Call to order

Approval of the minutes of May 1, 2014

Report of the Executive Committee

Remarks by the Chancellor

New Business

1. Introduction of new senators
2. Presentation of committee charges for AY2014-15
3. Update on faculty training on power-based personal violence
4. Motion from Senator Wooders (amendment to the Faculty Senate Constitution)

Good of the Senate

Adjournment to reception

------------------------


Voting Members absent: Anderson, Adam; Blume; Cannon (regrets); Delpire (regrets); Enterline; Fogo (regrets); Fountain (regrets); Guelcher; Hemingway (regrets); O’Hara O’Connor (regrets); Price (regrets); Rohde; Webb (regrets); Wittig; Wright (regrets); and Wright-Rios.

Ex Officio Members present: Anderson, Audrey; Brady; Combs; Fortune; Hall, A; Johnston; Kopstain; Lutz; Raiford; Sweet; Wcislo; Wente; Zeppos.

Ex Officio Members absent: Bandas (regrets); Bernard (regrets); Cyrus (regrets); McNamara (regrets); Miller (regrets); Stalcup; Williams.
Call to order

Chair Paul Lim called the meeting to order at 4:10pm.

Approval of the minutes of May 1, 2014

Chair Lim asked for any changes to the minutes. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve. A motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

Report of the Executive Committee

Chair Lim gave an overview of the issues that the Executive Committee has discussed recently:
1. Strategic Planning and its implementation
2. Faculty Training on Power-Based Personal Violence
3. Concur—streamlining process of travel and reimbursement
4. International office closing and its aftermath
5. Donald Brady to serve as parliamentarian for this year: Chair Lim asked for the Senate’s approval of Donald Brady to serve as parliamentarian for this year. There was no objection to this nomination, and it was approved.
6. Compliance issues
7. Benefits committee (changes to 403b)

Remarks by the Chancellor

Chancellor Zeppos gave his remarks. He discussed: the strategic planning process, where the university will be investing and what ideas they will be investing in, and the healthcare environment.

New Business
1. Introduction of new senators: Chair Lim asked all new senators to stand up and he thanked them for their service. He also introduced the members of the Executive Committee, committee and task force chairs, and new administrators.
2. Presentation of committee charges for AY2014-15: Chair Lim presented some of the committee charges. Chancellor Zeppos mentioned the regulatory burden survey that will be sent to faculty members. Chair Lim mentioned that the Senate’s SPAF (Strategic Planning and Academic Freedom) committee has already met with the consulting group about this survey.
3. Update on faculty training on power-based personal violence: Chair Lim said that the Senate has been working tirelessly to respond to this issue with care, commitment, and campus-wide cooperation. We are nearly at the point of rolling out a university-wide faculty training very soon. It will happen on both sides of the university. It will include detecting signs of students not doing well, and help to teach faculty the warning signs and give them resources to help their students.
Chancellor Zeppos said that we can really be leaders in every issue, including this one. It shows a level of faculty interest and engagement at our institution.

a. Faculty Senator: This has to be a broadly coordinated activity. Some students will fire back that any activities that infringe on their rights are wrong. Chair Lim replied that the students recognize that binge drinking is a problem, so this is important that they recognize it, too. Chancellor Zeppos said that our investment in the students’ well-being is key.

b. Faculty Senator: Will training be mandatory? Will it address sexual violence?

c. Vice Chancellor Audrey Anderson: It will be online and in person. We will track numbers of faculty who participate. We are required by law to offer it to all faculty members. We will have a compliance review from federal government about this issue. We will have people available to come to any departmental meeting as well. It will be focused on sexual violence. The presentation will be approximately 25 minutes and 25 minutes of Q&A.

d. Chair Lim: Our initial thought was to get the senators trained and then get their departments trained.

e. Faculty Senator: We need to improve capacity and clarity around these issues and how they affect students. Faculty members are first responders. We are the ones who can act promptly.

f. Faculty Senator: What about how to train graduate students and TAs? Chair Lim said we are still thinking about this and how to do it. Provost Wente said that PETSA training is required for all graduate students. It is more about them as students, but not first responders. Vice Chancellor Anderson said that we are working on this, but there are legal definitions that we have to work with. We are trying to decide next best steps.

g. Faculty Senator: Is the module suitable for professional schools as well? Chair Lim said yes.

h. Faculty Senator: When are the compliance people coming to campus? Vice Chancellor Anderson replied that she wasn’t sure, but it will probably be by the end of the fall semester.

i. Faculty Senator: There are Title IX issues to consider. You have to disclose if you are a faculty member if a student tells you something about sexual assault. We need careful guidance about this. Vice Chancellor Anderson said that this training will help with these issues. Also, it’s not just about students, but also staff members and others in our community.

4. Motion from Senator Wooders (amendment to the Faculty Senate Constitution):

Chair Lim recognized Senator Wooders who presented her motion:

“Whereas the Constitution of the Faculty Senate refers to Chapter IV, Section 4a, of the Code of By Laws of Vanderbilt University and
Whereas the current version of the Code of By-Laws of Vanderbilt University does not contain a Chapter IV,
We resolve that the Faculty Senate review and revise the Faculty Senate Constitution as needed and bring the amended version of the Constitution to the Faculty Assembly for approval.”
The motion was seconded. Chair Lim opened the floor for discussion. There was none. The motion was adopted by a show of hands.

**Good of the Senate**

Past Senate Chair Donald Brady brought up that changes are coming to the university’s 403b plans, and more information will be forthcoming. Chair Lim reminded everyone to sign in and leave their name tents before leaving.

**Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 5:30pm.
Call to order

Approval of the minutes of September 11, 2014

Report of the Executive Committee

Remarks by the Chancellor

Scheduled Remarks
1. Frank Wcislo, Dean of the Ingram Commons
2. Faculty Training on Power-Based Personal Violence (Anita Jenious, director of Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action and Disability Services)

New Business
1. Motion to archive committee reports (Senators Brian Heuser and Myrna Wooders)

Good of the Senate

Adjournment

Voting Members present: Anderson, Adam; Bachmann; Baker; Blume; Benbow; Brown; Cannon; Christenberg; Christman; Delpire; Dewey; Fogo; Fountain; Friedman; Guenther; Greer; Hall, D.; Harrington; Hasty; Hemingway; Heuser; Johnson, R.; Kennedy; Koutsoukos; Lamb; Lim; Lind; Marcus; Martin; McCammon; McCoin; Norman; O’Hara O’Connor; Oskay; Pearson; Reside; Rohde; Spottswood; Tarpley; Turner; Webb; Wehby; Willis; Wittig; Wooders; and Wright.

Voting Members absent: Balser; Cliffel (regrets); Creech (regrets); Enterline; Fauchet; Guelcher; Guthrie; Haglund (regrets); Hetherington (regrets); Hopkins (regrets); Johnson, E.; Johnson, J; Maroney; Price (regrets); Slayton; Sloop; Smrekar; Steiger (regrets); Talbot (regrets); Townes; Wait (regrets); Walsh (regrets); Wright-Rios; and Ziegler.

Ex Officio Members present: Anderson, Audrey; Bandas; Brady; Hall, A.; Johnston; Kopstain; McNamara; Miller; Wcislo; Wente; and Zeppos.

Ex Officio Members absent: Bernard (regrets); Combs (regrets); Cyrus; Fortune; Lutz (regrets); Raiford (regrets); Stalcup (regrets); Sweet; and Williams.
Call to order

Chair Paul Lim called the meeting to order at 4:10pm.

Approval of the minutes of September 11, 2014

Chair Lim asked for any discussion on the minutes.

Senator Myrna Wooders asked to add “Vice Chancellor” to Audrey Anderson’s name in the minutes.

Chair Lim asked for a motion to approve the minutes with these changes. There was a second. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

Report of the Executive Committee

Chair Lim gave the report of the Executive Committee:

- Power-Based Personal Violence issues: Chair Lim said that this training that the senate members are going to have today had its beginnings in a motion brought before the senate by Senators Anderson, Cannon, Heuser, Smrekar, and Wooders a year ago.
- Internationalization / Globalization of Vanderbilt: Chair Lim said that the Executive Committee will be talking about this, and there may be a future town hall meeting on this issue.
- Graduate Education: Provost Wente has created a study group to think through the issues surrounding Graduate Education.
- Benefits Committee and its impact ☰ Future Town Hall Meeting: Past Chair Donald Brady said that there will be a presentation that the Retirement Oversight Committee will give to the Senate on Nov. 3 at a special Senate meeting.
- Tuition benefit for children with educational challenges / differences: non-traditional programs: Chair Lim said that this issue was brought to the Executive Committee by a faculty member. The Executive Committee is looking into this issue still.
- Athletics and its future: Chair Lim said that Vice Chancellor David Williams will be the featured speaker at the regular November Senate meeting.
- Archiving the past and achieving greater transparency in the future: Chair Lim said that it is important to have a record of the work of the senate. He said that we cannot go back and correct the past, but we can work for even greater transparency in the future.
Remarks by the Chancellor

Chancellor Zeppos gave his remarks. He discussed: alumni involvement, faculty training on power-based personal violence, and the Commons experience.

Scheduled Remarks

1. Frank Wcislo, Dean of the Ingram Commons: Dean Wcislo gave a history of intellectualism and residential life on campus. In 1998-2000, there was an institutional commitment to a four-year residential college system. He said that the reason that the undergraduate student body is more diverse is because of Opportunity Vanderbilt and the Commons. He also talked about: Expected Learning Outcomes (2007-11), Faculty and Student-Peer Mentorship, Holistic Intellectual Engagement: The Academic-Social-Cultural-Personal, and Living-Learning Community as Matrix. He said that the big payoff for this is not just for students, but it is for all of us. We are more invigorating and invigorated.
   a. Faculty Senator: What is it like now with students having this experience and then making the transition out of the Commons?
      i. Dean Wcislo: There were always alternatives: McGill, Mayfield, etc. And now we have College Halls opening this year. This is a brand new project that is different from the Commons—the students have to figure out how to make new relationships there and build community. One of the bottom line premises is all of this is student empowerment. The students themselves are engaging in various ways to make College Halls a success.
   b. Faculty Senator: Is drinking a problem in the Commons?
      i. Dean Wcislo: Of course. We are a formally dry area since no one in the Commons is of legal drinking age. It is also the case that prohibition creates dysfunction. Our bigger problem, though, is binge-drinking. And our even bigger challenge is weighing the balance between administrative intervention and student culture. It’s a problem in American society and it is a complex problem. The high-touch approach at Vanderbilt helps, too. Certainly, we are addressing the problem.
   c. Faculty Senator: What have you learned about the priorities of the professor?
      i. Dean Wcislo: I was able to finish a book in the Commons. Paul Lim has also been prolific. Living in The Commons brings to faculty who live there an increased intellectual acuity. Also, I am so much better in the classroom than I was before.
   d. Faculty Senator: Question about scale on the Living-Learning Community on the Matrix slide. Looks like there is room for growth. How are you addressing this?
      i. Dean Wcislo: One thing that we began working on is the training of faculty around health and wellness issues. Faculty in classrooms
are early warning systems. There is a need for training in student behavioral issues. We want to move more aggressively on this. Mentorship is also important. Vanderbilt Immersion will be happening soon, and we don’t know what it will look like yet. We are also indebted to the Medical School faculty who serve in Vanderbilt Visions program.

