Meeting
Regular meeting of the full senate, 3:15 p.m., Kendall Cram Room, Lavin-Bernick Center.
Presiding: The chair, President Cowen.

Attendance
Ex Officio: Cowen (pres./chair), Long (vice chair), Lopez (proxy for Bernstein, provost), Lorino (CFO), Y. Jones (COO), Cullen (pres, ASB), Barrera (chair, SAC), Mackin (sec), Wiese (parl)
Deans: Query (Libraries), MacLaren (NTC), Schwartz (Arch.), Marksbury (SCS), Ponoroff (Law), Haber (SLA), Barrera (proxy for Buekens, SPHTM), Altiero (SSE), Marks (SSW)
A. B. Freeman School of Business: Sujan, Page, McFarland
Newcomb-Tulane College: Kalka
Architecture: Bernhard
Continuing Studies: Green, McLennan
Law: Hoeffel (proxy for Nowicki), Davies, Overby
Liberal Arts: Masquelier, Cole, Rothenberg (also proxy for Horowitz), Maveety, Balée
Medicine: Reitan, Mushatt, S. Landry (also proxy for Bunnell), DeSalvo, Voss
Public Health and Tropical Medicine: Hutchinson, Webber, Rose
Science and Engineering: Schmehl, Diebold, Walker, Tasker
Social Work: Pearlmutter, Lewis
Student Senators: Walker, Wendt, Kelley
Staff Senators: Earles, Brittan (proxy for Hayes)

Senators at Large: Hoeffel, Parker, Langston, Carroll, Purrington, Wilson, Tornqvist
Invited Guests: Levy (assoc SVP Research), McMahon (VP IT), Holtman (assoc VP, WMO), Johnson (gen. counsel), Baños (chief of staff), Mitchell (assoc provost), Coignet (dir strategic planning)
Absent Senators: Sachs, DeNisi, V. Jones, Doucet, Beyerstedt, Robins

Introduction of New Senators and Guests
President Cowen introduced Rachel Reitan, senator from the School of Medicine, and Jean Holtman, the associate vice president for the Workforce Management Organization.

Minutes
The minutes of the February 2 meeting were approved without change.

Elections
Committee on Committees (Two-year terms)
Dean Haber was elected as representative of the ex officio senators.
Professor Lewis was elected to represent the School of Social Work.
Professor Bernhard was elected to represent the School of Architecture.
Election of a senator to represent the
School of Law was postponed until the May meeting.

**Faculty Representative to the Board**

Vice Chair Long, who had been serving as a replacement representative to the board, was elected to a full, three-year term.

**Senate Secretary**

Secretary Mackin was re-elected. The president declared the vote unanimous after rejecting the one nay vote because the secretary did not have voting rights. Secretary Mackin agreed to serve until a suitable replacement could be elected or until he retired in 2010, whichever came first.

**President’s Report**

President Cowen discussed his March presentation to the board; the presentation had been distributed to the senate before the meeting. His report covered four topics: signs of hope, challenges to overcome, current priorities, and strategic questions for the board to consider.

Under signs of hope, the president discussed the stimulus plan and its potential for funding research. Much of the funding was directed to scientific research, but some additional funding would be available for the humanities. Vice President Levy had been coordinating with all schools so that Tulane would be mobilized to take advantage of any opportunities.

Student interest and quality remained high among prospective students. By the time of the meeting, he said, all accepted students had been notified. Although the final results would not be known until May 15, the president noted that student deposits were keeping pace with last year.

Under challenges, the president mentioned Katrina legacy issues, the most notable of which was FEMA. He said Tulane had submitted $217 million in claims but had received only $58–$59 million. At that rate, he added, FEMA would take 10 years to get through the remainder of the university’s claims. President Cowen said he had discussed the problem with Homeland Security Secretary Napolitano when she visited New Orleans.

Another challenge the president discussed was rebuilding areas that had been decimated by Katrina, especially the development platform and the clinical care mission. The development office comprised 130 people before Katrina and 60 afterwards. The office was able to complete its major fund-raising campaign but would need to rebuild for the next campaign. Clinical care would be affected by the issue of a new hospital in New Orleans. He said the issue was complex; the outcome would affect the School of Medicine for years to come. He promised to write a Tulane Talk on the hospital issue in the next month.

The economic downturn was the cause of several challenges the president addressed. The decrease in endowment value would affect the payout. The administration was changing its payout on the endowment to reflect the value at the end of calendar year 2008. That revaluation would result in a payout of $1 million less but would mitigate some of the long-term pain.

