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), Bernstein (SVP, provost), Sachs (SVP, dean SOM), Lorino (CFO), Y. Jones (COO), Cullen (pres, ASB), Barrera (chair, SAC), Mackin (sec), Wiese (parl)

Deans: Hogg (proxy for DeNisi), Query (Libraries), MacLaren (NTC), Schwartz (Arch.), Marksbury (SCS), Ponoroff (Law), Haber (SLA), Buekens (SHPMT), Altiero (SSE)

A. B. Freeman School of Business:
Sujan, Page, McFarland

Newcomb-Tulane College: Kalka

Architecture: Jones, Bernhard

Continuing Studies: Green, McLennan

Law: Nowicki, Davies, Overby

Liberal Arts: Balée, Masquelier, Cole, Rothenberg, Langston (proxy for Maveety), Balée

Medicine: Reitan, Hadi (proxy for Mushatt), Doucet, S. Landry, DeSalvo, Voss

Public Health and Tropical Medicine:
Hutchinson, Webber, Rose

Science and Engineering: Burin (proxy for Schmehl), McGuire (proxy for Diebold), Walker

Social Work: Pearlmutter

Student Senators: Walker, Pillert, Kelley, Pond (proxy for Beyerstedt)

Staff Senators: Earles, Hayes

Senators at Large: Robins, Hoeffer, Parker, Langston, Carroll, Purrington, Wilson, Tornqvist

Invited Guests: Levy (assoc SVP Research), McMahon (VP IT), Maczuga (assoc VP, tech transfer), Grant (VP univ comm), Johnson (gen. counsel), Love (VP inst. equity), Baños (chief of staff), Mitchell (assoc provost), Coignet (dir strategic planning)

Absent Senators: Marks, Bunnell, DeSalvo, Tasker, Lewis

Introduction of New Senators and Guests

President Cowen introduced Charlie McMahon, the new vice president for information technology.

Minutes

The minutes of the December 1 meeting were approved without change.

Elections

Senator at Large

Torbjorn Tornqvist was elected to complete the term of Professor Desai, who will be unavailable for the spring semester.

President’s Report

President Cowen began by asking Provost Bernstein to report on the process of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Provost Bernstein said the SACS process
would conclude in the fall of 2011. He listed several milestone dates in the process. In September 2010, the university would provide documentation of compliance with standards and expectations. The process of compliance certification was underway, guided by a committee on compliance led by Senator McFarland. Compliance documentation applies to all units, both academic and non-academic. Formal mission statements and annual reports were expected from non-academic units this summer. He said that most academic units had already provided that information, but the requirement was somewhat of a change in culture and practice for the non-academic units.

In November 2010, SACS would notify the university of its findings on compliance with standards and practices. Any issues that arose would require the university to come up with strategies to address the concerns of SACS.

In December 2010, the university would deliver the other component of the reaffirmation process, a quality enhancement plan, comprising new initiatives to enhance the quality of what Tulane does as a university. The plan was being coordinated by a committee chaired by Professor Kehoe. The committee had already begun reaching out to the university community for suggestions. The provost said that quality enhancement plans in peer universities had included diverse approaches, including major initiatives in information technology, in curriculum, and in undergraduate housing. He expected the university to identify its QEP initiative this summer.

In the spring of 2011, the SACS accreditation team would visit the Tulane campus. The team was expected to present its findings that summer, and reaffirmation should be complete in fall. Provost Bernstein noted that this process recurs every decade.

Senator Rothenberg asked about the relationship between the new director of assessment and the current director of institutional research. Provost Bernstein replied that the director of institutional research had much broader responsibilities than accreditation, analyzing data and generating information for many organizations, public, nonprofit, and private. He said the director of assessment would work very closely with the director of institutional research and the office of academic affairs on the accreditation process.

Following the discussion of the SACS process, President Cowen talked about the implications for higher education and Tulane of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, better known as the stimulus package. He said the university must be prepared to take advantage of opportunities when the legislation passed. He then asked Yvette Jones, chief operating officer and senior vice president for external affairs, to give an overview of the proposed legislation.

Vice President Jones pointed out that the numbers she would discuss were not final; the details of the act were still being negotiated. She provided a handout of main elements of the plan as it stood at the time, noting that the administration was working on a list of shovel-ready projects. On infrastructure, for example, the administration was looking at renovation of buildings as a proposal to submit to the state.

She explained that the ARRA, as proposed at the time, included separate funds for research and academic institutions. The proposal also included about $9 billion for federal science agencies. Research renovations and equipment would be appropriate requests for agency funding. Those agencies were still working on procedures for evaluating proposals. Some proposals that had not been funded could be reviewed again later.

