEAFF. Several members of PEAFF worked on the task force, which was chaired by Professor James Blumstein.

At the March meeting of the Senate, Professor Blumstein made a presentation of the then preliminary report, and there was some discussion of the report at that time.

Shortly thereafter, Senator Ely reported that Professor Blumstein submitted a final task force report to PEAFF. He mentioned that the report has been posted to the Senate web site.

Earlier this month, PEAFF met to discuss the report. PEAFF approved the report and was urging its adoption here today. Very briefly, PEAFF recommends that the Senate A) adopt the report, and B) urge the Chancellor in conjunction with the Executive Committee to implement the report and make appropriate revisions in the *Faculty Manual*.

Senator Ely then opened the floor for questions, comments, and discussion.

Comment (Senator Summar): I would like to make a motion for amendment. In meetings between the Executive Committee and the Vice-Chancellor and Provost, we discussed avoiding taking a final position on the proposal to remove the one day a week limit on consulting. The amendment would be that we would take no position on this issue.

The motion was seconded.

Question (Senator Innes): The section in question would eliminate the one-day limit on consulting, correct? The forty day rule?

Response (Chair Ramsey): Yes. We are trying to avoid taking a position on that question now—not that that would be a closed issue long-term, but it could be one that the administrators would like to work on with the Executive Committee and the task force.

Question (Senator Hawiger): I think that this would be wise to avoid the specifics; however, I know the task force is very thoughtful and this reflects very well the sentiment of the faculty. I have a question about the process. What happens next?

Response (Chair Ramsey): This is a recommendation to the Chancellor to change the policy. The recommendation does not rewrite the *Faculty Manual* and asks him to take steps to implement the recommendation and to rewrite the *Faculty Manual* accordingly. In practice, that will involve the university counsel and others.

The question of how the *Faculty Manual* gets amended is one that the Senate leadership has taken a strong interest in. The Faculty Life Committee has been looking into this, and there is a

good possibility that one of the task forces for next year will be devoted to this very question. There is nothing in the text of the *Faculty Manual* that describes how the Manual gets revised.

Chair Ramsey asked for any further discussion. Hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion to amend before the Senate.

The motion to amend carried with 26 votes for, 4 votes against, and 1 abstention. Chair Ramsey then asked for further discussion on the motion as amended. Hearing none, Chair Ramsey called for a vote on the motion as amended.

There was a call to make sure there was a quorum. The Senate Parliamentarian assured the Senate that there was indeed a quorum.

The motion was carried with 30 votes for and 2 votes against. Chair Ramsey thanked the chair of PEAFF and the task force.

Next Item on the Agenda - Report of the Senate Task Force on Cross-School Initiatives

Chair Ramsey then turned the floor over to Professor David Wood, chair of the Senate Task Force on Cross-School Initiatives. He thanked all task force members, especially those who served from outside the Senate.

Professor Wood thanked the members of the task force for all of their hard work. He also thanked faculty members and administrators for giving their time to the task force and for responding to queries and surveys.

He mentioned that the text of the task force's report was on the Senate website and that he hoped everyone would have a chance to read it. He said that out of the 20 recommendations put forth by the task force, he has picked nine to focus on for this presentation: Evergreen Capital Funding, Diversifying AVCF Focus (Beyond Cross-School Initiatives and Seed Funding/Pilot Projects), Transparency of Process, Sustainability Clarified, Pro-Active Research Development, Integration with Graduate Education, Motivating Faculty Participation, Impact of Centers on Departments, and Combating Institutional Drift.

As to the first point, Professor Wood stated that the task force recommends establishing a rolling capital fund, or evergreen capital fund, so that Vanderbilt can continue to invest seriously in its best ideas.

Speaking to the second general point, diversifying the focus of the Vanderbilt venture capital fund, first, Professor Wood said that the task force wants Vanderbilt to pursue this beyond just cross-school initiatives. The task force applauds what the fund has done with cross-school initiatives. But the need for institutionally-created capital funding is critical to new ventures within departments. Professor Wood stated that the more we release ourselves from ETOB funding and its mindset, the more we can lift the restriction on possibilities. He said that the second way to do this is to provide seed funding. Professor Wood said it might arguably be more effective to give seed funding to a larger number of projects. Then, fund them for a year or

two to see how they pan out. In this way, particularly projects with a higher inherent risk could at least be given a better opportunity to prove themselves rather than be set aside.

