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
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:
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 slot 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 Ziegler 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.