The legislation being considered included billions of dollars for research and renovation of research facilities. Some funds would also be available for challenge grants, supplements or extensions to existing grants, and bridge funding. Vice President Jones said that information sessions would be held
on campus and that the proposals were an opportunity for the university community.

President Cowen added that the senators should communicate this information to their constituent units. He said the proposals created a unique opportunity for higher education with about a 12- to 24-month window. Ordering priorities would be important. He suggested that all should pay attention to e-mails on the subject and attend as many information sessions as possible.

President Cowen then discussed the state of the economy, the effects on higher education, and the impact on Tulane University. He said the economy was going through a protracted recessionary period unlike any since the Great Depression. Virtually all experts expected it to last from three to five years. At worst, it could be like Japan’s experience and last for a decade or more. He expected unemployment to top out during the first six months of 2009. After that, recovery would be very slow. No sector of the economy would be immune. He said the belief that New Orleans would avoid the recession was unrealistic; it was likely to hit the city but perhaps not as hard as other places. The recession would impact those graduating, those retiring or hoping to retire, and those remaining at Tulane.

The president acknowledged that there was no clear solution. No one was sure enough about cause and effect to say whether the stimulus package would work. He said he hoped the members of the administration were bright enough and adaptive enough that they would respond if things did not work out as they had wished. President Cowen said he was, by nature, an optimist, but he expected this to be a long, difficult period of time. He thought the stock market might recover before the rest of the economy.

Referring to the effects on higher education, President Cowen said that in his 35 years experience he had never seen anything like it. Every day, news stories appeared about problems at institutions across the country, and first-tier institutions were being hurt as well. Brandeis University was thinking of closing its art museum and selling the art. Harvard and Stanford had also been affected. The Web site of the American Association of Universities showed e-mails by university presidents across the country. The big issue appeared to be the question whether this recession was a relatively short-term phenomenon or whether it would cause thinking about a new paradigm for higher education and radical change in how universities are organized. If the problem was short term, the answer was to be frugal; if longer term, other strategies were required.

As far as Tulane was concerned, the university thus far was weathering the storm better than most peer institutions. Tulane was forced after Katrina to do some things that are helping in the current situation. He mentioned several bright spots for Tulane. Student interest in the university was at an all-time high; applications had reached 40,000 this year, guaranteeing a high quality class of the right size. Student interest was also high in the professional schools. One concern was to be careful managing financial aid because of the increased need. The president said that research funding also remained strong, and that funding helped the university through indirect cost recovery and by supporting retention of talented people. The university was in a good financial position with cash and liquidity.

The challenges, he said, included the disappearance of major fund raising. Although the number of donors had increased, the total amount donated was lower. The administration was putting emphasis on unrestricted donations and annual funds. It was also seeking to increase further the number of donors.

Financial aid, as he had mentioned, was a concern. In the past year, it had increased $8-$10 million. More students needed aid, and more students qualified for merit aid because of the quality of the applicant pool. The president said it would be difficult to sustain those increased levels over the next
few years. The problem was how to meet the highest priority needs while staying fiscally responsible.

State funding was being reduced, which could affect monies received by Tulane for the health sciences and capitation. The state was in a deficit; its cuts would have the largest effect on state universities but would have a trickle-down effect on Tulane. Some cuts would be made this year, and he expected more through 2011 and 2012.

Because of the deteriorating economic situation, the budget assumptions discussed at the December meeting were undergoing changes. The administration was instituting a headcount stabilization plan, which, President Cowen said, was different from a freeze. The plan called for examining each open position. During the last 30 days, the administration had been reviewing possible exceptions. The decision process had been more generous with faculty positions and with staff positions where critical mass was required in some areas. He said the stabilization plan was in effect and all remaining open positions would be removed from the budget.

President Cowen said that raises would be limited to those employees who made $35,000 per year or less because they had the greatest need. Everybody else would remain at the FY 2009 salary level. If recovery occurred faster than expected, raises might be possible next year. He said the proposed FY 2010 budget would come back to the Senate Committee on Budget Review and then to the senate. He emphasized again that he was committed to the principle that no single person would lose his or her job at the university. He also wished to provide as much financial aid to students as possible, and he would continue to support diversity. He said the university had recruited its first students under the Posse program. The administration also intended to put some money toward new doctoral programs, although not as much as planned in the coming year. President Cowen concluded by saying he expected the university to get through these rough times as it had gotten through Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath.

Senator Sujan asked whether other universities were making radical innovations. President Cowen said no, they were still acting as though the problem was short term, but a year from now, institutions may look longer term.