Professor Wood then addressed the third point: transparency of the process. There are many ways that transparency could be improved in this process, and they are noted in the report.

The fourth point, Sustainability Clarified, speaks to the notion that many faculty members had about putting a proposal forward, Professor Wood stated. He said that some faculty were discouraged from proposing projects because they were unsure of whether their proposal could satisfy the requirement for sustainability. This could be cleared up in future incarnations.

Fifthly, the task force recommended advising the Associate Provost's Office of Research to engage in even more proactive long-term, deep-cycle, encouragement of collaborative research, especially in the relatively undeveloped areas of Arts, Humanities and Social Science. Professor Wood said that the task force recommends hiring professional grant writers for this purpose. Other universities have done this with great success.

Sixth, the task force recommends the integration of graduate education with cross-school initiatives. This was intended, of course, from the beginning when the Academic Venture Capital Fund was set up, but with the new graduate initiative its more important than ever to involve graduate education in this process.

Seventh, there are incentives and disincentives for faculty, especially untenured faculty, to get involved in research centers, especially interdisciplinary research centers. Faculty motivation is a key area to look at when discussing these issues.

Eighth, the task force recommends looking at the impact of centers on departments. It was assumed that development of new centers would bring net gains to the departments. Since this will not always be the case, the task force believes that it is imperative to work through the possible problems in advance.

Lastly, the task force recommends combating institutional drift. One could see this Academic Capital Venture Fund process as a licensing of structural change. The task force recommends looking at this process and finding out how best to deal with future initiatives.

Professor Wood opened the floor for question, comments, and discussion.

Comment (Senator Farran): I just want to say that this is a wonderful report. I want to urge people here who haven't had a chance to read it—it reads very easily, as well; it's very well presented. The comments of the faculty at the end are quite enlightening. Thank you.

Comment (Chancellor Gee): First of all, I want to congratulate your committee. Second of all, this is a process that is quite unique in higher education. We do intend on making progress in this area using your report. I want to thank you personally on behalf of all of us.

Comment (Provost Zeppos): I wanted to say that I thought it was just an excellent report and that many of the recommendations are ones that we aspire to and are trying to put in place right now. One thing I would add here that we are very keen to do is to recruit faculty who are particularly interested to be part of our new trans-institutional centers.

I feel comfortable that we not simply investing this money, but that there's a general sense in the departments and with the deans that these are opportunities to hire people into schools who might not otherwise come to Vanderbilt but are purely drawn because of what we are doing here. I think it affects the hiring that we are doing in all the schools. We have to look at these investments and use them and our other resources for faculty and graduate education because that was the original intent.

Two of other things I want to mention quickly. I love the idea of seed grants. The Discovery grants are in some ways our efforts to have some sort of other funding. We need to look at, as you recommended, how effective they are. I think the seed funding is absolutely critical because it should not be "winner-take-all."

Then finally, I am very, very keen and interested to look more at the tenure-promotion question and I think that there are some models that we are using right now in hiring and tenuring and promoting and certainly thinking of using in some of these programs that could be good models that we use to develop models that actually work across the university.

Comment (Senator Hawiger): I would like to say that this is a very powerful and analytical report and it reflects the excellence of the initiatives which were undertaken by Chancellor Gee in 2002. Your call for transparency is well taken, and I think that faculty deserves more transparent process. In terms of tension between the emphasis on science/medicine/engineering at the expense of the arts/humanities and social sciences, these are the issues we are dealing with. I believe that we can put a thoughtful spin on this creative tension and develop more initiatives around life sciences.

I have two questions concerning specific recommendations: for recommendation #12, what specifically is the objective here? Are we going to continue to fund both big projects and small projects?

Response (Professor Wood): The task force recommends that there needs to be some ongoing provision for capital funding for these kinds of initiatives to be able grow and realize their potential, and I think we should sort of plan for that.

Follow-up Question (Senator Hawiger): Concerning recommendation number 18 (the impact of AVCF projects on traditional department and schools): Is this trying to say this is a positive impact or a negative impact?

Response (Professor Wood): It's an issue. Sometimes it's pure benefit to the department. Sometimes they lose colleagues or faculty members. Sometimes they lose entire floors of their building, and that's an issue and the task force thinks this needs to be looked at.

