

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Third Meeting, Monday, 15 November 2004, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

AGENDA

1. Call to order Professor William L. McBride
2. Approval of Minutes of 18 October 2004
3. Acceptance of Agenda
4. Remarks by the President President Martin C. Jischke
5. [Report of the Chairperson](#) Professor William L. McBride
6. [Resume of Items Under Consideration](#)
by Various Standing Committees For Information
Professor Herbert L. Weith
7. Question Time
8. [University Senate Document 04-5](#)
Reapportionment of the University Senate For Discussion
Professor Herbert L. Weith
9. [University Senate Document 04-4](#)
Non-tenure Track Research Faculty Appointments For Action
Professor William J. Zinsmeister
10. [A Developing Vision for the Purdue Libraries](#) For Information
James L. Mullins
Dean of the Libraries
11. New Business
12. Memorial Resolutions
13. Adjournment

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Second Meeting, Monday, 15 November 2004, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

Present: *William L. McBride (Chairperson of the Senate) presiding, Professors Brian A. Alenskis, Kristine J. Anderson, Carol L. Baird, Thomas Bauman, Alan M. Beck, Rodney J. Bertolet, JennieMarie Blankert, Richard E. Blanton, George M. Bodner, Mark D. Bowman, Joseph W. Camp Jr. (Secretary of Faculties and Parliamentarian), Natalie J. Carroll, Yan Chen, Susan E. Conners, Patrick E. Connolly, John J. Contreni, Terry L. Davidson, Sharon DeVaney, Harold G. Donnelly, Linda M. Duttlinger, Janusz Duzinkiewicz, Richard O. Fanjoy, Wendy S. Flory, Greg N. Frederickson, Eric S. Furgason, Richard F. Ghiselli, April J. Ginther, Gabriele F. Giuliani, Alten Grandt, John G. Graveel, James P. Greenan, William A. Harper, Nathan W. Harter, Sally A. Hastings, L. Tony Hawkins, R. Neal Houze, Vicki J. Killion, Wayne W. Kjonaas, Charles E. Kline, Christine M. Ladisch, Morris Levy, Andrew U. Luescher, David R. McMillin, P. Jane Morris (Sergeant at Arms), Rab Mukerjea, Hisao Nakanishi, Cindy H. Nakatsu, Robert E. Novak, Daryl L. Orth, Frank V. Paladino, Richard C. Penney, Patrice D. Rankine, George E. Rogers, John R. Rousselle, Robert Sabol, John A. Sautter, Dan E. Schendel, Aaron Schnur, Richard Schweickert, Deb Sheets, Timothy L. Skvarenina, Glenn G. Sparks, Terry S. Stewart, Bernard Y. Tao, Jacqueline Walcott-McQuigg, Ralph Webb, H. Lee Weith, Sirje Laurel Weldon, David J. Williams, G. Thomas Wilson, and William J. Zinsmeister.*

Absent: *President Martin C. Jischke, Professors Lonnie D. Bentley, Evelyn Blackwood, J. Stuart Bolton, James R. Bottum, Shorna R. Broussard, John M. Connor, Otto C. Doering III, David R. Gaskell, Mark A. Green, Bruce Hamaker, Steven D. Johnson, Daniel J. Kovenock, Thomas Kuczek, C. S. George Lee, Sally Mason, Sean McDeavitt, Cary A. Mitchell, Mark Morgan, David E. Nichols, Michael R. Oliver, Morgan R. Olsen, Barry Pittendrigh, Laura J. Pyrak-Nolte, J. Paul Robinson, Kenneth R. Robinson, Thomas B. Robinson, William T. Robinson, Alysa C. Rollock, Farshid Sadeghi, Keith E. Schwingendorf, David L. Stanley, A. Charlene Sullivan, Alain S. Togbe, Phillip J. VanFossen, Whitney Walton, Clarence W. Wilkerson, Yuehwern Yih and Michael Zoltowski.*

Guests: *Eva Apotheker, Craig Davison, Alex Eremenko, Jeff Gustin, Amy Raley and Paul Roales.*

1. The meeting was called to order by the chairperson of the senate, Professor William McBride at 2:30 p.m.
2. The minutes of the meeting of 18 October 2004 were approved as distributed.
3. The agenda was accepted as proposed.
4. The President was not in attendance and no remarks were available.
5. Professor William McBride presented the report of the chairperson (see Appendix A).
6. Professor H. Lee Weith, the chair of the Steering Committee presented, for information, the Resume of Items Under Consideration by Various Standing Committees (see Appendix B). Professor Weith invited Professor John Rousselle, chair of the University Resource Policy Committee, to rise and explain two of the issues being dealt with by his committee. Professor Rousselle mentioned that his committee approved adding a graduate student member to the Library Committee. This will come to the Senate as a document at the January meeting. The committee will also be sending a document to

the Senate that recommends restricting smoking to designated areas while making the rest of the campus a smoke-free environment.