2. Faculty Training on Power-Based Personal Violence (Anita Jenious, director of Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action and Disability Services)
   a. Chair Lim again thanked Professors Cannon, Anderson, Smrekar, and Wooders for last year’s motion on Green Dots that was the beginning of the senate’s engagement on this issue.
   b. Anita Jenious gave the faculty training on power-based personal violence.
   c. Faculty Senator: I’m trying to imagine how this would play out in my office and keeping all of this in my mind. Are we legally obligated to know all of these steps?
      i. Anita Jenious: You are legally obligated to report to the Title IX office. And you have fulfilled your obligation by reporting this to my office.
   d. Faculty Senator: If we do inform them that we are not a confidential resource, but they have already told us that there is a problem anyway, do we still report?
      i. Anita Jenious: Absolutely, you want to give us a call.
      ii. Vice Chancellor Anderson: The way to think about this legally is that if a student, colleague, or staff member tells you anything, we need to know about this as you are representing Vanderbilt. And Vanderbilt as an institution is charged with creating a response. We have a duty to respond. But by you as a faculty member telling Anita’s office, your duty to respond is discharged.
   e. Faculty Senator: If they just say that I have a problem and need to have someone to talk to (you might suspect something is wrong, but they do not say anything), do we still need to report that?
      i. Anita Jenious: No, but you can still give them the list of confidential resources. I would not advise asking for any details, especially if they are asking for someone to talk confidentially.
   f. Faculty Senator: Isn’t there a risk in knowing that faculty are not confidential resources, that students will be less likely to come to us?
      i. Anita Jenious: Perhaps. But know that making a response doesn’t mean a full-blown investigation. There are a number of different factors we have to weigh in deciding what kind of response to make. If the university doesn’t know about these situations, we can’t address them.
   g. Faculty Senator: Most of my colleagues and I think of ourselves as a confidential resource. What other things are we bound to report?
      i. Anita Jenious: Any crimes against minors under the age of 18.
      ii. Under TN law you are bound to report crimes against minors and individuals expressing suicidal thoughts or ideation.
h. Faculty Senator: There are two sides to this policy. This policy is there to protect the student, but also to protect the faculty member.

i. Faculty Senator: Beyond a legal requirement to report, to what extent have students been involved in shaping the policy? Has there been student conversation around how to reduce sexual violence?
   i. Anita Jenious: The policy was revised over the summer, so there weren’t a lot of students around then.
   ii. Vice Chancellor Anderson: Students have been involved in other areas, though.
   iii. Cara Tuttle Bell, Project SAFE director: Students have come to us wanting lots of programming. We have already done 70 programs since school started. We do programs on consent and dating safety. We are booked into February 2015.
   iv. Dean Mark Bandas: We are requiring all new Greek members to go through the Green Dots six-hour training.

j. Past Chair Donald Brady: School of Medicine will be inviting Anita to do training for our departments soon.

k. Chair Lim: We will be contacting deans in order to find ways to track compliance for training. There will be an online option as well. He also reminded everyone to sign in when leaving so that they could track those present for the training.

l. Comment from a faculty senator: At the Arts and Science faculty council meeting yesterday, we discussed students who travel for field research and how do we protect students who travel abroad.

m. Anita Jenious said that you will also get more information via email after this presentation.

New Business

1. Motion to archive committee reports (Senators Brian Heuser and Myrna Wooders)
   a. Senator Wooders presented the motion to ask that committee reports be archived. Senator Heuser said that he also supports this motion:

   “Whereas availability of information from past years is necessary to allow the Faculty Senate (especially its current committees) to benefit from the wisdom and advice of prior sessions of the Senate and to ensure that prior recommendations of Faculty Senate committees are dealt with appropriately and in a timely manner:

   Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate archive past records of committee reports going back as far as there are electronic records of committee deliberations.”

   b. Question: Will these be made public on the Senate website?
   c. Senator Heuser: My personal take is that I don’t think that the deliberations of the senate should be made public.
   d. Faculty Senator: There was discussion about this in the Senate Affairs committee last year, whether or not to make the minutes public.
e. Senator Wooders: The senate minutes are public already as they have been posted on the senate website back to 2002. You can find them if you use the Wayback Machine.

f. Vice Chancellor Audrey Anderson: The purposes that you’ve pointed out so far are mostly using this information internally. There is a possible increased legal risk to the university if these reports are made available to the public.

g. A faculty senator asked if there should be an amendment to the motion: Add language about “password protection.” There was discussion about doing this, but no official amendment was made.

h. Chair Lim then called for a vote on the original motion as proposed. The motion passed by voice vote.

Good of the Senate

Chair Lim asked for any ‘good of the senate’ information, and there was none.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:30pm.
Call to order

Approval of the minutes of October 9, 2014

Report of the Executive Committee

Remarks by Provost Susan Wente

Scheduled Remarks
    David Williams, Vice Chancellor for University Affairs and Athletics

New Business
    Motion to approve new degree program, PhD in Astrophysics (Senator Brian Christman,
    Chair of Academic Policies and Services Committee)

Good of the Senate

Adjournment
Call to order

Chair Paul Lim called the meeting to order at 4:10pm.

Approval of the minutes of October 9, 2014

Chair Lim asked for any discussion on the minutes.

A senator has two corrections. First correction is Professor Wcislo regarding drinking on campus—it should be the “light touch” not the “high touch.” (Note: after checking the audio recording of the 10/9/14 meeting, it was determined that the original wording was indeed correct, so it stands). Second correction is that the entire motion including the preamble needs to be included in the minutes.

Professor Lim confirmed that the senator was willing to approve the minutes as amended.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as revised. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Report of the Executive Committee

Chair Lim gave the report of the Executive Committee:

- He reported that there is an update on implementation of the PBPV training that occurred at the last senate meeting. There are tweaks that need to be made to the training, and that is why department chairs and deans have not been notified about the training roll-out. The Executive Committee has been working on that.
- We have discussed globalization and internationalization. We will send out a faculty survey to canvass the opinions of the faculty regarding effectiveness, scope, and best practices for Vanderbilt to globalize within the world and the world to globalize within Vanderbilt.
- Third, we are working on the strategic plan implementation. We are working with Faculty Senators to implement the strategic plan.
- Fourth, we had a presentation by the Online Education Task Force. We will be bringing forth recommendations from that committee at a future Senate meeting.
- Fifth, the Future of the Libraries committee has been formed and was announced in MyVU.
- Last, tuition benefits for children who do not attend traditional college or university. There will be a report presented and we will discuss it in the Executive Committee and consider next steps.

Chair Lim asked if there were any questions or comments about the Executive Committee’s work. There were none.
Remarks by the Provost

Provost Susan Wente spoke to the senate about her first four months as provost and new initiatives in the Provost’s office. She also spoke about the search for the new Dean of Arts and Science, the search for the new Dean of the Graduate School, the search for the new Dean of Libraries following the work of the Future of the Libraries committee, the search for the new Vice Provost for Research, and the search for the new Dean of the Ingram Commons. She laid out the strategy for the implementation of the strategic plan initiatives, and discussed new programs such as TIPS, which will take the form of two types of proposals—VIA (Vanderbilt Initiative Awards) and VRA (Vanderbilt Reinvestment Awards). She also mentioned the Chancellor’s Faculty Fellows program that was not in the strategic plan, but that dovetails with the plan’s goals. She then took questions.

Faculty Senator: Where can we find the rules and procedures for the Chancellor’s Faculty Fellows?
Provost Wente: They are on the Provost website. They are for tenured faculty or equivalent rank in the Blair School. Also, the Law School is eligible because faculty promoted there go straight to full Professor. They are still included. It is not just for newly tenured associate professors.

Faculty Senator: How large will the group be?

Provost Wente: We do have a cap but I do not want to divulge the cap because we want the process to be candidate-driven. I have a realistic target in mind based on how many people we promote every year. It will be ongoing every year so if all cannot be accommodated the first year another nomination process will come next year.

Faculty Senator: We are not going to hire a full professor in economics until we have a new Dean of Arts and Science I have heard. Will the lack of a permanent dean affect any of the programs or the faculty in Arts and Science?
Provost Wente: No, I would say not.

Hearing no further questions, Chair Lim thanked Provost Wente for her remarks.

Scheduled Remarks

Chair Lim welcomed Vice Chancellor David Williams who gave an update on student-athletics.

Vice Chancellor Williams gave a presentation focused on five pillars:
1. Academic success
2. Competitive success
3. Solid financial stewardship
4. Quality of the student-athlete experience
5. Changing legal landscape

He said that Vice Chancellor and General Counsel Audrey Anderson will speak about the fifth pillar at the end of his presentation.
**Competitive success**

We operate 16 varsity sports of which 15 are scholarshipped. Men’s cross country is not scholarshipped. Our women’s golf team won the SEC championship, men’s baseball won the national championship this year. It is our second national championship. In 2007, we won the women’s bowling national championship.

We participated in our third consecutive bowl game. We’ve only participated in 7 bowl games in Vanderbilt’s entire history.

**Financial stewardship**

We ended better than budget this year, and the Rec Center came in on time and within budget.

**Academic success**

He showed GPAs by team. We have four teams below our FY15 goal of having all teams over 3.0. He said that we are focused on raising the average GPAs of all athletes to 3.0, and our goal is 3.2.

Vice Chancellor Williams showed academic awards and GPAs over time for all student-athletes. Percentage-wise, we lead on SEC honor roll, but we are not first because the poll is based on numbers of athletes not percentages.

Faculty Senator: How many student-athletes do we have?
Vice Chancellor Williams: About 5% of students are student-athletes.

Faculty Senator: Do student-athletes have more psychological problems?
Vice Chancellor Williams: They may have issues related to competition or their desire to compete at the highest level. Our student-athletes have the same issues as other students like being homesick, but people don’t often think of them as having those issues.

**Quality of the student-athlete experience**

Vice Chancellor Williams also talked about his academic support staff, the Summer Bridge Program, life skills training, study abroad program, the integrity of the recruiting process at Vanderbilt, graduation rates, and degree completion program.

Faculty Senator: What is our institutional strategy for athletics? What is our institutional plan for athletics? Why do we invest so much time, effort, and money in athletics for the institution?

Vice Chancellor Williams: Athletics has a huge value in the well-roundedness of the individual. There are things you learn as a member of a team that enhance your ability to be a good student, employee, citizen. There are things that are at odds between athletics and academics but I do think there is value to athletics. It helps them get through college. It doesn’t have to be at the highest level. It has the ability to enhance their University experience.
Faculty Senator: Is there a list of institutional returns on investment? How do we measure what these millions we spend give us as a benefit at our university?

Vice Chancellor Williams: We struggle with that too because we get asked what is the value of college athletics. We would be willing to partner with someone to investigate that. We understand there is a value and a partnership, and I think as we go down the road we have to be able to articulate those benefits.

Faculty Senator: What is the cost to the university of the major sports?

Vice Chancellor Williams: The University invests $12 to $15 million in athletics and a majority goes to sports that do not produce revenue like tennis, golf, and lacrosse.

Vice Chancellor Williams said that he will turn the floor over to Vice Chancellor Anderson who will discuss the legal issues surrounding athletics.

Vice Chancellor Anderson: Let me describe the three kinds of lawsuits that are occurring in college athletics currently:

- Anti-trust law. Federal trial court in CA has ruled that certain NCAA rules that limit what we provide student-athletes violate anti-trust laws.
- Have student athletes deemed employees of the University.
- Have student athletes deemed employees under Fair Standard Labors Act to pay athletes at least minimum wage.

Vice Chancellor Anderson said that she would be happy to discuss this in detail with anyone who might be interested.

New Business--Motion to approve new degree program, PhD in Astrophysics

Chair Lim indicated there was two minutes left in the meeting, and we need to attend to new business. He offered the option of voting on the motion now or, if there is a two-thirds vote to table until the next meeting, we can do that instead.

Here is the motion:

“Resolved that the Faculty Senate approves the proposed Astrophysics Ph.D. Program”

Chair Lim said that the materials were previously distributed, and the external reviews were all positive. He reminded everyone that this is a committee motion, so no second is required. He added that Professor David Weintraub is here if there are any questions about the content of the degree program.
Faculty Senator: Seems like a high quality group to lead proposal. It has brought in lots of grant funding. One concern: we don’t have a permanent dean in Arts and Science, and we are looking for a dean and should something like this wait?

Provost Wente: I’ll just address this one procedural question. John Sloop is the current interim dean of the College of Arts and Science, and he has the full authority and power of an acting dean in that role by power of the provost.

At this point, a question arose as to whether there was a quorum present. It was determined that there was not, and thus, given that the Chair and the members considered this to be substantive business, Chair Lim chose to suspend voting on the motion until such time as a quorum was present. The motion will be placed under “Old Business” at the next senate meeting.

Good of the Senate

None.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:36 p.m.
Call to order

Approval of the minutes of November 6, 2014

Report of the Executive Committee

Remarks by the Chancellor

Scheduled Remarks
   None

Standing committee reports
   None

Ad hoc committee reports
   None

Old Business
   Academic Policies and Services Committee: Motion to approve new degree program (Brian Christman, Chair)

New Business
   Motion on anonymous electronic voting: Senators Joel Harrington, Claire Smrekar, Bryan Heuser, and Myrna Wooders

Good of the Senate

Adjournment
Call to order

Chair Paul Lim called the meeting to order at 4:10pm.