Comment (Provost Zeppos): I just want to say that on the humanities question, this is a challenge and a national intellectual issue. I was at the Mellon Foundation two weeks ago meeting with their top program officers. We had an hour-long discussion about how to do this work—interdisciplinary work and the life sciences being integrated into the humanities in a powerful intellectual way. I think we should be critical and self-aware, but if we can make progress on this question in the university we will really be best in class. People are really struggling with this at the university level and at the foundation level. The Mellon Foundation is sitting there with 300 million dollars for the humanities saying: how can we invest to change this?

Response (Professor Wood): One of the things the task force looked at was the process of allocating funds. We don't believe that there was any bias in terms of any favoring science over humanities. A lot of humanities proposals weren't worked up as they might have been. A lot of people who might have made proposals didn't make them. They may need help writing grants of the sort that scientists are used to.

Question (Senator Vicki Greene): First I wanted to say that I think these present centers are an asset. My concern is that these centers were kind of peer-reviewed as a group, but not against a lot of disciplinary research that goes on as well. How do you plan to put people, faculty, and resources into a center that does research versus department-based research? Is there going to be any kind of competition? Or, in a sense, has that already taken place?

Response (Provost Zeppos): What should be our strategy as far as working with the faculty, working with your departments and your chairs to build greatness in those departments? That, I think, in some ways, can be strongly related to the centers. In other ways, I would use the department as an example, but I am afraid I would step on some toes, if that department is growing separate from the centers, that's just a darn good department that should get more investment. I think you will see those things happen as well.

Comment (Dean McCarty): Of the 20 departments of Arts and Science, I would argue that not one single one has failed to benefit in a measurable way from all these centers that have been established. And I think that the quality of the departments has not been forgotten in all of this. It has been a dual enhancement through different means.

My bigger concern, and I haven't read the report completely, is the issue of carrying capacity. You used the metaphor of the forest and the fertilizer--I am worried about how many trees can grow on our plot of land.

Response (Professor Wood): Well, you have to read the report. There is a little section on carrying capacity.

Follow-up (Dean McCarty): Then, I withdraw my my comment. Thank you, I'll read it.

Comment (Chancellor Gee): There are two observations I would make. First of all, the major driving force behind this initiative was the fact that it was our attempt to break the bondage of ETOB, and so we had to do it in a very powerful way. I think we were very successful at that.

The second thing was the fact that if one talked about this purely as a venture capital fund, you would say, “Well, we have two or three strikes, we have two or three misses and we have some that go in the middle.” I think that we can honestly say that the centers that have been created, all of them right now are meeting or exceeding expectations that we would have.

So in some ways, the richness of the first round exceeded any of our expectations. All the things that you are saying are exactly what we are going to be saying now, “Given our successes, how do we now start to modify our behavior?”

And those are the kinds of questions that I think are really wonderful to be asking. And I would just say, that you know, we don’t right now have another 85 million dollars, but I do view this only as a pause.

Question (Senator Smith): The report mentioned a number of times the importance of additional funding for the Humanities Center, which is neither a center of research excellence nor a discipline-based center. I wondered if you could say a little bit more about that, about why your committee thought this was important.

Response (Professor Wood): Well, it actually was a proposal, as I understand it, under the last Academic Venture Capital Fund process. But it was probably inappropriate as a proposal given the directive to unfold new centers. We do suggest that when we talk about broadening the range of funding opportunities that further consideration be made to increasing the funding to the Humanities Center.

Chair Ramsey asked for any further discussion. Hearing none, he called on Senator Robert Thompson to make a motion on behalf of the AVCF committee.

Senator Robert Thompson: On behalf of Dr. John Oates, the chair of AVCF who could not be here, I would like to report that David Wood of AVCF made a presentation that was well received by the APS committee. The APS committee moves that the Senate commend the task force for raising a complex set of issues and to recommend that the university administration give these issues their full attention.

Chair Ramsey explained the reason for this motion. Since the task force report contains 20 recommendations and there couldn’t possibly be debate and a vote on each one, the Executive Committee agreed that the report should be seen not simply as the end of the process, but as the beginning of a very important conversation on academic investment at Vanderbilt.

Chair Ramsey thanked Professor Wood and the task force members again for all their hard work.

The motion was approved by acclamation.

Next Item on the Agenda – New Business

Chair Ramsey called for new business. Senator Heflinger asked about the Classified Research report. Chair Ramsey explained that the decision was made to defer action until the fall to give the university community more time for discussion of this difficult and important issue. Hearing no other new business, 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 5:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dale Farran,
Secretary