President Cowen said the State of Louisiana proposed reducing funding for all private colleges. Tulane received an annual capitation amount of $2 million that had been zeroed out in the proposed budget. Other aspects of the state budget could also have an adverse effect. The university’s office of government affairs was working on the problem of getting some funds reinstated, but the outcome would not be known until the legislative session ended.

The economic downturn also had led to a significant increase in financial aid for students, which the president had previously discussed with the senate. The increase was affecting all universities. President Cowen said he expected another uptick in aid costs because of the needs of students.

The downturn had also led to increased uncertainty about the admissions yield—the number of accepted students who would
actually attend Tulane. Across the country, admissions offices were uncertain about the percentage of yield and would not know until late May. At the same time, the economic downturn severely constrained the university’s ability to increase future tuition.

Under priorities, the president first discussed fiscal management, which included maintaining cash and liquidity; a salary freeze for those making more than $35,000; the stabilization program, which was likely to become a harder hiring freeze because the program had allowed more exceptions than anticipated; limiting non-salary expenses and capital investments; and increasing revenue where possible.

Other priorities included keeping the faculty and staff, who were the intellectual capital of the university, without which it could not accomplish its mission, and increasing donor participation, especially in unrestricted giving. Another priority the president mentioned was positioning the university for a fast recovery when an economic upturn arrived. To do so, the university must continue to enhance its leadership, notably in hiring a dean of the Law School and directors of the Newcomb and Murphy institutes. He said rebuilding the development platform would also be an important component in positioning the university for recovery.

President Cowen then discussed four strategic questions that he had presented to the board for its consideration in future planning. The most encompassing question was whether higher education was at a “tipping point” for major change in its mission and modes of operation.

His second question was how the School of Medicine could achieve its missions of clinical care and graduate medical education in an uncertain environment for health care. The hospital issue was one part of that environment, but other major changes could occur over the next three years. He said that strategic question occupied a large part of the administration’s time.

A third question was how Tulane could advance research and graduate education as resources became more limited. President Cowen said the dollars coming in from the stimulus programs might be gone in two or three years. Over-expansion could result in built-in costs rising while income dropped. The university intended to expand doctoral programs, but the money was limited.

The president’s final question involved the size of the undergraduate class. He asked whether the university would be able to keep its entering class size at the desired number of 1,400. The corollary question was what would be sacrificed by increasing it. The size of the undergraduate population would be increased by 800 in four years.

The president concluded his report by saying that Tulane would get through the hard times. The university had gotten through Katrina and was able to handle difficulty.

Senator Kelley expressed his concerns about increasing the size of the undergraduate population. He said students were feeling squeezed on campus. Many worried about finding housing on campus. Dining facilities were crowded. He asked whether the administration was taking those factors into account. President Cowen replied that the administration was aware that increasing class size would require a substantial investment in residential and dining facilities and some additional infrastructure. That investment would require money the university does not have on hand and would be a difficult decision.

Senator Kalka added that increasing class size would require increasing faculty size, not just the infrastructure. President Cowen agreed. He said that adding 800 students would be a substantial change.

Senator Purrington noted that the change would affect the requirement that students live on campus for two years. The president added that many parents wanted their children to live on campus for all four years. He said that many of Tulane’s peer institutions keep students on campus longer
than Tulane does. He did not believe it was in the university's interest to have students living off campus.

Senator Carroll questioned the change in capital investment reflected on the facilities report, in which the events center was being reconsidered, but an athletic practice facility was being proposed. She thought the event center was of much greater value to the university community. President Cowen replied that the administration had not decided to build the practice facility and would do so only if donors gave to that facility. He said donors are not “fungible,” i.e., they are not interchangeable. A donor willing to give to athletics might not be willing to give for another purpose. The facility will not be built without complete funding from outside the university. Vice President Jones added that $6 million of the $13 million required for the event center had been donated.

Senator Carroll asked for further clarification on the question whether the donations were for an event center or a practice facility. President Cowen answered that one major donor gave for the event center; the others were more interested in a basketball practice facility.

Senator Sujan asked whether the desire to grow the university's research component was tied to recovery from the effects of Hurricane Katrina or the federal government's stimulus program. President Cowen said one set of issues was structural. Did the university have the facilities to expand to increase research, especially in science and engineering? Another set of issues involved doctoral education, not just in science and engineering but throughout the university. The administration had been prepared to invest money in expanding doctoral programs. Not as much money as planned was available, but the administration was continuing the planning process. Development of doctoral programs would increase research across the campus and add to Tulane's prestige as a research institution.