7. At question time the secretary reported no questions had been submitted in writing and the chair invited questions from the floor. No questions were forthcoming.
8. Professor Weith, chairperson of the Steering Committee, presented for discussion, University Senate Document 04-5, *Reapportionment of the University Senate 2005-2006*. Professor Weith explained that the Senate bylaws call for reapportionment at least once per year and this document meets that requirement. Professor Weith noted that the College of Engineering gained one senator while the School of Liberal Arts lost one senator. Senators asked questions about the document for example, how were the numbers for each school obtained? The numbers are head counts available from Human Resources in Freehafer Hall. It was queried whether the recent change in the bylaws that created a change in the election of the Senate leadership, would require modifying the formula for reapportionment as two additional members will become part of the Senate for a total of 102. Professor McBride indicated it would not as the Chair and Vice-Chair will be senators-at-large according to the by-law revisions. He suggested that the issue of when apportionment is done will need to be dealt with in the near future as the by-laws require it to be done in December, but the Senate normally does not meet in December. So that the Senate could act on the document during this meeting, Professor Weith moved to suspend the rules. His motion was seconded and passed unanimously on a voice vote. He then moved to approve Document 04-5. His motion was seconded and passed on a voice vote without dissent.
9. Professor Zinsmeister presented, Document 04-4, *Proposal for Non-tenure Track Research Faculty within Purdue University*, and made a motion for its approval. His motion was seconded. A discussion followed during which Professor Zinsmeister and Associate Provost Ladisch answered several questions from the floor. Several concerns were voiced by faculty members. For example, were there any changes made to the document based on the questions and discussion from the October Senate meeting? Professor Zinsmeister stated that the Faculty Affairs Committee decided not to make any changes in the document. Professor Schendel asked if the document could be brought to the faculty as a whole for their input and/or vote. Professor Weith noted that provisions exist in the Senate Bylaws for presenting documents to the entire faculty. One senator wanted to know why sabbatical leaves and paid leave for outside activities were excluded for these individuals. Associate Provost Ladisch noted that these activities are prohibited by the external funding sources. One Senator wondered what would happen to graduate students after the professor's funds expired. This issue would have to be handled by the professor and the department involved. In response to a question about the similarity of this proposal to those found on other campuses, Associate Provost Ladisch stated that research faculty positions at Purdue's benchmark institutions and the Big 10 institutions were studied and many institutions have similar positions. However, differences among the institutions make direct comparisons difficult. As the individuals will not be represented on the University Senate nor will they be eligible to serve on many committees, one senator wondered what will happen if a grievance or harassment issue arises. Associate Provost Ladisch said that there are many policies at Purdue University already in place that can be used to handle these issues. When it became apparent that the concerns of the senators would not be fully addressed at this time, Professor Alan Beck arose and moved that further consideration of the document be postponed until Provost Sally Mason was present and could answer the questions and concerns of the senators. His motion was seconded and it passed on

a majority voice vote with about five dissenting votes. The document will appear on the agenda for the January Senate meeting under “Unfinished Business.”

10. The chair introduced Dr. James Mullins, Dean of the Libraries, who addressed the senate on A Developing Vision for the Purdue University Libraries (See Appendix C). Following his presentation, Dean Mullins answered questions from the floor.
11. There was no new business.
12. There were no memorial resolutions.
13. The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE - PROFESSOR WILLIAM L. MCBRIDE

First of all, in the absence of President Jischke, I want to extend to all of you on his behalf, as well as on my own, warmest wishes for the forthcoming Holiday season. This may seem to be rushing things, and indeed it is, but the University Senate no longer meets in December, as it once did, and so this will be our final meeting, barring some unlikely emergency, until January. Since President Jischke himself is away today, attending the annual meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, or NASULGC, and giving the prestigious Morrill Lecture there, named in honor of the author of the famous Land Grant Act of 1862, I asked him whether he would like me to extend these greetings in his name, and he said that he would. He also indicated that a reception was being planned at the President's Home, Westwood, date and time to be announced, for us Senators, in keeping with a very pleasant custom of recent years, and so many of you will be able to reciprocate his good wishes when you see him then.