Approval of the minutes of November 6, 2014

Chair Lim asked for approval of the minutes. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Report of the Executive Committee

Chair Lim gave the report of the Executive Committee:

1. Faculty Manual update
   a. Letter of welcome for all new faculty members from the Faculty Senate chair: This suggestion came from a member of the Faculty Manual ad hoc committee.
   b. Role and significance of the senate for the new faculty member: Will underscore importance and raise awareness of the faculty senate.
   c. Role and significance of the faculty manual: It is important for all faculty to know about the faculty manual.

2. Concur and its ongoing issues
   a. Arts and Science Faculty Council report: Chair Lim has talked to Beth Conklin about this. She shared with him a 20-page document outlining issues with the Concur travel website.
   b. Chair Lim also mentioned discussing this with Provost Wente and Vice Chancellor Balser in the Executive Committee’s monthly meeting with them.
   c. Chair Lim said that they are also interested in getting the other schools/departments to weigh in to get a more global perspective on the way Concur has functioned within Vanderbilt.
   d. Tony Grayson who is in charge of Concur will be talking to the Executive Committee at their next meeting about these issues.

3. Formation of the task force on University Athletics: Chair Lim said that after Vice Chancellor David Williams’ presentation, the Executive Committee has discussed creating a senate task force on university athletics. There is a university standing...
committee on athletics that Vice Chair-elect Ann Price chairs, but we believe that these are important issues that deserve more in depth attention by the senate. Chair Lim said that this task force will include both senate members and also members of the faculty at large.

4. VU and VUMC split and its aftermath: Chair Lim said that this is an ongoing issue for all of us. We can talk about this more as it unfolds.

5. Retirement benefits presentation and rollout plan: Chair Lim thanked Past Chair Donald Brady for putting this presentation together for the special-called meeting in November. He talked about his own department having Past Chair Brady come and talk to them about the changes in retirement plans. He encouraged other senators to have these conversations in their departments.

6. Globalization and Internationalization Town Hall: Chair Lim said that Past Vice Chair Jeff Johnston and Vice Chair Rolanda Johnson are finalizing the survey questions and the survey will be sent out early next semester. We want to engage faculty members in this conversation while the implementation of the strategic plan is happening.

He asked for any questions.

Senator: Some of the documents available on the website regarding retirement benefits seem to be contradictory. Another thing that happened is the staff member that relayed this information tells me that the faculty senate voted on and approved this new plan. I don’t remember the vote.

Chair Lim: I don’t remember that either. But that seems to be a piece of misinformation.

Senator: Then the relevant people should be informed.

Past Chair Donald Brady: What is on the HR website now is what currently happens to retirement benefits. An article just came out today in MyVUMC and will be coming out in MyVU that leads you to the new website with the plan for retirement benefits in the future.

Senator: One of my colleagues raised the question: is this consistent with our contracts?

Past Chair Brady: What contracts?

Senator: The general contracts outlined in the Faculty Manual.

Past Chair Brady: The ability to have matching funds and the contribution limits—all of that remains the same. Who administers the plan itself and the options that are offered is what is being adjusted. I would expect that it is consistent with our contracts.

Remarks by the Chancellor

Chancellor Zeppos talked about the recently announced changes about VUMC, athletics, internationalization and globalization, and strategic planning implementation.

Old Business

Academic Policies and Services Committee: Motion to approve new degree program (Brian Christman, Chair)
Chair Lim gave a summary of what happened at the last senate meeting concerning this motion—when the vote was announced, it was determined that there wasn’t a quorum present, so there could be no vote. He then recognized Senator Brian Christman who presented the motion from last month’s meeting:

“Resolved, That the Faculty Senate approves the proposed Astrophysics Ph.D. program”

Senator Christman said that the program has already gone through extensive review with various committees both inside and outside the university. He also mentioned that Professor David Weintraub of the Physics and Astronomy department is here to answer questions about the program as well. Chair Lim then opened the floor for discussion.

Senator: I very strongly support this program, but I have one question. Who are our peer institutions who have these programs?
Professor Weintraub: There are a number of tables in the proposal itself that identify peers by size and reputation. Among top 25 research universities that offer this Ph.D.: Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Columbia, CalTech, Chicago, Johns Hopkins, Cornell, Berkeley, and UVA.
Senator: I also support the program. But I did wonder about having two junior faculty teaching the core as was mentioned in the review letters? Is that a concern?
Professor Weintraub: Both of those faculty members received tenure last spring. This concern no longer exists.
Chancellor Zeppos: I want to commend David, Richard Haglund and their colleagues in the department. This is a phenomenal proposal. The department has made some strategic hiring decisions in this area to get to where they are now.
Professor Weintraub: These two faculty members were specifically hired seven years ago to enable us to get to where we are right now to be able to offer this degree program.

Chair Lim called the question. The vote was taken by a closed ballot, and there were 36 votes to approve the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

New Business

Motion on anonymous electronic voting: Senators Joel Harrington, Claire Smrekar, Brian Heuser, and Myrna Wooders

Chair Lim recognized Senator Joel Harrington and asked him to speak the rationale of this motion:

“Whereas on March 13, 2003, the Faculty Senate discussed the issue of privacy and electronic voting at some length and, on April 10, 2003 the Senate further discussed and passed a motion including the statement: “Voting on matters before the Faculty Senate shall normally be by "ayes" and "nays" (voice vote or show of hands) or by electronic voting;”"
And whereas the rule above continues to be a part of the Constitution of the Faculty Senate and technology has advanced so that anonymous electronic voting has become substantially more efficient;

Be it resolved that, except for routine matters such as the approval of minutes and adjournment or when a roll call is effected, all voting in the Faculty Senate be electronic and anonymous.”

Senator Harrington said that this is based on two premises: 1) the secret ballot is the bedrock of our democratic society and it works well at all levels of governance. It takes away any coercive effects of an open vote and it gives us a reliable measure of support on a specific issue, 2) this would be done by electronic voting, and it would take one-tenth of the time that a closed, written ballot takes. Senator Harrington also mentioned that someone from the Center for Teaching could come and demonstrate the clicker technology for us at the next senate meeting.

Chair Lim opened the floor for discussion.

Senator: I have comment in support of this. Not only is it easy, but you can save the results for documentation and recordkeeping.

Senator: I have used this technology in my teaching for a number of years, and I think it would be great to use this in the senate.

Senator: I think if our students can do this, we can do this.

Senator Harrington: Derek Bruff of the Center for Teaching has offered to loan us clickers to get us started.

Senator: I have used this technology for a while, and it is not totally failsafe. There are times when the computer breaks down, etc. So the word “all” in the motion makes me nervous.

Senator Harrington: In that case, we go back to paper ballots. We will always have paper ballots on hand just in case.

Senator: The motion as currently written wouldn’t allow for that.

Senator: So, is that a proposal for an amendment to the motion?

Senator Harrington asked Past Chair and Parliamentarian Donald Brady if paper ballots could be used in an emergency if this motion were adopted. Past Chair Brady said that the motion would need to be amended to allow for this exception. A friendly amendment was presented below:
“Be it resolved that, except for routine matters such as the approval of minutes and adjournment or when a roll call is effected or in the matter of electronic disruption, all voting in the Faculty Senate be electronic and anonymous.”

Senator Harrington said that he would accept this friendly amendment.

Senator: The current constitution gives the option for electronic voting, but it is never used.

Senator: So, why don’t we just use the option for electronic voting? I don’t know that we need to have a motion to do that.

Senator Harrington: Because it’s not required—it’s only optional, currently.

Senator: What’s the advantage of requiring it?

Senator Harrington: The advantage of requiring it is that you do not have to call for a secret ballot, which in itself is a declaration of a position depending on how the debate goes. We know going into the debate that it’s going to be a secret ballot and we also know after the vote has been taken where the level of support is whereas with an open vote, we don’t know this. The main thing is that it opens up debate because we know going in that there’s going to be a secret ballot.

Senator: Do we have data to suggest that people vote more accurately in secret than in non-secret?

Senator Harrington: Are you proposing that we do some background research before we put this to a vote?

Senator: No. Well, yes, but no.

Senator Harrington: I do not have that data, but I don’t think this would help our discussion of this motion today. Put a different way: do you have any arguments against this? Would this stifle the discussion in any way or give us a false vote?

Senator: I have some data that is published about smoking preferences and high school students. And there is a difference between overt and secret votes.

Senator: The more anonymous we make it, the more accurate it will be.

Senator: The nice thing about having the technology is that it can be used for straw polls and other purposes besides voting.

Senator: What about if you press the wrong button? Can you retrieve your vote?

Senator Harrington: Yes, you can.
Chair Lim closed discussion and explained that the vote on this motion would occur at the next regular senate meeting in February 2015.

Senator: There have been other motions where we voted on them at the same meeting. Why not this one?

Past Chair and Parliamentarian Donald Brady explained that any motion to change the Rules of Order has to be presented at one meeting and voted on at the next meeting (at least three weeks later).

Senator: So we can use electronic voting to vote on this motion next time?

Chair Lim: Yes, we can.

**Good of the Senate**

Chair Lim asked for anything under Good of the Senate.

Senator: With regard to our earlier discussion about changes to the retirement plan, the Faculty Manual says we do have a choice of four different providers. So, a change in the retirement policy requires a change in the Faculty Manual. And the Faculty Manual part 1 chapter 5 addresses how we have to change it. And then we should have a vote on this. It’s a change in the provisions of our contract. So, we need a proposed amendment, and then we need to have a motion and a vote.

Senator: I think this needs to be discussed in the Senate Affairs committee, because we shouldn’t be voting on things we cannot change and the Faculty Manual should be factually accurate, so it seems like this should be a discussion for a committee.

Chancellor Zeppos: You still have the choices under the plan.

Senator: But staff got this memo saying that they did not have a choice.

Senator: I don’t have a position on this, but I would like clarification from the Executive Committee about the role of the faculty senate in the manual. If we are voting for changes that have already been made, then I don’t see the point of voting. But if it says that faculty have to vote before changes are made, then I’d like to know what happened because I just don’t know. I’d like some clarification.

Chair Lim: I think it is appropriate to defer this matter to the Senate Affairs committee and the Faculty Manual ad hoc committee.

Senator: I’d like to know if we are voting on policy or if we are voting on revisions to the manual to keep it current.
Chancellor Zeppos: I think what the committee is also looking at is: is there stuff in the manual that does not pertain specifically to faculty? They are looking at the question: what should be in the faculty manual?

Senator: I think that’s appropriate. If there are things in there that shouldn’t be, that’s fine. But if there is stuff that we need to vote on, then we should know what that is.

Senator: We do have a contract. And the contract does refer to the Faculty Manual. The Faculty Manual has a procedure for revisions in the Faculty Manual. I think we have to clarify how we make those revisions, and then we should follow the Faculty Manual. There have been major changes that have not gone through the procedure outlined in the manual.

Chancellor Zeppos: For any major change, I would want it to go through the senate.

There was discussion about the parental leave policy and how it came through the senate before being put into the Faculty Manual.

Chair Lim: The role of the senate is that it serves as an advisory role to the Chancellor for the policy changes in the Faculty Manual.

Chancellor Zeppos also mentioned changes due to federal regulations from NIH, etc. These must be enacted and put into the Faculty Manual, and the senate has decided not to vote on it since we would lose our federal funding if we didn’t change the policy.

Senator: But you can enforce them without putting them into the Faculty Manual, correct?

Chancellor Zeppos: But then you get into the situation where I have a contract, and there’s a relationship between you as a faculty member and the university. I think it’s preferable that all the rules of governance of faculty be in the Faculty Manual.

Senator: The chapter dealing with amendments to the Faculty Manual does take care of interim changes. It also has a provision that the Chancellor can propose an amendment to the manual, the faculty could vote no, and the Chancellor could have the final decision.

Chancellor Zeppos: I’m making a different point, which is I’m not always proposing changes that I necessarily want—I’m required to make these changes by federal agencies, etc.