Senator Purrington asked the president to comment on the future of the hospital-clinic and on the demise of the development platform. President Cowen responded to the second part of the question first. He said development suffered from both voluntary and involuntary losses of staff after Katrina. The administration had found it harder to replace those losses than other staff positions. The administration also took some time to rethink its approach to development. He said investing in development should pay for itself; he hoped to take development to another level.

On the issue of the hospital and clinic, the president said he would give a short overview because the complexity of the situation could take hours to discuss. Charity Hospital had been Tulane's largest site for graduate medical education, more so than the Tulane hospital. More Tulane residents worked at Charity, and it was an important training site in general for the medical school. Currently, the school was using the interim hospital, which was much smaller than Charity. As a result, Tulane's medical training had to be coordinated with several other hospitals. He said that short-term solution was not sustainable. Parliamentarian Wiese, who supervises graduate medical education, added that the number of residents had dropped from about 500 to 380 since the closing of Charity. So, the president said, the replacement of Charity was important to Tulane.

The situation was complicated further by legacy issues from the 1990s, President Cowen said. In 1997, the Louisiana Legislature transferred ownership of the Charity system to Louisiana State University, although governance was shared with Tulane. After Hurricane Katrina, questions of governance had arisen that could affect Tulane's ability to conduct graduate medical education.

An additional complicating factor, the president noted, was health care reform. The new model made community health centers much more prevalent. Thanks to the work of Senator DeSalvo, Tulane was on
the leading edge of reform. Those changes would affect who will go to the new proposed hospital. The president repeated his statement that this was a short answer for a very complex issue.

There were no further questions or comments about the president’s report.

**Unfinished Business**

**Handbook Change—Title of University Professor**

The chair of the Committee on Faculty Tenure, Freedom, and Responsibility, Senator Langston, presented the second reading of a proposed change to the Faculty Handbook, Part III, B1 (Faculty Titles). The change would create the title of university professor. It was originally proposed by the provost’s office and approved by the committee. The version presented (see appendix 1) incorporated some changes that had been discussed at the February senate meeting. The changes included consultation by the provost with deans, directors, department chairs, and other faculty colleagues when considering appointments of university professors and deletion of a confusing statement about tenure residing in the department.

Senator McFarland asked how the proposal would affect endowed chairs. President Cowen said no appointments to university professor would be made without a named endowment. Senator McFarland said he liked that answer but that was not part of the proposed change. Senator Langston said the change to the Faculty Handbook authorizing the title was made with the hope that money would be provided, but details of funding in individual cases were not part of the Handbook change. President Cowen added that the administration’s policy was to seek endowed funding at the $5 million level.

The amendment to the Handbook was then passed by a vote of 48-5.

**Bylaws and Handbook Change—Committee on Research**

Vice President Levy, chair of the Committee on Research, offered the second reading of two motions, one to amend the senate bylaws on the committee’s function and structure (appendix 2) and the other to update the Faculty Handbook’s section on research (appendix 3). She orally presented minor changes to the amendment of the Handbook, which she had not had time to distribute to the senate before the meeting. Those changes clarified that the Subcommittee on Patents would be appointed by the Committee on Research and the Subcommittee on Research Fellowships would be appointed by the Committee on Committees.

Senator Walker questioned whether the senate could vote on the Handbook amendment if the senators had not received advance written notice of the changes. Secretary Mackin said the changes had been discussed at the last meeting and that discussion was included in the minutes, so the requirement for previous notice was fulfilled.

The senate approved the bylaw change by a vote of 49-0 and the Handbook change by a vote of 48-0.

**Committee Reports**

**Committee on Libraries**

Senator Tornqvist briefly discussed his written report, which had previously been distributed to the senate. He pointed out that Tulane ranked low among its peer institutions in library expenditures, both for materials and for staff. He also discussed planning for library expansion, with which the committee was involved. Options for a new building next to the Howard-Tilton Memorial Library were being explored.

Senator Tornqvist also discussed the ongoing process of recovery of library collections after hurricane damage. A center for recovery, which is next to the library storage facility, has been operational
for the past year. Funding for both the building program and the collection recovery has been delayed by FEMA.