Senator Landry asked if the phased implementation of faculty salary enhancement had been placed on hold. The president answered yes, the program was not going forward under current conditions.

Senator Carroll asked about the status of the university's censure by the American Association of University Professors. President Cowen said he did not have much to add to what he had previously said to the senate, but for the sake of the newer members he would discuss the administration's feeling about what the AAUP did to the institution. Nothing had changed his view of what the AAUP did not only to Tulane but to other institutions as well. He said he thought their process was deeply flawed and their report was equally flawed, with many misstatements. He believed they ignored the responses that the administration gave to the report or at most put the responses in footnotes to the report. No institution in the area felt it had received a fair hearing because the AAUP conflated its roles of advocacy and adjudication in handling this. He said he was simply repeating what he had said before. The AAUP censured—not the faculty, not the student not the staff—but the administration.

President Cowen said he had had two contacts with the AAUP since that time of the report. One was a phone call the AAUP made to him last spring before, he believed, they were planning to meet in June. The message of that phone call was that the AAUP would like to find a way to take Tulane off its censure list. They then made some demands that Tulane would need to comply with. He said he would not reveal the details of their demands because it would not
be fair to the AAUP or to him. But he did report what he stated to them in conclusion of the conversation—that what they had asked of the institution was not appropriate and, he went so far to say, it was an "unprincipled request."

The president added that what he was deeply committed to was working with the faculty, staff, and students at Tulane University to address whatever issues at this institution they felt needed to be addressed. When the interim principles for financial exigency came up in the senate, the administration not only did not argue against those principles but supported them. He said the administration went through a healthy and constructive process with the senate in coming up with the interim principles as a demonstration of its commitment to address those issues. The administration also supported the senate's action in approving those principles as a demonstration of its commitment to address those issues. The administration also supported the senate's action in approving the principles before the board and helped put them into the Faculty Handbook. "We worked as a senate together to do that," President Cowen said. The administration did not do that because the AAUP told him he had to do that or because he thought it would satisfy the AAUP. He said he did it because it was the right thing to do as colleagues at Tulane.

So, the president said, there had been one interchange between the AAUP and his office, and the outcome was a simple one: what they had asked him to do, he felt he could not do and he felt it was unprincipled. What he cared about were the colleagues he had worked with at Tulane for 11 years. The only other contact with the AAUP was a letter received last October, which was a short and conciliatory letter. In the letter they said they wanted to congratulate the university for the steps it was taking with the interim principles and for the resolution of some faculty cases. They added that there were just a few more things that Tulane needed to do, but they never said what those were. Since then, he said, they had not called him, nor had he called them. That is where things stood.

Senator Purrington said he understood that the AAUP was reasonably happy with what Tulane had done and could be on the verge of a positive decision for Tulane. He asked whether the president would he be willing to deal with them. President Cowen said that he was not by nature stubborn for the sake of being stubborn, but that he was very principled. He continued to believe the AAUP had made a very significant error. He said what they should do is simply take the university off the list, period. He did not think there was one more thing that should be expected of Tulane. He added that if they really cared about what they were doing, they would say Tulane of its own volition did what they thought was right for its faculty and staff. If they were waiting for a phone call from Scott Cowen asking to be taken off the censure list, he did not think that would happen. On the other hand, he said, if they were to call him and say they would like to have a conversation, he would certainly be willing to talk. He had never denied a phone call. He had also responded to every letter they sent him if he thought it warranted a response. He restated his belief that Tulane should be removed from the censure list and that the AAUP should act on its own to remove Tulane from the list.

There were no further questions.

**Committee Reports**

**Faculty Tenure, Freedom, and Responsibility**

The chair of the committee, Senator Langston, briefly discussed his written report, which had previously been distributed to the senate. He began by answering a question that had been raised about the committee's jurisdiction over appeals from third-year reviews. He said a review of the senate bylaws and the Faculty Handbook showed that the committee clearly had jurisdiction. He added that he personally could not understand why that jurisdiction had come into question.

Senator Langston said the study of
non-tenure-track faculty was still ongoing. He asked Provost Bernstein to explain to the senate the problems his office had in compiling the information. The provost said his office was going through a difficult process of gathering information and making sense of the data. The major problem was the need to manually match data from different sources. He said faculty members are sometimes entered three different ways in three different systems. He hoped to have accurate information assembled by March.

Senator Langston added that, because of the difficulties involved, the committee had compromised somewhat on the details of its request.