Senator: Right, this is what is in the Faculty Manual. You notify the senate that these changes have been made, and then the senate can discuss them, if they wish. There may be certain cases, I don’t know what, but in which the senate says that they don’t like the changes.
Chair Lim: I think all of this discussion is indicative of the Faculty Manual as a critical and canonical text. We have the ad hoc committee working on it, and many of these issues have already come up.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:15pm.
Call to order

Approval of the minutes of December 4, 2014

Report of the Executive Committee

Remarks by the Chancellor

Scheduled Remarks
   Jeffrey Balser, Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs and Dean of the School of Medicine

Standing committee reports
   None

Ad hoc committee reports
   None

Old Business
   Motion on anonymous electronic voting: Senators Joel Harrington, Claire Smrekar, Brian Heuser, and Myrna Wooders

New Business
   Motion from Faculty Manual ad hoc committee on establishing standing committee status
   Motion from Faculty Manual ad hoc committee on revisions to the Faculty Manual (Part 1, chapter 5)

Good of the Senate

Adjournment

Voting Members present: Baker; Balser; Barnes; Benbow; Cannon; Christenbery; Christman; Cliffel; Dewey; Harrington; Hasty; Hetherington; Heuser; Johnson, J; Johnson, R.; Kennedy; Lind; Koutsoukos; Martin; McCammon; McCoin; O’Hara O’Connor; Oskay; Price; Rohde; Smrekar; Steiger; Talbot Tarpley; Walsh; Webb; Willis; Wittig; Wooders; and Ziegler.
Call to order

Vice Chair Rolanda Johnson called the meeting to order at 4:10pm. She noted that Parliamentarian Donald Brady is not able to be present and Past Vice Chair Jeff Johnson will be acting parliamentarian for this meeting.

Approval of the minutes of December 4, 2014

Vice Chair Johnson asked for approval of the minutes. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Report of the Executive Committee

Vice Chair Johnson gave the report of the Executive Committee.

1. Retirement benefits: The retirement transition plan is in full swing, and faculty and staff can go into the website now and make changes. We encourage the senators to go back to their departments and schools, and distribute this information to faculty and staff. The Executive Committee will continue to work with the Retirement Oversight Committee to monitor the progress of the transition, and will report back to the Senate as needed.

2. Concur: This has been an ongoing issue for the last few years. The Executive Committee has met with Tony Grayson and CFO Brett Sweet, and they have also shared concerns with Provost Wente and Vice Chancellor Balser. The data from Arts and Science was very helpful in pointing out real issues with the Concur website. We will let you know how that progresses.

3. Athletics task force: At the January elected senators only meeting, we were not able to get to this agenda item. We will have discussion related to athletics at the March meeting of the Faculty Senate. The Senate Athletics task force has not been established yet, as the Executive Committee thought it would be best to have a discussion among senators first. The task force will consist of senators and non-senators.
4. Comprehensive Transition Programs: The Executive Committee met with Professor Katherine Donato and Assistant Provost for Faculty Dawn Turton about possibly providing tuition assistance for dependents for comprehensive transition programs approved by the Department of Education. The Executive Committee is exploring advantages, disadvantages, and best practices as it relates to these programs along with what is happening at peer institutions.

5. VU/VUMC Reorganization: Dr. Balser will talk today about this topic. The Executive Committee has also been meeting with the Provost and Vice Chancellor about this. She then asked for any questions.

Question: There are approximately 2,900 faculty at Vanderbilt, and 30 Senate members who come to meetings, so it’s really not possible for senators to communicate with even the people in their schools. Would it be possible for us to get mailing lists so that we can communicate directly with the faculty in our schools?

Vice Chair Johnson: I think we realize that the senators can’t go back and interact one on one with all faculty and staff, but at least try to get that list within your school or department, and then articulate that information. There are some schools that already have avenues of communication that are effective. If senators can tap into those avenues of communication, I think we can get the word out more broadly.

Remarks by the Chancellor

Chancellor Zeppos gave his remarks.

Scheduled Remarks

Jeffrey Balser, Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs and Dean of the School of Medicine

Vice Chancellor Balser gave his presentation on the split between Vanderbilt University and VUMC.

Question: What are you worried about in terms of potential risks?
Vice Chancellor Balser: Uninsured care and the growing economic burden of uninsured care on academic medical centers is huge problem. We do half of the nations’ uninsured care in 5% of the hospital beds. We are the uninsured care provider for America. We are the uninsured care provider for middle Tennessee at Vanderbilt. That is a huge economic threat to us.

Question: How big is the VUMC campus going to get?
Vice Chancellor Balser: It’s not going to get much bigger. You mean, “Are we going to grow the faculty?” and the answer is, “Not very much.” We are developing affiliate relationships with doctors so even if they are employed by us, they won’t be faculty. Most will be affiliated providers. We are not looking to grow the faculty by that much.

Question: Would you mind if we had the presentation put on a password-protected website?
Vice Chancellor Balser: I will defer to the leadership of the Senate as to how and where that could be done. There are aspects of this presentation that Legal and Finance may not want public, and I need to get their guidance on it.

**Old Business**

Motion on anonymous electronic voting: Senators Joel Harrington, Claire Smrekar, Brian Heuser, and Myrna Wooders

Vice Chair Johnson asked Senator Joel Harrington to present the motion:

“Whereas on March 13, 2003, the Faculty Senate discussed the issue of privacy and electronic voting at some length and, on April 10, 2003 the Senate further discussed and passed a motion including the statement: “Voting on matters before the Faculty Senate shall normally be by "ayes" and "nays" (voice vote or show of hands) or by electronic voting;”

And whereas the rule above continues to be a part of the Constitution of the Faculty Senate and technology has advanced so that anonymous electronic voting has become substantially more efficient;

Be it resolved that, except for routine matters such as the approval of minutes and adjournment or when a roll call is effected, or in the matter of electronic disruption, all voting in the Faculty Senate be electronic and anonymous.”

Vice Chair Johnson stated that the motion had been amended with a friendly amendment at the last meeting. She asked for any discussion on the motion. Senator Harrington said that the wording that was added was: “or in the matter of electronic disruption.”

Vice Chair Johnson called the question and the vote was taken electronically. The motion passed unanimously.

**New Business**

Motion from Faculty Manual ad hoc committee on establishing standing committee status

Vice Chair Johnson asked Senator Heuser to present the motion:

“Whereas, an extensive number of changes (both substantive and merely technical) have been made intermittently and continue to be made to the Manual on an ongoing basis. In addition to the changes to the Manual itself, changes in other University policies often have a direct bearing on various aspects of the Faculty Manual and require some kind of intentional deliberation (Recent changes to the University’s retirement benefits are a perfect example). Prompt compliance with regulatory changes from federal/state agencies as well as other regulatory bodies such as the Joint Commission is also a driving force in the need for the manual to have a degree of regular oversight. Finally, it is also the case that Deans from each of the Colleges/Schools at Vanderbilt regularly require clarification
of different aspects of the Manual, especially where congruence with their own policy and procedures is concerned.

The members of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Faculty Manual unanimously recommend the creation of a standing committee of the Faculty Senate for the Faculty Manual. This new committee could become either a stand-alone committee or a subcommittee of either the existing Senate Affairs or Faculty Life Committees.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate establish a standing committee for the Faculty Manual to take effect upon the completion of the initial work by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Faculty Manual.”

Senator Heuser thanked Senator Maggie Tarpley who serves as chair of this committee, as well as all of the committee members for their good work. He said that they are open to the standing committee being housed under the Senate Affairs or Faculty Life committees.

Vice Chair Johnson opened the floor for discussion.

Hearing none, Vice Chair Johnson called the question and the vote was taken electronically. There was a question about a quorum, and Past Vice Chair Jeff Johnston stated that quorum as defined in the Senate constitution is 20% of the voting members, which is 14 members. There were more than that present and voting. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion from Faculty Manual ad hoc committee on revisions to the Faculty Manual (Part 1, chapter 5)

Vice Chair Johnson asked Senator Wooders to present this motion:

“Chapter 5: Amendments to Faculty Manual

All amendments or proposed amendments to the Faculty Manual are required to pass through Steps 1 to 3 below.

Step 1. Proposal for Changes
A proposal for a change in the Faculty Manual must be made by the Chancellor, the Provost, the Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs, or the Faculty Senate Chair on behalf of the Faculty Senate. The proposal becomes formal when the officer initiating the proposal sends the proposal in writing to the other three participants in the change process. The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall inform the members of the Senate of any changes to the Faculty Manual that have been proposed since the most recent prior meeting of the Senate.

Step 2. Deliberations
After a formal proposal for change is made, the Faculty Senate, the Provost, and the Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs shall have a minimum of thirty days to issue their recommendations to the Chancellor on the proposed change. All efforts should be made
to conclude deliberations within a reasonable time. It is likely that many changes that are purely informational will not require discussion. Others will merit extended discussion, including study by committees of the Faculty Senate or to the Office of the General Counsel. After deliberations are concluded, the ultimate decision on whether the proposed change becomes effective lies with the Chancellor. The Chancellor will communicate these changes to the other three officers involved in the change process.

**Step 3. Notification:** The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall inform the members of the Senate of the final disposition of each proposal. Deans of each School shall bring the changes to the attention of the faculty members of their schools. A copy of any changes to the Faculty Manual shall go to the Office of the Faculty Senate for archiving as discussed below.

**Interim Change**

There may be instances in which some almost immediate change is needed due to changes in Federal, State, funding, or regulatory agencies. A change in government regulations might well include a specific compliance date (for instance) and an interim change may be required. If that change involves matters that the Faculty Senate (for instance) wishes to study in more detail or if the Faculty Senate is not in session, an interim change may be required. In such cases, the Chancellor either may make the change or designate another officer to do so, with an indication on the Faculty Manual website that the matter is under review. The procedure shall then follow that stated above, beginning with a proposal for change.

**The Archival Process**

Under the current Vanderbilt Document Retention Policies found at https://int.vanderbilt.edu/admin/Compliance/DocRet/Lists/Retention%20Policy/Alpha.aspx (accessed 2 Feb 2015), the Faculty Senate Office is the office of record for the Manual; the Vice Provost for Faculty Office is the record custodian.

1. In August of each year, a snapshot is taken of the Faculty Manual and frozen for that year; the snapshot is retained in the Faculty Senate Office for 7 years, then sent to the University Archives.

2. The final record of changes made each year, prior to the snapshot being taken, is retained permanently in the Faculty Senate Office.

3. Records leading up to final changes are retained for 7 years in the Faculty Senate Office, then destroyed.

In addition to the document retention policy cited above:

1. Each year a hard copy of the August snapshot supplied by the Faculty Senate Office shall be preserved as an archived document in the Jean and Alexander Heard Library’s office of Special Collections and University Archives. The copy in University Archives shall be maintained in such a way that both the archived hard
copy and the online snapshot for any given year are conveniently available to faculty members.

2. As changes are made in the Faculty Manual following the procedure above, they shall be documented on the Faculty Senate website, and the accumulated set of all changes made during the year shall be archived along with the snapshot.”

Senator Wooders also thanked Senator Maggie Tarpley who serves as chair of this committee, as well as all of the committee members for their good work. Senator Wooders noted that the distributed paper copy of the non-tracked motion had some omissions from the tracked version paper copy. She enumerated those differences. She outlined the major changes that were proposed by this motion. She noted that the only policy change was the addition of “Step 3” and that in the past, although policy changes were to become effective immediately, faculty were not always notified of the changes. She also noted that the Faculty Manual is part of faculty contracts with the University and she quoted from her own contract a part of a sentence that has been in many contracts for some time.

Vice Chair Johnson opened the floor for discussion.

Question: So, this version with the tracked changes in the final version?
Senator Wooders: Yes, this is the final version.

Vice Chair Johnson called the question and the vote was taken electronically. The motion passed unanimously.

**Good of the Senate**

Comment: I want to thank the Chancellor for his strong leadership on sexual assault prevention. I do want to enter into the minutes of the Senate that one year ago, the Senate passed a resolution unanimously that Senator Smrekar and I worked on that did ask the senators themselves to take a leadership role. So I do want us in future meetings to revisit what the leadership role of the Senate and senators is as relates to sexual assault prevention on the Vanderbilt campus.

There were other comments regarding sexual assault prevention.

Provost Wente offered to provide a report or presentation to the Senate about VU’s alcohol policies and any training around that issue.

**Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 5:35pm.
Call to order

Approval of the minutes of February 5, 2015

Report of the Executive Committee

Remarks by the Chancellor

Scheduled Remarks
   None

Standing committee reports
   Senate Affairs report (Senator Buddy Creech)

Ad hoc committee reports
   None

Old Business
   None

New Business
   Motion from APS committee regarding new degree program (Senator David Wright)
   Motion from Faculty Life committee regarding benefits for retired faculty who do not have emeritus status (Senator Mel Ziegler)

Good of the Senate

Adjournment

Call to order

Chair Lim called the meeting to order at 4:10pm.