Committee on Athletics
The chair of the committee, Senator Wilson, presented its annual report, which the senate had received before the meeting. He said the committee had not received any appeals in the last year. The committee had received an invitation from the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. He said COIA was an organization dedicated to reforming the role of athletics on college campuses. The committee was still discussing the invitation, but the emerging consensus was that Tulane was “ahead of the curve” in managing athletic programs and COIA membership could result in adding an unnecessary layer of bureaucracy. The senate had previously rejected COIA membership before Katrina.

Senator Kelley asked if the committee had reviewed the decision by the department of athletics to move the Homecoming game. Senator Wilson said no, the committee did not address those types of issues.

President Cowen said he had been asked earlier whether Tulane could defer adding back sports that had been suspended after Hurricane Katrina. He announced that the university had made an oral agreement with the NCAA that allowed Tulane to delay adding women’s soccer and bowling for one more year.

Committee on Physical Facilities
Professor Klingman, chair of the committee, discussed its annual report, which had also been distributed before the meeting. He said most major projects were on hold, but the Unified Green proposal was moving forward. The first phase would begin construction after May commencement. Parking on McAlister Drive would be moved to the new parking lot where Rosen House had stood. The committee supported the proposal after ensuring that access for emergencies, move-in day, deliveries, and special events had been planned. He said the project would result in no net loss of parking and would enhance shuttle service.

Referring to the earlier discussion about the event center, he acknowledged that the project was being reconsidered. An athletics practice facility on the lake side of Reily Center had been proposed and was in the early stages of design. Continuation of design would be dependent on fund-raising.

Upcoming concerns for the committee would include development of the downtown campus, long-term planning for university libraries, and Tulane’s involvement in the Presidents Climate Commitment.

Senator Purrington asked if the committee could do something about the globe lights on campus. Professor Klingman said the new lighting on the Unified Green would not be globe lights but would reflect light downward. The committee hoped that eventually all the globe lights would be replaced.

Senator Rose asked about a policy that would increase the setting of thermostats in all buildings by five degrees. Professor Klingman said that would be one of the issues looked at under the climate commitment. President Cowen said the administration supported such efforts at conservation.

Senator Rothenberg asked how the university would pay for the Unified Green and why it was a priority. President Cowen answered that this phase had been fully funded before the economic downturn and was part of the master plan for the middle part of campus. Professor Klingman added that this was the first phase of a larger $10 million proposal that was not completely funded.

Senator Purrington asked if the university had done long-range planning for the use of solar energy. President Cowen admitted that, up until that time, the university had not. The administration had focused on other issues of sustainability, but under the climate commitment would look at uses of solar energy.

Senator Carroll requested that the university stop using leaf blowers.
President Cowen asked what the alternative was. Senator Carroll responded, “Rakes and people.” The president asked whether that would mean hiring more people. Senator Carroll acknowledged that possibility, but she asked whether he had tried to teach a class with a leaf blower running outside for 45 minutes.

Senator Bernhard noted that a committee had been formed to address issues related to the commitment on climate change. Many of the issues that had been raised would be topics for that committee.

**Committee on Information Technology**

Senator Parker, the outgoing chair of the committee, highlighted aspects of his written report. He said the committee had been heavily involved in the search for a chief technology officer, which culminated in the hiring of Vice President McMahon. An issue of faculty concern was podcasting, which could involve problems with student privacy and faculty intellectual property. Senator Parker said he would pass that issue on to his successor.

Senator Parker discussed the results of a security audit. The office of information security required more resources, but current constraints would limit improvement in the short term. Identity management was another area that needed improvement. Many systems and records include social security numbers unnecessarily. Removing those will be a major project involving everyone.

E-mail storage remained a problem, he said. The university's e-mail system had crashed the morning of the senate meeting. The university was evaluating outsourcing through Google and Microsoft. The plan was to outsource student mailboxes during the summer of 2009 and faculty and staff mailboxes at the end of the year.

Senator Parker said the accounting system actually has a robust Oracle engine whose functionality has not been fully exploited. Full implementation would take about two years.

Many of the needed improvements in the campus system, Senator Parker said, were dependent upon completion of the Banner project. The Banner system would include admissions, student records, financial aid, and accounts receivable. The implementation would begin in June 2009 and be completed in November 2009. When complete, the upgrade would resolve many security issues.

Additional issues that remained in information technology included distributed support and the strategic plan. Senator Parker said that a framework should be developed to delineate the relationship between central IT support and distributed support at various schools and centers. Development of the strategic plan for information technology had been delayed by the search for a chief technology officer but could now be restarted.