The final item Senator Langston discussed was the first reading of a committee motion to amend the Faculty Handbook by adding the title of "university professor" to the section on academic titles [see appendix 1]. He said the title was intended as a rare distinction for a full professor. The person selected could be chosen from the current faculty or could be hired for the position after going through the regular faculty hiring process for full professors.

In developing the procedure for university professors, Senator Langston said, the committee had looked at the procedures at peer institutions. Those procedures varied considerably. Some had cumbersome procedures, others had virtually no process whatsoever. He said FTFR had been assured by the provost that a candidate’s scholarly reputation would be the weighted factor and that the provost would consult with faculty peers inside and outside Tulane University. The committee’s understanding was that anyone might nominate a full professor to the provost for consideration for the title of university professor.

Senator Langston gave his interpretation of the privileges of the title: money, he hoped; a platform for university-wide contributions; and “latitude,” which he interpreted as money for relief from normal teaching. He said FTFR was concerned about the burden placed on departments. The tenure line would remain in the department.

Senator Purrington asked the provost what institutional goals would be achieved by the new title. Provost Bernstein replied that Tulane had not officially created this title before, but virtually all peer institutions had an equivalent title. The title served the purpose of giving the institution the opportunity to recognize superb accomplishment and to allow individuals to bring their extraordinary qualities to the benefit of the university as a whole. The title could be useful as a recruitment or retention tool and also could become a development tool, providing an opportunity to raise funds from those who wished to underwrite the position.

Senator Carroll said she was confused; she did not understand why the faculty had no role in the process. She thought many other ways could be found to construct a better procedure. Provost Bernstein said the procedure was not inconsistent with other institutions. His office had no intention of excluding the faculty or bypassing shared governance. Every candidate for the title would have gone through normal peer review. The title was useful as an award for unique distinction and required flexibility in the hands of the president and the board.

Senator Langston said he saw the title as analogous to titled professors in chaired professorships. The faculty promotes members through the ranks but does not award the titles. He gave an example of his own department’s process in choosing a chaired professor. The decision did not go to his school’s promotion and tenure committee. Provost Bernstein added that Tulane did not have a university-wide process for promotion and tenure; that process was decentralized to the schools. The title of university professor, on the other hand, required action at the university level.

Vice Chair Long said that apart from the issue of the title itself, he was concerned
about the statement that tenure resided in the department. He did not believe that the Faculty Handbook anywhere stated that tenure resided in a department. He pointed out that the statement could imply that a faculty member loses tenure if a department were to be closed. He said he did not believe that FTFR’s proposal intended to redefine tenure and suggested that the wording be changed. Senator Langston agreed that the wording would be rewritten to make it more precise.

Senator Rothenberg asked why a university-wide committee of faculty professors could not be established to vet candidates for the title and make recommendations. Senator Langston replied that the committee’s rationale was to keep the process simple to provide flexibility for retention and recruitment. The committee also considered the precedent established at peer institutions.

Senator Purrington asked if it would be possible to recruit a faculty member and not put that faculty member in a department. Provost Bernstein said that appointment to rank and tenure is done by faculty in the schools. The proposal was not a new rank, just a title. Senator Langston said he believed the hypothetical situation was impossible.

Senator Kalka asked for clarification on the issue of tenure residing in the department. Provost Bernstein said rank and tenure did not reside in the departments but in the schools.

Senator Overby asked how the language used in FTFR’s proposal fit in with that of peer institutions. Senator Langston said the language was standard and fit in somewhere in the middle of the language used by peers. He said that FTFR emphasized the word “rare”; in many years, no appointment to the title would occur.

Senator Purrington asked if Tulane had ever used the title of university professor before. Senator Langston answered yes, a former emeritus professor in the School of Arts and Sciences had been given the title.

However, no explanation of precedent or process was available.

Senator Carroll stated that she saw no harm and many benefits arising from consultation with the relevant department. Such consultation would be a sign of respect for faculty expertise. She said the word “consultation” was open enough to allow discussion without giving the department the right to veto the appointment.

**New Business**

**Committee on Research**

Laura Levy, associate senior vice president for research and chair of the Committee on Research, presented a first reading of two committee proposals, one to change the senate’s bylaws [appendix 2] and one to change the Faculty Handbook’s section on research and scholarship [appendix 3]. She also presented a committee resolution on subcommittee membership for immediate senate action [appendix 4]. She said the proposals were the result of a request from the Committee on Committees for review of her committee’s structure and procedures. The proposals eventuating from the review turned out to be quite extensive.