Approval of the minutes of February 5, 2015

Chair Lim asked for a motion to approve the minutes from February 5, 2015. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Report of the Executive Committee

Chair Lim gave the report of the Executive Committee:

1. Campus Safety
2. Update on Green Dots Training
   a. Motion was adopted to establish a “formal partnership with the Green Dots Program.” (November 2013)
   b. Fewer than 5% of the faculty have completed the 6 hour training.
   c. Chair Lim reminded everyone that Green Dots is a bystander prevention program.
   d. He said that the next training sessions will take place on March 20 and April 3, 2015 between 3-9pm.
3. Update on Title IX training: Chair Lim said that all VU faculty have received an email from Provost Susan Wente about the training for Title IX compliance. The online training module is now available for all faculty members. Chair Lim said that this is a significant milestone as we seek to create a safe campus. He said that the Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee have collaborated with the EAD office to launch an initiative called “Golden Opportunity, and Golden Obligation.” He noted that Anita Jenious and Sheree Wright have trained many faculty members in person, but there are hundreds more who still need to be
trained. Chair Lim is very excited that the training is available online to all faculty members today. He mentioned the reporting obligation by faculty members and highlighted its importance.

4. Title IX and Compliance Matter Update: Chair Lim introduced Vice Chancellor Audrey Anderson to speak on this important point:
   a. Vice Chancellor Anderson: I’m going to give an update on our compliance review from the Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights (OCR). About a year ago, in March 2014, OCR sent us a letter saying that they were going to do a compliance review of our Title IX program. There are about 100 colleges and universities that the OCR is doing some kind of investigation or compliance review of their Title IX programs, focused on the institution’s education and training to prevent and respond to student sexual misconduct/sexual assault issues. So, since we received that letter, we have been engaging in a very rigorous way with OCR. We have given them many documents, policies, procedures, training materials. We have gotten a lot of help across the university. We have given them every single investigation file we have with an issue involving a student starting in 2010 through January 2015. I imagine that we will have to update those files as the investigation progresses. They were on campus in Dec 2014 and Jan 2015, and interviewed 30 staff members who investigate complaints of sexual misconduct. They talked to staff in VUPD and EAD. We imagine that they will come back to talk to people in the Dean of Students’ office and Student Housing. They may want to talk to some faculty members. They have already talked to some staff in our schools who have taken in student complaints of sexual misconduct. They were doing focus group meetings and one-on-one meetings with students in Jan 2015. We told OCR that we want to hear from them immediately about anything that they are finding that they think we can do better. So far, they haven’t brought up anything that they have found, but they might have something for us later. Based on what we’ve seen them do on other campuses, it is likely that when they complete their investigation, they will come to us with a list of things that they think we could do better, and we will enter into some kind of a resolution agreement with them that might require us to maybe change some of our policies or do additional training. We might also have to look back at complaints that we have already adjudicated and take another look at them. It is also possible that they could issue findings that we are in violation of Title IX and fine the institution. We are still very much in the course of this. I ask you to engage in conversations with your students about these issues. I had the pleasure of doing a presentation in a class at Peabody this past week. The online training is fabulous and I’m so glad that we have it. It doesn’t substitute for conversations about this topic. Ask your students, “Who knows who our Title IX coordinator is?” or “If you or one of your friends is the victim of sexual assault on campus, do you know where you should go to get help?” If you are uncomfortable talking about this, invite Anita
Jenious or myself to come speak to your class. These conversations are really important. Any questions?

b. Questions: none

5. Concur: Chair Lim said that there have been a number of issues brought up about Concur. There are encouraging signs having to do with changing how travel arrangements are made through Concur and making using Concur optional. The change is not definitive yet, but there will be an update on the horizon soon. Chair Lim asked for any questions, but there were none.

6. Task force/Ad Hoc Committees wrapping up their work
   a. Greek Life task force: This task force has done its fair share of work, and has gotten the community to have good conversations about issues that matter. They are wrapping up their work this semester.
   b. Online Education task force: They are also wrapping up their work, and will present their report in the next month to the Senate.
   c. Faculty Manual ad hoc committee: They will be transitioning to a standing committee as per the motion that passed at last month’s meeting.

7. Conversation about the task force on University Athletics
   a. Chair Lim said that he has apportioned a significant amount of time to this topic because he wanted to open up the conversation about Athletics to the larger Senate. He also gave contextual background on this issue and why a task force is warranted now. He discussed how the discussions with Vice Chancellor David Williams and with Chancellor Zeppos and others have informed the establishment of this task force and its charge.
   b. Charge:
      i. The Task Force on University Athletics (hereafter as TFUA) will be charged to study the current practice/performance of the following areas germane to the intersectionality of Vanderbilt’s academic mission underneath which falls its athletic commitments. These areas are not exhaustive, and upon serious consideration, could be revised.
   c. Composition:
      i. It seems optimally desirable to have the Task Force composition to be made after considering the following factors:
      ii. TFUA should be made up of students (student-athletes and non-student-athletes), faculty and staff, and should reflect a broad spectrum of the Vanderbilt demographic.
      iii. TFUA should maintain semblance of independent thinking and gathering of information, thus members should not be ideologically charged in either direction, and should not have axes to grind.
      iv. Members of the Task Force will help further articulate the core values and mission of Athletics within the identity context of a Vanderbilt student.
   d. Return on Investment
      i. Is it possible or even desirable to query about RoI for amateur athletics?
ii. What type/kind of RoI will be used as a measurable metric?
iii. SEC and its revenue sharing
e. VU Student-Athlete forever more
   i. Does VU have any educational/ethical responsibility toward its student-athletes after they graduate?
   ii. If so, what would it look like?
f. Approximate timeline:
   i. 2015-16: TFUA gets launched; Charges clearly articulated and understood by the members. The focus for this year will be on Academic Mission of VU Athletics, and will study the following areas with a view toward recommendation and offering a values-driven statement. Such a statement will include: (1) Admission standards; (2) types of courses/majors taken; (3) overall GPA while at Vanderbilt; (4) types of immersion experience and other extracurricular activities available.
   ii. 2016-17: Return on Investment for VU Athletics; Care of Student-Athletes after graduation; Vanderbilt as an SEC school – its opportunities and challenges.

g. Questions:
   i. Comment: I’m pleased to hear this, especially since it reflects the concerns brought up after David Williams’ presentation to the Senate.
   ii. Chair Lim said that these issues are not separable. If we care about our students and their well-being, we need to look at all aspects of university life.
   iii. Question: Has this been done in the past? Is there anyone who is currently charged with doing this work now?
      1. Chair Lim: There is a standing committee on University Athletics, which has had a more advisory role. There will be shared information between that committee and the new task force. The role of the task force will be to take a fresh, and expanded look at this.
      2. Question: There’s not a regular review, for example, of every five years to look at this, correct?
      3. Vice Chair-elect Ann Price: I currently chair the University Athletics Committee. Our charge is the intersection of athletics and academics. It does not include the return on investment issue, for example. We can help this task force, though, and it doesn’t hurt to have another group looking at these issues.
   iv. Question: Am I correct that this does not include intramural athletics? Allowing people to have athletics in their lives is important. Under other administrations, club sports were put under Student Life. Will this committee be looking at this issue?
1. Chair Lim: They will not be looking at club sports, but at varsity sports. Would you like to serve on the task force? Varsity athletes are amateurs, remember.

v. Comment: I think this idea of calculating “Return on Investment” is very intriguing, and I assume that doesn’t mean just financial. There will be a community value judgment involved. We might look at other schools, but this will be unique to Vanderbilt and its values.

vi. Chancellor Zeppos: It will be really important for this group to look at this in terms of funding, reputation, and opportunities for getting a world-class education. I would be less concerned at this point about specifically defining the charge. I’m interested to hear what the faculty think about this important issue.

vii. Comment: I will strongly endorse this as well. I wonder about the academic/athletic balance. I would like to understand the trade-offs the students have to make to participate in athletics. Could we explore that as well? Chair Lim said yes.

viii. Comment: In many of the discussions in the media, they make a strong distinction between revenue and non-revenue sports. The experience of the athletes are very different in these different sports.

ix. Question: We need to think about the mental health of the student athletes. Do they access services the same way that other students do? Is it that they are stronger or are they not accessing these services?

x. Comment: We might want to consider having past student athletes to sit on the committee rather than current athletes. They might feel freer to express their opinions.

xi. Comment: There is one critical point that I’d like to see addressed, and that is that Vanderbilt is not the same institution that it was 15-17 years ago, and we need to keep that in mind.

h. Work Place Civility: Building Trust—CARE event. This event will be co-sponsored by us along with the University Staff Council. This will be happening on March 25.

Remarks by the Chancellor

The Chancellor gave his remarks on the proposed athletics task force, campus safety, VU/VUMC transition and split, and issues of diversity.

Standing committee reports

Senate Affairs report (Senator Buddy Creech)

Senator Buddy Creech gave the report from Senate Affairs committee about the faculty awareness survey that was given last year.

1. Goals of Survey:
1. a. Familiarity with Faculty Senate
   b. Satisfaction with Faculty Senate’s representation of faculty concerns
   c. Open-response options to discuss issues of importance
   d. Committee Leads: Jeffrey Blume and Sarah Rohde

2. Results: Senator Creech went over the results (37% faculty responded)

3. Familiarity with the Faculty Senate. There might be an opportunity to increase the communication here.

4. Free-Text Responses from Faculty:
   a. 349 responses to “A concern that I would like to bring to the attention of the Faculty Senate is…”
   b. The Senate Affairs committee created these buckets of information from the free-text responses:
      i. Academic Promotion and Student Issues
      ii. Campus Safety
      iii. Concur Travel and Reimbursement
      iv. Diversity and Gender Equality
      v. Faculty Life, Salaries, and Benefits
      vi. Faculty Governance/Faculty Senate
      vii. VU Administration issues
      viii. VUMC-Specific Issues

5. Next steps:
   a. Bucket refinement
      i. For each area of concern, the Senate Affairs committee will work with current committees and new task forces to address key concerns
   b. Low-hanging fruit
      i. Some issues are currently being addressed (e.g., Concur, retired faculty, sexual assaults on campus) and will be communicated to the faculty
   c. Seeds of change
      i. Improved communication
      ii. Engagement of University Staff Council, Senate committees, and Administration to address larger issues

6. Questions:
   a. Question: One question to me is line of command. When you have a concern usually, you go to your chair or your dean. What determines when a faculty member comes to the Faculty Senate with a concern?
      i. Senator Creech: It’s a great question. Prior to joining the Senate, the only thing I ever took to a senator was my opinion about an issue. Global issues should come to the Senate, I think. I don’t know if we have guidance for our faculty about what should be brought up to the Senate level.
      ii. Chair Lim asked how senators communicate to their constituents. This is the conversation that we should have. There are many different ways to communicate to faculty members about the activities of the Senate.
iii. Senator Creech mentioned that by having the conversations locally, this will then stimulate more interactions.

b. Comment: Add a question about how easy is it to communicate with my chair or dean to the survey next time. There was discussion about different sizes of departments and schools, and how best to communicate.

c. Comment: In Peabody, we have a slot at the regular monthly faculty meeting. We also created a spot for a senator at the Peabody Faculty Council.

d. Comment: Let’s look at best practices, and see what works in other schools. One size may not fit all.

New Business

Motion from APS committee regarding new degree program (Senator David Wright)

Senator David Wright presented the history of this proposed degree program in Earth and Environmental Sciences. He then presented the motion from the APS committee:

“Resolved, that the proposed Ph.D. program in Earth and Environment Sciences be approved by the Vanderbilt Faculty Senate”

Question: Who will you be competing with for students?
Answer: Places like Northwestern, Duke, and Emory. In general, a lot of the major Research universities with good Ph.D. programs.

There was an attempt to vote electronically, but it was unsuccessful. There was a motion to vote with a show of hands for the rest of the meeting instead of using electronic voting. The motion was seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

The motion to approve the degree program passed unanimously by a show of hands.

Motion from Faculty Life committee regarding benefits for retired faculty who do not have emeritus status (Senator Mel Ziegler)

Senator Mel Zeigler gave his presentation on this motion from the Faculty Life committee:

“Whereas retired faculty in good standing at the time of retirement who are not granted emeritus/emerita status do not receive any continued benefits from the university.