**Committee on Educational Policy**

Vice Chair Long’s annual report was very brief, for which the senate was grateful. The committee had a quiet year and dealt with no major issues. It was currently considering the academic calendar for 2010-11. Lent and Easter will occur later in the spring, which could result in no classes after the Easter break. The committee would continue discussing the implications of the calendar.

He said the Subcommittee on Athletic Admissions would conduct its review of the performance of student athletes in April.

**Committee on Student Affairs**

Senator Pearlmutter, chair of the committee, discussed the committee’s annual report, which covered calendar year 2008 and normally would have been delivered to the senate in February. The committee had discussed housing problems, the Code of Student Conduct, and a change in referendum procedures for the student government. The committee had approved a draft of the code of conduct, which had been forwarded to the administration for further vetting.
The committee had also approved the changes to referendum procedures, which then required senate approval. The student senators also proposed two other changes to student government that required senate approval, one involving the method of determining representation on student government and another that made council chairs representing student organizations voting members of the Undergraduate Student Government Senate.

Senator Cullen explained that the current constitution of the Associated Student Body required referenda for all amendments. The proposed change would allow amendments to bypass the referendum requirement if two thirds of the relevant governing body approved the request to bypass. He said the purpose was to expedite the process for amendments that were not of general student interest.

Senator Kelley discussed the proposed changes to representation in the Undergraduate Student Government. The current structure of representation included school senators, who were elected within their respective schools, and at-large senators, who were elected by class year, with six true at-large senators from any class. The proposed change would eliminate the at-large senators and replace them with one senator each from the residence hall governments and three from the community government, which represented students living off campus. The schools would retain representation, although the distribution would change somewhat. The USG Senate would also include council chairs with the second change proposed.

Senator Pearlmutter said her committee approved the changes to student government and recommended approval by the senate.

Most of the senate discussion focused on the proposed change to the method of representation in the USG Senate. Senator Carroll, noting that the USG had conducted a referendum on the proposed structural change, asked why such a large number of students had abstained. Senator Cullen explained that such results indicated some of the problems with the referendum process. In this case, he said, The Hullabaloo had mistakenly reported that the structural change had already occurred, which added to the students' confusion about the proposal. Abstentions were counted because students voted on a Web site that recorded each vote on separate issues.

Senator Sujan asked why more than 200 students objected to the proposal. Senator Kelley said many were from smaller schools who felt their influence would diminish with the increased representation from larger schools. Senator Cullen interposed that another reason for opposition, one he shared, was that the proposed change heavily favored incoming freshmen. Each residence hall has one vote, and freshmen have more residence halls. Senator Kelley responded that a potential benefit was the inclusion of the off-campus residential association.

Vice Chair Long asked whether the school representation would be reapportioned when school enrollments shifted. Senator Kelley said it would, although the balance between residence halls and schools would remain the same.

Secretary Mackin asked Senator Cullen if his objection was based on the proposal’s failure to provide proportional representation to all students because of the residence hall allocation. Senator Cullen replied that he was opposed for that reason. If he were a member of these governing bodies, he would have voted against it. Senator Kelley explained that the voting distribution for residence halls was based on the distribution within the Residence Hall Association.

Senator Overby asked if the distribution of nine seats to the residence halls and three seats to the off-campus group was proportional to the actual numbers of students. Senator Cullen responded that the seats were not proportional to the actual numbers. He estimated that the actual numbers were closer to 50-50 or, at most, two to one, not three to one.
explained that the number of seats was constrained by the total number in the senate of 31, which was based on the USG’s vote in the ASB.

Dean Query asked what the main source of dissatisfaction with the status quo was. Senator Kelley said the problem was that at-large senators lacked an identifiable constituency. They represented a class or the entire student body and had difficulty defining that group’s interests.

Senator Langston asked when the vote on the referendum was taken and what the opinion of the student members of the University Senate was on the issue. Senator Cullen said the vote occurred in February just before Mardi Gras. He said he opposed the proposal. Senator Kelley said he was neutral. Senator Walker said she favored the proposal because a majority of those students who voted had supported it.

With no further discussion, the senate voted to approve the change to referendum procedures by voice vote. On the issue of the structural change in representation on the USG, the senate declined to approve the change by a vote of 16 for approval and 25 against. Senator Cullen said he would take the results back to the student government and develop a revised plan.