The major changes to Bylaw III included adding the phrase “to determine final disposition of such matters” to the executive function of reviewing grant/contract proposals that raised important research issue. The executive function in the current bylaw of reviewing the activities of the Institutional Review Board and related committees would be changed to an advisory function because the listed compliance groups were federally mandated. The proposal also called for renaming the Subcommittee on Summer Grants to the Subcommittee on Research Fellowships and changed the membership of the Committee on Research slightly to better reflect the current organization of the university.

Changes to the organization of the university over the years had also led to the need for extensive revisions of Part III,
Section K, of the Faculty Handbook, Vice President Levy said. The proposal called for listing each office that supported research activities at the university and changing the heading to “Research Oversight.” Other changes to functions of the Committee on Research and its subcommittees would reflect the changes recommended for the senate’s bylaws. She added that a minor revision to the description of the appointment of subcommittees would be made in the final version of the proposal. Members of the Subcommittee on Patents would be appointed by the Committee on Research, but members of the Subcommittee on Research Fellowships would be appointed by the Committee on Committees.

Senator Carroll commented that she did not understand what happened to the other subcommittees that had been listed under paragraph 3b of Section K in the Handbook. Secretary Mackin explained that federal mandates had required the university to make the Institutional Review Board and related committees a separate board within the university. This change had taken place years ago, well before the reorganization following Hurricane Katrina, but had not been reflected in the Faculty Handbook or the senate bylaws.

Senator Purrington asked whether waivers to publication restrictions were granted often. Vice President Levy answered that they occurred about five times per year. Senator Purrington followed up by asking what types of issues led to the granting of waivers. Vice President Levy said various types of issues arose, for example, proprietary issues or serious issues of privacy.

With no further questions on the bylaw and Handbook changes arising, Vice President Levy moved that the senate adopt the committee’s resolution on the composition of its subcommittees. She explained that composition of subcommittees was not covered by the Faculty Handbook or the senate bylaws. Secretary Mackin added that, if the resolution passed, he would post the subcommittee composition in the standing rules of the senate.

Senator Carroll pointed out that the current Subcommittee on Patents had 11 members but the new version would have only eight. Vice President Levy responded that the larger number of members was not necessary, expertise was.

Senator Davies noted that the proposed membership for the Subcommittee on Research Fellowships was heavily weighted toward four schools and asked why it was not more inclusive of the whole university. Vice President Levy said that the weighting was based on the number of faculty members conducting active research. She added that the weighting could not reflect the number of applications for fellowships from the various schools because the subcommittee did not yet have a history of applications.

The senate then approved the resolution on subcommittee membership by a unanimous vote.

**Adjournment**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 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 Proposal for Title of University Professor

FTFR recommends for adoption an initiative arising from the office of the provost: to create a new title, that of University Professor. The title would be, as indicated below, the University’s most significant professional honor, to be awarded rarely. The rationale for the creation of this title is to provide the University an opportunity to acknowledge in a new way those members of the faculty who have attained unique distinction in their fields and to enrich the intellectual life of the university as a whole by providing such individuals a campus-wide platform for interaction and accomplishment.

FTFR therefore moves to amend the Faculty Handbook by inserting the following text immediately after the text on Emeritus Professor (Part III, B (Academic Titles), 1. Faculty Titles):

**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 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. He or she must either 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. An outstanding record of scholarly or creative accomplishment that establishes him or her at the front ranks of university faculty nationally and internationally.
   c. Dedication to the highest standards of professional excellence.
   d. 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.

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 ensure 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.
c. Appointment as a University Professor will not change the tenure of the faculty member. Tenure will continue to reside in the department in which the faculty member serves as a professor [editing change forthcoming].

Appendix 2, COR Proposed Bylaw Change

[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

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 whose members are chosen by the Senate Committee on Committees [editing change forthcoming].

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

1. **Patents:** A policy on intellectual property precedes this section on research and scholarship.

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.
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.

Appendix 4, COR Proposal for Subcommittee Membership

Resolved: The senate approves the following membership requirements for the subcommittees of the Committee on Research:

Patents (members chosen by Comm. on Research):
Chair: Faculty member
1. Law faculty
2. SSE faculty
3. Uptown faculty
4. SOM faculty
5. Downtown faculty
6. Chief Technology Officer
7. Office of the General Counsel
8. Associate VP for Technology Transfer and Business Development

Research Fellowships (members chosen by Comm.on Comms.):
Chair: Associate Provost
Members:
1. Assoc. Sr. VP of Research.ex.off
2. SSE faculty
3. SSE faculty
4. SLA faculty
5. SLA faculty
6. SOM faculty
7. SOM faculty
8. SPHTM faculty
9. SPHTM faculty
10. Uptown faculty at-large