The members of the Faculty Life Committee unanimously recommend that non-emeritus/emerita faculty be designated the title of “Retired Faculty” and that those who are and remain in good standing shall receive the following continued benefits from the university:
1) Issuance of a Vanderbilt University identification card with the distinction of ‘Retired Faculty.’

2) Access to the campus computer network and a Vanderbilt email address as determined by the Director of ITS.

3) Library borrowing privileges and access to library buildings during both regular and restricted hours.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate support and endorse such actions be taken to adopt the above recommendations.”

Point of information: How many faculty retire and do not get emeritus status?
Senator Ziegler: Currently, there are 90 retired faculty. There are 358 emeritus/emerita faculty.

He mentioned that his committee did a cost analysis of this proposal, and it would cost around $3 per month for a retired faculty member to have a VU email address. So, the cost would be minimal for these benefits.

He said that to the point of legal issues, he met with Sean Scully at the request of Vice Chancellor Audrey Anderson, and Sean said that he didn’t think that there would be any legal issues involved with this benefit to retired faculty. He said it would be more of a policy issue.

Vice Chancellor Anderson: I need to amend that because there might be some risk issues. Any time someone is using the “Vanderbilt.edu” email address, outsiders will see them as being associated with the university, and Vanderbilt can and has gotten sued based on what those people are saying. Once they are retired faculty, they are no longer subject to our policies and procedures, and I have no way of knowing or to control what they do. There would be some additional risk. I would have to look at the insurance issues around this to see if retired faculty would be covered or not.

Senator Ziegler: I don’t think Sean brought this up with me, but maybe that’s what he meant by this being a policy issue.

Vice Chancellor Anderson: There’s no legal concern, since there’s nothing under the law that prohibits us from doing this.

Senator Ziegler: What we did in the motion is to say that you had to remain in good standing. And also we said that there would be a status called “retired faculty,” so their IDs would have this on it or not.
Question: If someone used an email address, would it be implied that they would have to follow our policies and procedures? Or could you have a policy that states this?

Answer: Currently, emeritus faculty have this status so the risks you are talking about should already be included in the group of emeritus faculty. This would simply expand the pool to include retired faculty members.

Chancellor Zeppos: I think it’s important to treat faculty who have devoted their lives to Vanderbilt really well.

Senator Ziegler: Let me comment on that because I think that’s exactly how the committee feels. Another motion we are looking at is to move forward on is organizing an alumni faculty organization that would be university-wide.

Question: Are you trying to rectify the fact that 90 faculty have slipped through an administrative crack in the emeritus/emerita procedure? Or are we trying to create a new category for people that we purposely exclude from emeritus status? We should put the emphasis on doing the right thing in the beginning and then we might not need new policy about this.

Senator Ziegler: I take your point. Even the idea of who is allowed to be emeritus/emerita is based on tenure, I think.

Question: If we can help them to feel a part of the community, then this will help us to gently help faculty members retire. People want to stay a part of the community, and this could help with that.

Senator Ziegler: That is the goal from our committee with this motion—to help retired faculty continue to be a part of the Vanderbilt community. We thought we could move this forward, and this seemed to be the quickest thing we could do.

Question: Are emeritus/emerita faculty covered by liability insurance?
Vice Chancellor Anderson: I don’t know the answer to that. Probably not because they are not employees.

Comment: Those of us on the Faculty Life committee do want faculty who are not considered for emeritus status to be welcomed into retirement while maintaining a meaningful relationship with the university. We also think that if they feel more of a part of the community, they will be more likely give back, in terms of money as well as their time. I think we should look at the spirit of this rather than teasing out the details at this stage.

Comment: We do want retired faculty to be welcome in the community. There are faculty who are concerned that they will be cut off, and that they will no longer be able to do their work.
Vice Provost Tim McNamara: I very much appreciate the intent of your motion. I agree with virtually all of the endorsement that I’ve heard. I would encourage the committee to give careful thought to how we define retired faculty. We are assuming that it is someone who has worked here a long time. But it could mean someone who has only been here a short time before retiring, in the case of non-tenure track faculty who are only hired for a few years.

Senator Ziegler: We have talked to Andrew Berry about that. As far as I understand it, if someone comes and teaches for only a few years, they are not considered a retired faculty member.

Vice Provost McNamara: Who makes this decision as to who is a retired faculty member?

Past Chair Donald Brady: As a member of this committee, I think this is all good input, and I think we need to take this off the table for now and have further discussions.

There was a motion to table this motion for further discussion. The motion to table was seconded. It was approved unanimously by show of hands.

Good of the Senate

There was none.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:41pm.
Call to order

Chair Lim opened the meeting at 4:10pm.

Approval of the minutes of March 12, 2015

Chair Lim asked for a motion to approve the minutes from March 12, 2015. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Report of the Executive Committee

Chair Lim gave the report of the Executive Committee:

1. There has been a conversation on forthcoming issues with the Faculty Manual in light of the VU/VUMC reorganization with David Raiford and Tim McNamara.
2. Update on the formation of the Task Force on University Athletics
   a. Task force composition will be completed soon. There will be senate representation as well as student athletes and PCC representatives.
3. Scheduling conflicts: We have talked about conflicts around the monthly meeting of the Senate. We would like to encourage deans to help the senate’s work by scheduling their school/college meetings around the senate meetings, and we would also like their help in encouraging attendance.
4. Nominations for next year’s Chair-elect and Vice Chair-elect positions: Ongoing and this is open to all first-year senators. Richard Willis and Ann Price
5. Conflict of Interest policy: Discussion with Vice Chancellor Audrey Anderson and Christy Hooper at a meeting of the Senate Executive Committee.
6. Ongoing conversation regarding tertiary educational benefits
7. Conversation on the Faculty Survey results and the letter that was distributed to faculty: The Executive Committee has had conversations with the Chancellor as well as the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs.
8. Chair Lim also pointed out the time limits for each agenda item and asked for the speakers to keep to these limits. He pointed out that we will devote 15 minutes under “Good of the Senate” to discussion of the Faculty Survey and other issues relating to it.
9. Finally, he announced a specially-called meeting of elected senators only on Tuesday, April 7 and urged all senators to attend.
Remarks by the Chancellor

Chancellor Zeppos gave his remarks about diversity and inclusion; the campus zoning plan; restructuring and transition; and the role of the Senate in taking issues and questions to the administration. He answered questions after his remarks.

Motion

Senator Ann Price moved to suspend the Rules of Order and use paper ballots instead of electronic voting for this session only. The motion was seconded. The motion was passed unanimously by a show of hands.

Ad hoc committee/task force reports

Report from the Online Education task force with motion (Task Force Chair Ranga Ramanujam)

Ranga Ramanujam, chair, gave his report from the Online Education task force.

He gave a history of the task force’s work, starting in May 2013. He said that the idea from the beginning was for the faculty to participate proactively in the discussion of online education. He said that they particularly looked at faculty’s rights, roles and responsibilities.

He said that they have considered lots of issues, but this motion today stems from a very fundamental question: if a Vanderbilt faculty member wishes to offer an online course outside of Vanderbilt, what exactly is the current situation regarding conflict of commitment?

He said that the task force realized that this issue is not really addressed in the current Faculty Manual. The current policy guidelines are ambiguous on the issue.

He said that they have had many meetings with various groups and stakeholders over the last few years in order to get a wide perspective on the issue (Senate Executive Committee, Senate Committee on Strategic Planning, Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Faculty Manual, University Conflicts Committee, etc.). They looked at policies from other universities regarding online education as well. He pointed out that some think the proposed policy is too long, while others believe it is too short.

He said that they propose that this language should be added to Part III, Chapter 3 of the Faculty Manual. He said that this policy is specifically for faculty teaching online courses through non-Vanderbilt entities.

He also stated that the question was not whether or not faculty could teach outside of Vanderbilt; instead, it is about how, when, and what are the processes that are required to do so.
He talked about the difference between the general standard for assessing conflict of commitment in non-Vanderbilt online teaching and special provisions for online courses for academic credit and for online courses providing certifications.

Motion: “Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate approve the following text to be inserted into the Faculty Manual:

Conflict of Commitment Guideline Regarding Non-Vanderbilt Online Teaching

General Standard: For faculty who are members of the Faculty Assembly (“faculty”), teaching outside the University presents issues that require special attention because it has the potential to compete with the University’s own offerings. In judging the appropriateness of any online teaching outside the educational mission of the University, faculty should consider the time commitment and the potential impact of these activities on the fulfillment of their commitments to the University as per Article III of the Faculty Manual.

In addition, the following special considerations and procedures apply to online courses offered, or reasonably expected to be offered, for academic credit and to online courses providing certifications:

Special Provision for Online Courses for Academic Credit: Faculty are not permitted to offer online courses for undergraduate, graduate, or professional degree credit for another education institution or venture except with permission of the faculty member’s Dean (or the Dean’s designee).

In determining whether to grant such permission or as guidance for reviewing potential conflicts, the Dean (or the Dean’s designee) and faculty should consider whether such online teaching will impair the instructional offerings of the faculty member’s School or other Schools at Vanderbilt University. In making this impairment determination, the following factors (among others) may be useful to consider, with affirmative answers counting against approval, but no set number of affirmative answers being conclusive: Is the faculty member one of the primary instructors or a course director in the online offering? Is the online offering comparable to any current course at Vanderbilt? Is the online offering among the courses that Vanderbilt plans to include in its own offerings in the next two academic years? Is the online offering likely, in fact, to compete with Vanderbilt courses for student enrollments? Does the online offering require the instructor to commit to teaching the content exclusively with the online vendor or other institution and not to provide any similar content in another online format?

Special Provision for Online Courses Providing Certifications: Faculty must disclose their plan to teach in online courses that offer certifications to their Dean (or the Dean’s designee) prior to undertaking such teaching.”

He then asked for any questions or comments.

Senator Myrna Wooders: “I am going to vote “No” to the proposed changes and I exhort you all to do the same. The proposed changes do not mention the three months of the
summer nor out “forty days”. These are important and the proposal needs to clarify its
intent.
The Faculty Manual states:

“Accordingly, the maximum expenditure of time spend on external activities by a full-
time faculty member appointed on a nine-month basis should not exceed forty days
during the academic year, including holidays.”

Our current contracts do not require that we do not teach during the summer. I see no
reason to change that. Indeed, academic-year faculty are salaried for only nine months of
the year.

The mind, the creativity of the mind, and the knowledge stored within it are the property
of the individual faculty member. Vanderbilt does not own the content of the courses that
we teach; these are our own intellectual property. Course content is no different than a
book.

The Faculty Manual also states:

“All rights in scholarly books, articles and other publications, artistic, literary, film, tape,
and musical works (“Literary and Artistic Works”) are granted to the faculty, staff, and
students who are the authors. Literary and Artistic Works includes texts that have been
stored on computer media, but excludes computer programs or computer software or
databases that are neither accessory to nor an electronic expression of a scholarly text.”

Note that rights to electronic expressions of a scholarly work are maintained by the
individual faculty member.

To publish is to make publically available -- with the result of a publication. The medium
does not determine what constitutes a publication. An on-line course is a modern
scholarly book. To provide an on-line course carries “forward our noble mission of
educating, healing, and advancing scientific research,” (Chancellor, in the Faculty
Manual). Our current contract allows us to contribute to this noble mission during our
forty days of permitted activities and during the summer, in whatever way we choose. I
see no compelling reason to give that up.

But whatever your view on these matters, the current proposal by the Faculty Senate
Online Education Taskforce is too ambiguous to be acceptable as a part of the Faculty
Manual and, thus, our contracts.

In addition to quoting my notes above, to emphasis the importance of having clear
statements of our obligations in the Faculty Manual, and the fact that a lack of clarity can
lead to misunderstanding of our contracts, I referred to a letter from a former Dean. In
view of some subsequent events I am copying below the Dean’s letter, responding to my
request for a nine-month pay schedule; academic year faculty are already on a nine-
month salary schedule.
“I believe it is the case that the move to a nine-month salary schedule from twelve months will implicate all your compensation, including insurance coverage.” Former Dean of A&S, October 8, 2012.

The on-line education motion did not, for example, mention the three months of the summer when, according to their contracts, academic year faculty (with some exceptions due to grants or administrative duties) are free to take other employment.”

Professor Ramanujam: This has nothing to do with intellectual property. This is not a motion about who owns the course materials; it’s about online teaching. And it’s not necessarily tied to intellectual property, which is a separate issue that the task force will be talking about in its report. We don’t necessarily see this motion as tied to intellectual property. It’s simply a matter of saying if you teach a course for credit or for certification for a non-Vanderbilt entity, then it requires the dean’s permission in order to do it.