On the third issue of giving voting rights to council chairs representing student organizations, Senator Cullen explained that student government procedures in this case required getting University Senate approval before submitting the issue to a student referendum. He said the USG Senate had approved the change overwhelmingly. Council chairs had a vote prior to 1998, when the procedures were changed. Much of the USG business involved student organizations, so the USG Senate believed the 1998 change was a mistake. The proposed change would add 11 council chairs to the USG Senate, increasing the total of voting members to 42.

The University Senate approved the proposed seating of council chairs unanimously by voice vote.

New Business

Motion on American Association of University Professors’ Censure

Senator Carroll moved that the senate adopt the following resolution: In light of developments this past year that bear on AAUP censure, be it resolved that the Tulane University Senate supports removal of the censure by the Association’s 2009 Annual Meeting. We are not aware of any conditions at Tulane University that suggest that censure should be continued. Vice Chair Long seconded the motion.

Senator Purrington commented that the idea seemed to be to look forward instead of backward. Senator Carroll said the motion reflected the fact that new procedures had been put in place that dealt with major faculty concerns.

Senator Maveety asked what the opinion of the local AAUP chapter was. Senator Carroll responded that the executive committee of the local chapter had approved a similar motion. The state conference voted in favor of a slightly different motion.

Senator McFarland asked what it would mean for the senate to pass this resolution. Senator Carroll responded that the point was to provide information from this representative body about the current state of the university. Senator Pearlmutter added that it would end the appearance of a stalemate. Senator Rothenberg said she saw the resolution as providing information to the rest of the university.

Senator Purrington asked if the last sentence were part of the motion. Senator Carroll said she had included it against the secretary’s advice in order to leave it up to the senate. Secretary Mackin explained that his advice was based on the recommendation in Roberts Rules not to include rationale in a motion. Members who agree with a motion but do not necessarily agree with the rationale could be forced to vote against the motion. Generally, a motion should be kept as simple as possible.

Parliamentarian Wiese commented that, if
one wished to include rationale in a motion, the rationale should be in the form of a whereas clause. Senator Purrington said his intention was to simplify the motion, and he moved to amend the motion by deleting the last sentence. His motion was seconded.

Senator Parker asked if the statement implied that all cases that were open were now closed. Senator Carroll said no, the intent was to indicate the procedural changes that had occurred to ensure faculty involvement.

Senator Purrington’s amendment was passed by a large majority on a voice vote. Senator Kalka then moved the previous question. That motion to close debate was approved unanimously by voice vote. The amended motion that read, "In light of developments this past year that bear on AAUP censure, be it resolved that the Tulane University Senate supports removal of the censure by the Association’s 2009 Annual Meeting,” was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jim Mackin, Secretary

Secretary’s Note: All written reports mentioned in the minutes will be available on the senate Web site, http://www.tulane.edu/~usenate/.

Appendix 1, FTFR Amendment to Faculty Handbook, Adding Title of University Professor, as Adopted

Part III, B (Academic Titles), 1. Faculty Titles:
Insert:

University Professor: Tulane University reserves the title of University Professor for faculty members of extraordinary achievement whose scholarly or creative accomplishments have earned them substantial recognition from their academic peers. The title is recognized as the University’s most significant professional honor, and is awarded rarely and only in accordance with the criteria specified in this policy. The title is bestowed by the Trustees of the University, upon the recommendation of the University President, in recognition of a uniquely distinguished record of scholarship, research, or artistic achievement. It transcends departmental and disciplinary lines, allows the designated individual the greatest latitude in teaching, writing, and scholarly research or creative activity, and provides them with a university-wide platform for continued accomplishment.

1. Criteria
To be eligible for appointment as and continuation as a University Professor a faculty member must satisfy the following criteria:

a. Hold the rank of professor with tenure at Tulane University or have been recommended for tenure at that rank in accordance with the University’s promotion and tenure policies and procedures.

b. Have an outstanding record of scholarly or creative accomplishment that establishes him or her at the front ranks of university faculty nationally and internationally.
c. Be dedicated to the highest standards of professional excellence.
d. Demonstrate exemplary character and integrity reflecting great credit upon Tulane University.

2. Procedure

University Professors are appointed by the Board of Tulane University upon the recommendation of the President of the University. The President will make the appointment recommendation in consultation with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The Provost will consult with relevant Deans, Center and Institute Directors, Department Chairs, and/or other faculty colleagues on proposed University Professor appointments.

3. Privileges of the Title

a. Within the constraints of available resources, individuals with the title of University Professor will be provided special financial support for their research or creative endeavors, and for their professional activities. University Professors will have the opportunity, through cross-departmental, cross-School, and/or University-wide lectures, symposia, exhibitions, performances, or other appropriate activities, to make unique contributions to the general artistic, intellectual, and/or scientific climate of the University.

b. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, in consultation with the appropriate Dean or Deans, will insure that individuals holding this title will enjoy the greatest latitude in apportioning their time between teaching, writing, scholarship, research, and/or other creative activity consistent with pursuit of the University’s mission.

Appointment as a University Professor will not change the tenure of the faculty member.

Appendix 2, COR Proposed Bylaw Change, as Adopted

[Bylaw III, Section 1--Committee Functions:]

Committee on Research: Functions

Executive:

(1) To review and make recommendations to the Associate Senior Vice President for Research concerning:

(a) the efficacy of new policies and procedure that affect research, development or training;

(b) the extent to which ongoing policies and practices enhance the acquisition and management of grants and contracts;

(c) the quality of support services provided to faculty who are attempting to acquire or have acquired external funding.

(2) To coordinate and monitor the activities of subcommittees.
(3) To review grant/contract proposals submitted by the Office of Research Administration that raise important research issues for the institution, such as involvement in classified research, restrictions on publications, use of research personnel, etc., and determine the final disposition of such matters.

Advisory:

(1) To recommend policies relating to research.

(2) To review the activities of the Institutional Review Boards, the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees, the Institutional Biosafety Committee, and the Environmental Health Science Operations Committee.

Subcommittees and their functions:

(1) Patents: to review and make recommendations regarding University patent policies and procedures; to review grant/contract proposals that raise important patent issues, as submitted to the subcommittee by the Office of Research Administration.

(2) Research Fellowships: to conduct an annual, merit-based competition to award research fellowships to faculty; to recommend directly to the Associate Senior Vice President for Research, who shall be a member of the subcommittee, the names of the candidates for awards.

[Bylaw III, Section 2--Committee Membership]

Committee on Research: Membership

Voting members include the associate senior vice president for research as chair, one faculty member each from the School of Medicine, School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, School of Science and Engineering, and School of Liberal Arts, one additional faculty member from the uptown faculty, and one additional faculty member from the downtown faculty. Ex officio non-voting members include the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost, the dean of libraries, the director of research administration, the university research compliance officer, and the associate vice president for technology transfer and business development.

Appendix 3, COR Proposed Change to Faculty Handbook, Part III, as Adopted

K. Research and Scholarship

1. Introduction

All tenured and tenure-track faculty members are required to engage in research, scholarship or creative efforts in the field of their specialty and to present the results of
their endeavors in publications or other appropriate forms. The spirit of research permeates all genuine University teaching. (Note also pertinent provisions in Statement on Academic Freedom, Tenure and Responsibilities, e.g., Article X, Sections 2 and 3.)

2. Research Oversight

a. Associate Senior Vice President for Research. The Associate Senior Vice President for Research (ASVPR) serves as the senior research officer for Tulane University. The mission of the ASVPR is to enhance the level of scholarly accomplishment, intellectual environment and national reputation of Tulane University by fostering excellence in research, scholarship and creative endeavor. The objectives of the ASVPR are to provide leadership for advancing the research goals of the university, to expand the base of nationally competitive research activity in a manner compliant with government regulation, and to elevate the national visibility and reputation of Tulane University faculty for excellence in scholarly and creative accomplishment.

b. University Research Compliance Officer. On behalf of the ASVPR, the University Research Compliance Officer acts to oversee and ensure research compliance with regulations applicable to the use of human and animal subjects, biological safety, pre-award grants administration, and export controls for research projects. In this capacity, the University Research Compliance Officer ensures that all research conducted at the University adheres to the applicable federal and state regulations, as well as accreditation standards.

c. Office of Research Administration. The Office of Research Administration assists faculty in identifying sponsors from which research support can be obtained; provides advice on the development of proposals; assists in preparing budgets; serves as the Authorized Organizational Representative for both paper and electronic proposal submissions; and develops and implements policies involving the financial and administrative aspects of sponsored projects.

Routing Proposals for Extramural Funding. Projects should be undertaken according to the concern and competence of the project director (Principal Investigator) and the judgment of peers. To assure that all extramurally funded projects are consistent with the University’s mission and that all resource commitments required of the University are appropriate, proposals for extramural funding must be routed in accordance with the current policy using the Proposal Routing Form. The Proposal Routing Form contains assurances, as required by federal regulations, including debarment and project-specific conflicts of interest and must be signed by the Principal Investigator.