Senator Wooders: Even during the summer?
Professor Ramanujam: Yes.
Senator Wooders: That’s a really big change. I think we should have as part of the motion that we get paid for the summers. We’re only paid nine months.

Question: In the event that there was a faculty member who took this to a dean who did not approve it, who would the faculty member go to if s/he thought that was the wrong decision? Is there a fallback procedure for an appeal?

Comment: This proposal needs consistent language as it refers to online teaching, online offerings, and online teaching materials.

There was a friendly amendment to change “online teaching, online offerings, online teaching materials” to simply “online courses.” The amendment was accepted by the proposers of the motion.

Senator Wooders: I think that when there is a motion that affects what faculty members can do during the summer when they are not paid by the university—when we are, according to our contracts, encouraged to engage in scholarly pursuits—it should be brought widely to the attention of the whole faculty. And not just passed by the senate at one meeting. It’s too serious.

Chair Lim: At the same time, you must understand that this body is the representative body of the faculty. The whole point of us gathering at this time is to represent the concerns.

Senator Wooders: How much feedback have we gotten from the faculty on this? I don’t think that much since we only received this a few days ago. But thank you for saying that it’s the representative body rather than the advisory body.

A written ballot was taken on the motion with the friendly amendment. The motion passed with 30 yes, 9 no, and 3 abstentions.
Old Business

Motion from Faculty Life committee regarding benefits for retired faculty who do not have emeritus status (Faculty Life Committee Chair Mel Ziegler)

Mel Ziegler, chair of Faculty Life, gave the presentation on this item of Old Business. He pointed out the comparison of retirement benefits between emeritus retired faculty and non-emeritus retired faculty. There are only three benefits from the list that will be extended to non-emeritus retired faculty by passage of this motion.

He explained that this is an endorsement and we hope that the administration will do this.

Motion: “Whereas retired faculty in good standing at the time of retirement who are not granted emeritus/emerita status do not receive any continued benefits from the university. The members of the Faculty Life Committee unanimously recommend that non-emeritus/emerita faculty be designated the title of “Retired Faculty” defined as those who voluntarily end full time service to the university, are in good standing at the time of retirement, and have served for an extended period of time and contributed to the mission of the institution and that those who are and remain in good standing shall receive the following continued benefits from the university:

1) Issuance of a Vanderbilt University identification card with the distinction of ‘Retired Faculty.’

2) Access to the campus computer network and a Vanderbilt email address as determined by the Director of ITS.

3) Library borrowing privileges and access to library buildings during both regular and restricted hours.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate support and endorse such actions be taken to adopt the above recommendations.”

Chair Lim asked for any discussion on this motion.

Comment: I commend you and I think this is a wonderful thing to do for faculty. Does this include the Medical Center faculty?
Senator Ziegler: Yes.
Question: Does computer access include things like STAR Panel?
Senator Ziegler: I don’t think so.
Vice Chancellor Balser: If you are retired faculty member, you don’t have access to healthcare systems.
Question: What’s the timeline in the definition of ‘retired faculty?’
Senator Ziegler: We were trying to leave that open so that determination can be made by individual cases.
Question: Could that be used in the reverse to prevent someone from getting it?
Senator Ziegler: I don’t know.
Comment: I think it’s more about the spirit of the motion, and the individual cases.
Vice Chancellor Balser: My only concern is how do we define retired? We have faculty in the Medical Center who leave and then go into competition with us. That’s very common. I would wonder if we really wanted to give folks who choose to do that access to the VU IT systems. I would at least want to certify that these people are truly retired.
Senator Ziegler: So, how could that be added to this definition?
Vice Chancellor Balser: I think we could come up with some reasonable assessment to decide if a faculty member was truly retired.
Comment: We could just add language that a retired faculty member must not go into direct competition with Vanderbilt in order to keep these benefits.
Senator Ziegler: I would accept that as a friendly amendment to the definition.
Comment: One way to get around this is to include this language in the definition of retired faculty, “Recommend that non-emeritus/emerita faculty who retire be designated with the title ‘retired faculty.’” (adding the highlighted words to the motion).
Senator Ziegler: I accept this friendly amendment.

A written ballot was taken on the motion with the friendly amendment. The motion passed with 42 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstentions.

New Business
Motion from Senators Jim Steiger and Myrna Wooders on scheduled remarks and changes to the order of business at meetings in the Senate Rules of Order

Senator Jim Steiger presented this motion. He said that senators feel inhibited in responding since the materials come forth quickly. After the fact, questions come up and there is no chance to ask them then. We would like for the materials to be handed out at least five to ten days ahead of time. The second part is to change the Rules of Order so that Scheduled Remarks occur at the end of the meeting, and then the presenter will attend the following meeting to answer questions. This would lead to a greater degree of involvement and cooperation. He said that he thinks this would create a more productive exchange. He realizes that there is a negative in that administrative time is valuable, and this would require attending two meetings instead of one, but he thinks the benefits would outweigh any negatives.

Motion: “Whereas Faculty Senators do not have advance information concerning Scheduled remarks and thus cannot formulate thoughtful questions in advance;

Whereas, presentations of Scheduled remarks are not available to Senators after their presentations and thus Senators cannot share the remarks with other faculty members,

Be it resolved that:
All slides and materials in Scheduled remarks be made accessible to Senators prior to their presentation to the Faculty Senate and the administration attend a follow-up question period at the next meeting of the Senate.

The Rules of Procedure of the Faculty Senate be changed to allow Senate Business to precede Scheduled remarks, specifically, that the Roles of Procedure be changed to:

The following order of business shall be followed at all regular meetings of the Faculty Senate:
- Call to order
- Approval of the minutes of the last meeting
- Report of the Executive Committee
- Remarks by the Chancellor
- Standing committee reports
- Ad hoc committee reports
- Old business
- New business
- Scheduled remarks
- Good of the Senate
- Adjournment.”

Chair Lim asked for a second for this motion. The motion was seconded.

Senator Creech: I move that this motion be sent to the Senate Affairs committee for further inquiry and study.

Chair Lim asked for a second for this new motion. The motion was seconded.

The motion to send this motion to the Senate Affairs committee was seconded. A written ballot was taken on the motion. The motion to refer to committee passed 42 yes, 1 no, and 0 abstention.

**Motion from Faculty Life committee regarding retired faculty association (Faculty Life Committee Chair Mel Ziegler)**

Senator Ziegler presented the following motion regarding retired faculty association. He said that through the work of former chair of the Faculty Life committee, Chris Lind, the research into what other universities did uncovered that many other places have some sort of retired faculty association. While the School of Medicine has a retired faculty alumni association, he said he would like to see this implemented across the university. This association could engage retired faculty as well as create goodwill.

Motion: “Whereas Vanderbilt retired faculty may desire to maintain a collegial relationship with the university.
Whereas an organization of retired faculty may foster mutually beneficial relationships between the university and its retired faculty.

The Faculty Life Committee recommends development of a university wide retired faculty association, which would serve all retired faculty in a spirit of fellowship and loyalty.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate support and endorse such actions be taken to adopt the above recommendation.”

Chair Lim asked for any discussion. Hearing none, the question was called.

A written ballot was taken on the motion. The motion passed with 42 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstentions.

**Motion from Senator Richard Willis on electronic voting and changes to the Senate Rules of Order**

Chair-elect Willis presented the following motion. He said that this motion amends a motion that was voted on at the February 5 meeting to allow for paper ballots as well as electronic voting.

“Whereas the Faculty Senate passed a motion to amend the Rules of Order on April 10, 2003 to state: "Voting on matters before the Faculty Senate shall normally be by "ayes" and "nays" (voice vote or show of hands) or by electronic voting."

And whereas this wording allows for the possibility of electronic voting when needed and served the Senate well for many years due to the flexibility it gives in choosing the best voting mechanism for each situation,

And whereas the Faculty Senate passed a motion to amend the Rules of Order on February 5, 2015 to state, “Except for routine matters such as the approval of minutes and adjournment or when a roll call is effected, or in the matter of electronic disruption, all voting in the Faculty Senate shall be electronic and anonymous.”

And whereas the Senate Affairs committee of the Faculty Senate issued this statement on the proposed motion:

“On December 9, 2014, the Senate Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate discussed the motion regarding anonymous electronic voting. In general, the committee was very supportive of electronic voting, recognizing the advantages of voting that is anonymous, efficient, and precise; however, the committee expressed concern that the amendment is an unnecessary change to the current rules of order. Based on the April 10, 2003 amendment to the Senate Rules of Order, “voting on matters before the Faculty Senate shall normally be by “ayes” and “nays” (voice vote or show of hands) or by electronic
voting.” Given that the current Rules of Order allow for the normal use of electronic voting, the Senate Affairs Committee recommends that the Senate simply adopt electronic voting, in a format of the Executive Committee’s choosing, as a normative means of voting on Senate business. The Committee holds that this meets the spirit of the amendment without unnecessarily complicating the Rules of Order.”

And whereas the motion passed on February 5, 2015 to amend the Rules of Order gives limited flexibility when choosing the best voting mechanism for each situation,

And whereas the need for anonymous voting can still be achieved by a written ballot,

Be it resolved that the Senate Rules of Order be amended by deletion and insertion. First deleting, “Except for routine matters such as the approval of minutes and adjournment or when a roll call is effected, or in the matter of electronic disruption, all voting in the Faculty Senate shall be electronic and anonymous.” and in its place inserting, “Voting on matters before the Faculty Senate for routine matters such as approval of minutes or when a roll call is effected shall normally be by "ayes" and "nays" (voice vote or show of hands). All other voting shall be anonymous by either electronic means or by written ballot.”

Chair Lim asked for any discussion on the motion.

Comment: It’s less important to me personally if it’s paper ballots or electronic voting as long as the voting is anonymous. That said, I find it astonishing not to mention a little embarrassing for our body that at a university of our caliber where one of the four pillars of the strategic plan is the electronic classroom that we find it difficult to implement what I would call late twentieth century technologies. So I would urge the Senate leadership as I did originally to work with the Center for Teaching and Derek Bruff on how to implement this. I think a quick five minute tutorial would work or at least in theory it would. I think it would be a lot more efficient if we could get it to work.

Chair Lim: I think that this might be a solution to have Derek Bruff come to give us a tutorial on the electronic clickers.

Comment: I agree that in the twenty-first century it would be nice to have clickers that work. We could even eventually use our cell phones. The problem with the current wording is that if we are in a situation like last time, we had to have a motion from the floor to suspend the Rules of Order, which requires a two-thirds majority of the members present. This motion would still allow us to use clickers all the time if you wanted to.

Comment: Before our motion, voting by ballot was not allowed. In 2003, they said show of hands or electronic voting. Let me mention that I have compiled all the minutes of the Faculty Senate since 2001 and they are on one of my webpages. You can go there and search and you’ll find the actual 2003 motion and it did not allow paper ballots. I’m
pleased with this amendment. The original motion did not serve the Senate well because it was only used two or three times. I agree with this amendment.

Chair Lim reminded everyone that this motion will be voted on at the May meeting since it involves a change to the Rules of Order.

Good of the Senate

Chair Lim asked for any business under Good of the Senate. He said that the Faculty Survey results have come in. And there are a number of issues and concerns. There is overlap with some other issues and concerns raised recently in the anonymous letter. I think the anonymity is most unfortunate; however, as chair of your Senate I have received 23 emails, 15 text messages and about 7-8 phone calls. They were not anonymous. So, I do think that we as representatives of the faculty at this university owe it to ourselves and to our faculty colleagues who entrusted us with this position to have a conversation. As Chancellor Zeppos mentioned earlier, it is really a dialogical engagement that will make us better. I think it is very crucial for us to think about not only the critique, but some of our constructive proposals going forward. In that spirit of constructive engagement, I’d like to open the floor for questions and comments.