Investigator’s Manual. The Office of Research Administration has prepared the Investigator’s Manual to guide investigators in managing their awards and identifying special issues related to sponsored research. When Tulane University accepts a sponsored project it assumes certain obligations imposed by the sponsor, or by government regulation, such as the fiscal management and accountability of research awards, and the ethical treatment of research subjects. The Investigator’s Manual provides information for administering awarded sponsored projects in accordance with
both the practices and policies of Tulane and the regulations of the sponsoring organizations.

d. **Office of Human Research Protection.** The Tulane University Office of Human Research Protection is charged with protecting the rights and welfare of human research participants. The Office of Human Research Protection works together with the Institutional Review Boards (IRB) to ensure that Tulane University is compliant in its efforts to protect the safety and well being of human research participants according to federal guidelines and regulations. The Office assists investigators with IRB processes designed to guarantee that all research activities are compliant with regulation and responsive to good research practices.

**Institutional Review Boards (IRB).** The Tulane University Biomedical IRB and Social/Behavioral IRB are charged with a two-fold mission:

- To ascertain and certify that all research studies reviewed by the IRB conform to the regulations and policies set forth by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and/or U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regarding the health, welfare, safety, rights, and privileges of human research subjects.
- To assist investigators in conducting research that complies with ethical standards and principles set forth by the DHHS and/or FDA in a way that permits successful completion of research involving human subjects.

e. **Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC).** The charge of the IACUC, mandated by Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare of the National Institutes of Health and by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, is to ensure the humane care and use of animals in research in a manner compliant with government guidelines and regulations. In compliance with federal law, an IACUC has been established for each Tulane University campus. Guided by the goal of assuring humane care and use of animals used in research, Committees review new and continuing animal use protocols, inspect facilities and laboratories, and monitor veterinary care, training and occupational health and safety programs at Tulane University. The IACUC provides assistance to investigators with the planning and conducting of animal experiments in accordance with the highest scientific, humane and ethical principles.

f. **Office of Biosafety.** The Office of Biosafety is charged with ensuring the safety of personnel and facilities engaged in research involving biological materials at Tulane University. The objective of the Office of Biosafety is to minimize the health risk to those involved in research utilizing recombinant DNA, infectious agents, and biological toxins, and in turn to protect the greater Tulane University community, the general public, and the environment. The Office of Biosafety, in cooperation with the Institutional Biosafety Committee, is charged with oversight of regulatory compliance at Tulane University regarding the use and storage of hazardous biological materials. The office assists Principal Investigators in registering their research with the Institutional Biosafety Committee, in developing safe research protocols, and by facilitating the acquisition of all required regulatory approvals and permits.
3. **The Committee on Research**

   a. **Function** The Committee on Research is composed of six faculty members chosen by the Senate Committee on Committees and is chaired by the Associate Senior Vice President for Research. Its function is to promote an active research environment and to provide guidance in the conduct of research through enlightened research administration policies. The Committee on Research performs some functions through two subcommittees as follows.

   b. **Subcommittees of the Committee on Research**

      1. **Patents:** A policy on intellectual property precedes this section on research and scholarship. Members are appointed by the Committee on Research.

      2. **Research Fellowships:** The Subcommittee on Research Fellowships conducts an annual, merit-based competition to award research fellowships to faculty. It also conducts regular competitions to award funds in support of international travel in conjunction with faculty professional development activities. Members are appointed by the Committee on Committees.

4. **Restrictions on Publications**

The primary mission of the University is the growth and transmission of knowledge. Toward this end, the right of faculty members to pursue their chosen path of inquiry and to disseminate the results freely is aggressively protected. In turn, faculty members are strongly encouraged to make the results of their research freely available to students, colleagues, and the public. It is realized that undertaking certain types of research may require entering into nondisclosure agreements. However, faculty are urged to avoid involvement in projects, especially classified projects, that restrict academic communication. Generally, the University will not approve grants or contracts that restrict publication of research results, except for a brief period of time to obtain a copyright or patent, or where a decisive case is made that the proposed contractual restrictions will promote the discovery and transmission of knowledge to a significantly greater extent than the absence of such restrictions. Exceptional cases will be referred to the Committee on Research for a review. The Committee on Research has executive authority on the question of restrictions on publication.