Comment: There are a lot of issues there that we talked about earlier. There are a lot of us who feel a great pride in Opportunity Vanderbilt. While there’s a strong voice of opposition, there are also people who support this initiative.
Chair Lim: As an individual faculty member, I agree unequivocally that the best thing about Vanderbilt is this Opportunity Vanderbilt program. It’s something that I personally am very thankful for and proud of as a faculty member.
Comment: Opportunity Vanderbilt has all the best principles and values, and I believe in it very strongly.
Comment: I think it’s great. I really want the best in life for everybody. I think we should offer everybody a good education. But I think we also have to look at the cost. Our staff bear a lot of these costs. Our staff are demoralized and discouraged. They are the people that are most affected.
Comment: I think the Faculty Survey that came forth and itemized a number of issues. There were so many issues that we had over 300 free-text responses on the survey. I would hope that we could decide on the priorities of which of these to address because there are a lot of issues here. And I think in order for any Senate committee to take these on, I think they need some prioritization.
Comment: Some of the concerns brought up in the survey may correlate to other concerns that have been brought up recently. I think this is where the tie-in happens.
Comment: We have other data as well. VIRG conducted a survey in 2012. I would urge the Senate Affairs to committee to look at this data as well.
Comment: It’s always disturbing to read negative comments about the institution. Can we look at net effect on faculty retention? I’d like data on that. I see wonderful recruiting of faculty members happening in spite of financial difficulties.
Chair Lim will get more data for the Tuesday meeting of elected senators. He read off the bucket topics from the Faculty Survey that have also come up in the various communications he has had with some faculty members.

Comment: Senate Affairs has been talking about this and the last thing we want to do next is to conduct another survey so soon. Tuesday’s meeting will be helpful and we will need to communicate any plan effectively back to faculty members.

Comment: My hope would be that the focus of Tuesday’s meeting will be on the role of the Senate. And come away with some specific and concrete suggestions and ways to move forward.

Comment: Because we are a private institution, many numbers that could be helpful are not available to us. Transparencies with numbers could help with

Comment: Faculty perceive that coaches are making so much more money than faculty salaries. There are issues of contradictory information.

Comment: I think one of the problems the Senate has is a communication issue—how does the Senate communicate to faculty and how do faculty communicate to the Senate?

Comment: Peabody has a senate seat on their council for communication purposes.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:35pm.
Call to order

Approval of the minutes of April 2, 2015

Report of the Executive Committee

Remarks by the Chancellor & Recognition of Third-Year Senators

Old Business
1. Motion from Senator Richard Willis on electronic voting and changes to the Senate Rules of Order
2. Report on the motion referred to the Senate Affairs committee (Senator Buddy Creech)

New Business
1. Election of Chair-Elect and Vice Chair-Elect of the Faculty Senate
2. Discussion of Year-End Committee Reports

Good of the Senate

Adjournment to reception


Voting Members absent: Baker (regrets), Brown, Cliffel, Delpire, Enterline (regrets), Fauchet, Fountain (regrets), Friedman, Guelcher (regrets), Guthrie, Hemingway (regrets), Hetherington, Hopkins (regrets), Johnson, E., Johnson, J. (regrets), Johnson, R. (regrets), Lamb, McCammon, McCain, Price (regrets), Rohde (regrets), Slayton, Wait, Wittig, Wright, Wright-Rios, and Ziegler.

Ex Officio Members present: Anderson, Bandas, Brady, Cyrus, Fortune, Johnston, Lutz, Miller, Stalcup, Sweet, Wente, and Zeppos.

Ex Officio Members absent: Bernard, Combs (regrets), Kopstain, Hall (regrets), McNamara, Raiford, Wcislo, and Williams.
Call to order

Chair Lim called the meeting to order at 4:10pm.

Approval of the minutes of April 2, 2015

Chair Lim asked for a motion to approve the minutes from April 2, 2015. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Report of the Executive Committee

Chair Lim gave the report of the Executive Committee:

1. He said that the process for forming the Task Force on University Athletics is moving right along. He said that we have drafted a charge and have recruited two co-chairs for the task force—Sandra Barnes from Peabody and Marc Hetherington from Arts and Science (both senators).

2. Updates on Concur: He said that a number of faculty have emailed and talked to him and other senators about this. He said that the Deans’ local options will be honored regarding whether faculty will use Concur or not for booking travel. Each Dean will submit plans for export controls and ISOS compliance for provostial approval.

3. Follow up on tertiary educational benefits for children with special educational needs: This has been brought to the Executive Committee and there have been several conversations with the Chancellor, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs. Most recently, Eric Kopstain, Tracy Nordberg, and the three movers of this issue (Dawn Turton, Vanessa Beasley and Katherine Donato) and I met to talk about some of the possible future actions regarding it. The result of this conversation is that there will be a motion brought to the Senate in the fall.

4. After the letter and the elected-senators only meeting: He said that at the elected-senators only meeting, we talked a good deal about both the Senate Affairs committee survey as well as the anonymous letter. Our general consensus is that many of the issues are already raised in the Senate Affairs committee survey data. He said that the other big concern was that when surveys are done, it needs to be brought back to inform a more robust conversation about this among faculty members and also for future implementation. We are thinking further about future endeavors to analyze and propose actions at the behest of the Faculty Senate, which we believe to be the representative body of the faculty.

5. He asked for any questions.
   a. There was a motion made at the September 2014 Senate meeting to update the Constitution. And a motion made at the October 2014 meeting to have the committee reports available electronically. Could you tell us the progress on those two motions?
   b. Chair Lim: Yes, for the motion on updating the Constitution, we were supposed to have it done in the spring, but since it wasn’t done, we are going to have to take it up next year. The reason for this is that it has to be
voted on at the Faculty Assembly. As for the committee reports, they are available on the Senate website.

Remarks by the Chancellor & Recognition of Third-Year Senators

Chancellor Zeppos recognized the third-year senators who are rotating off the Faculty Senate. He also talked about commencement, the new medicine and diversity chair, and a diversity strategy for the university.

Chair Lim recognized outgoing Past Chair Donald Brady and Past Vice Chair Jeff Johnston.

Old Business

3. Motion from Senator Richard Willis on electronic voting and changes to the Senate Rules of Order

Chair Lim presented the motion from Senator Richard Willis on electronic voting and changes to the Senate Rules of Order for a vote (it was distributed before the April Senate meeting and discussed at that meeting):

“Whereas the Faculty Senate passed a motion to amend the Rules of Order on April 10, 2003 to state: “Voting on matters before the Faculty Senate shall normally be by "ayes" and "nays" (voice vote or show of hands) or by electronic voting.”

And whereas this wording allows for the possibility of electronic voting when needed and served the Senate well for many years due to the flexibility it gives in choosing the best voting mechanism for each situation,

And whereas the Faculty Senate passed a motion to amend the Rules of Order on February 5, 2015 to state, “Except for routine matters such as the approval of minutes and adjournment or when a roll call is effected, or in the matter of electronic disruption, all voting in the Faculty Senate shall be electronic and anonymous.”

And whereas the Senate Affairs committee of the Faculty Senate issued this statement on the proposed motion:

“On December 9, 2014, the Senate Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate discussed the motion regarding anonymous electronic voting. In general, the committee was very supportive of electronic voting, recognizing the advantages of voting that is anonymous, efficient, and precise; however, the committee expressed concern that the amendment is an unnecessary change to the current rules of order. Based on the April 10, 2003 amendment to the Senate Rules of Order, “voting on matters before the Faculty Senate shall normally be by “ayes” and “nays” (voice vote or show of hands) or by electronic voting.” Given that the current Rules of Order allow for the normal use of electronic
voting, the Senate Affairs Committee recommends that the Senate simply adopt electronic voting, in a format of the Executive Committee’s choosing, as a normative means of voting on Senate business. The Committee holds that this meets the spirit of the amendment without unnecessarily complicating the Rules of Order.”

And whereas the motion passed on February 5, 2015 to amend the Rules of Order gives limited flexibility when choosing the best voting mechanism for each situation,

And whereas the need for anonymous voting can still be achieved by a written ballot,

Be it resolved that the Senate Rules of Order be amended by deletion and insertion. First deleting, “Except for routine matters such as the approval of minutes and adjournment or when a roll call is effected, or in the matter of electronic disruption, all voting in the Faculty Senate shall be electronic and anonymous.” and in its place inserting, “Voting on matters before the Faculty Senate for routine matters such as approval of minutes or when a roll call is effected shall normally be by "ayes" and "nays" (voice vote or show of hands). All other voting shall be anonymous by either electronic means or by written ballot.’’”

Chair Lim asked for any discussion.

Motion

Senator Mark Cannon moved to suspend the Rules of Order and use paper ballots instead of electronic voting for this session only. The motion was seconded. The motion was passed unanimously by a show of hands.

Chair Lim then asked for an anonymous paper ballot to vote on the motion proposed by Senator Willis. The motion was passed virtually unanimously, with only one abstention.

4. Report on the motion by Senators James Steiger and Myrna Wooders referred to the Senate Affairs committee (Senator Buddy Creech)

Senator Buddy Creech presented the modified motion from the Senate Affairs Committee. This is a reading of the motion and it will be voted on at the first Senate meeting of the next academic year:

“Whereas the Faculty Senate desires to conduct meetings that are effective and efficient,

Whereas it is helpful for Senators to review materials that are discussed during Faculty Senate meetings,

Be it resolved that:
1. The normative order of business, which may be modified at the discretion of the Chair of the Faculty Senate, will be the following:
Call to order
Approval of minutes
Executive Committee Report
Remarks by the Chancellor
Standing committee reports
Ad hoc committee reports
Old business
New business
Scheduled remarks, with discussion to follow
Good of the Senate
Adjournment

2. Materials presented during scheduled remarks, either in original or redacted format, will be posted to the secure Faculty Senate website at the discretion of the Executive Committee and the approval of the presenter.”

Senator Creech gave some background on this motion. He said that during the last meeting, this motion came forward asking to restructure the order of the meetings so that faculty business precedes invited remarks. The other part of the motion would require invited speakers to attend two Senate meetings. The first meeting would be to present invited remarks, and the second would be to answer follow-up questions. The last part of the motion was to require invited speakers to share their presentation materials, which would be posted to the Senate website.

He said that the Senate Affairs committee discussed this motion, and had two goals in mind. We first thought about the unintended consequences of keeping this motion just as it is. The second was if we modified it, how could we maintain the spirit of the motion even if the letter of the motion was modified.

He said that they discussed the need for a quorum, whether or not this would place an undue burden in terms of time on invited speakers, and the need for confidentiality of prepared remarks. With these thoughts in mind, he said that they are presenting this modified motion. He said that there is no action on this motion today, but this is the recommendation of the Senate Affairs committee. The motion will be voted on at the September 2015 meeting. He opened the floor for questions or comments.

Senator Wooders: I believe that this is a very good friendly amendment.
Question: It doesn’t say when the materials will be posted. Do you want to say “in advance of the meeting?”
Senator Creech: It would be fantastic to have them beforehand, and I’m happy to take that back to the Senate Affairs committee. But I like the wording to be flexible.
Comment: You could say “when possible, the materials will be posted in advance of the meeting.”
Senator Creech: I think if the presentations are ready in advance, that would be fine.

New Business
3. Election of Chair-Elect and Vice Chair-Elect of the Faculty Senate

Chair Lim said that we have five candidates for chair-elect today: Tom Christenbery, Brian Christman, Brian Heuser, Peter Martin, and Erin O’Hara O’Connor. He said that this vote will be done on paper ballots. He reminded the Senate that this vote requires a simple majority, and if no one wins by a simple majority during the first round, the person with the least amount of votes will be dropped and there will be more rounds of voting until a candidate receives a majority of the votes. He also explained that we cannot have a chair and vice chair-elect from the same school or college.

After many rounds of voting, Erin O’Hara O’Connor was elected chair-elect.

Chair Lim said that we have two candidates for vice chair-elect, Charlene Dewey and Donna Webb. In addition, any unsuccessful candidate for chair-elect can put his name up for vice chair-elect. All of them elected to do this, so Tom Christenbery, Brian Christman, Brian Heuser, and Peter Martin also stood for vice chair-elect.

There was a motion to suspend the rules and allow for a show of hands vote for two vice chairs-elect serving on the Senate Executive Committee this next year if it is ruled by the Parliamentarian that it is within the rules to do this.

Comment: Our by-laws do say that we elect “a vice chair-elect,” which says to me that it allows only room for one and not two. So, this motion is not valid under our by-laws.

After many rounds of voting, Charlene Dewey was elected vice chair-elect.

4. Discussion of Year-End Committee Reports

Chair Lim stated that the year-end committee reports are available on the Senate website for review.

Good of the Senate

Chair Lim asked for any Good of the Senate. Hearing none, he moved to the next item.

Adjournment to reception

Meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.