There has been no Board of Trustees meeting since our last Senate meeting, and so there is nothing to report on that front, as there was at our two previous meetings. The Board will be meeting this coming Friday, when I will be participating in the general assembly of a UNESCO-related organization, the International Council for Philosophy and the Human Sciences, in Beijing, and the Board will meet again just before the December commencement. Tim Skvarenina plans to attend this Friday's meeting and to present a report on our activities to the Trustees, and both of us plan to attend the December Board of Trustees meeting, and so we shall somehow prepare a joint report for you for our January Senate meeting.

I would like to refer briefly to two events that occurred over the past few days and that should be of some interest to you. First, there was the publication on Thursday, heralded by leaked news stories over more than a week prior to that, of the report of the Subcommittee on Higher Education of the Indiana Government Efficiency Commission, which consisted of Tim McGinley, the Chair of our Board of Trustees; Gus Watanabe, former Chair of Medicine of the IU Medical School and now Chairman of BioCrossroads; Ernie Bertell, an economist and member of the Notre Dame Trustees; and three appointed members: Phil Faccenda, Terry White, and the Chair of the Subcommittee, Thomas E. Reilly, Jr. I have read the report, which includes a number of interesting appendixes giving statistical comparisons of various kinds, mostly concerning Indiana's standing relative to the other states in a number of relevant categories, as well as, in the main text, some detailed proposals concerning all the state institutions of higher education, with special emphasis on Ivy Tech. The general attitude taken in this report was that our state institutions are fairly efficient from an internal point of view, but that efficiencies could be increased within the system as a whole by, most notably, shifting a certain proportion of baccalaureate students from West Lafayette and Bloomington to the community colleges, which of course cost less per student. There is one sentence on the penultimate page, p. 33, of the main text that summarizes the one recommendation of the Subcommittee which became most controversial even before its publication: "In pursuing their tuition revenue strategies, we urge the research universities to use this freedom to enhance their emphases on research and graduate education and to become more selective in their admission of undergraduate students." This is preceded by a comparison of in-state tuition costs for the current academic year among state-supported Big Ten universities, showing Penn State with the highest cost at \$10,856 and Indiana (at \$6,827) and Purdue (at \$6,092) close to the bottom, and is followed by a comparison of SAT scores for middle quartiles in the year 2001, showing Michigan at the top

of the chart and Purdue/West Lafayette, Michigan State, and Indiana University/Bloomington, in that order, at the bottom.

At the meeting on Friday of the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, as it was reported to me by colleagues from Bloomington who attended, there was considerable discussion of the report, some of it unfavorable to certain recommendations and some of it questioning the accuracy of some of its statistics, and by a split vote the Commission decided, contrary to one of the Subcommittee's recommendations, to approve a number of baccalaureate programs at Vincennes University, against the objections of Mr. Reilly and others.

Personally, I am dubious about the feasibility of the recommendation that we reduce our undergraduate enrollment, but let me leave it at that, except to use the occasion to urge you, once again, to visit our new Faculty website. The question of this month in our questionnaire section is what you think about the Subcommittee's proposal that I have cited. We waited until Friday to post it, having posted a question during the past month about restricting smoking on campus. The responses to that question were disappointingly small, as compared with those to the question about creating a faculty club here that we had posted during September. Those who did respond favored the restriction that was then under consideration, prohibiting smoking within 50 feet of any building, by a ratio of more than two to one. (Meanwhile, new, alternative proposals on smoking are under consideration. This morning I attended a meeting concerning the issue at Freehafer Hall, and John Rousselle, as Chair of the University Resources Policy Committee, now has one that he will mention in a few minutes and that we will probably be debating at our next meeting; it was decided just too late to be included in our agenda for today.) To return to the matter of our website, I again urge you to avail yourselves of the website more often – we are beginning to receive more questions under the "FAQ" heading, but it is still just a trickle – and to urge your colleagues to do the same. We have just succeeded in making access to it easier, because a link has now been added to the first page of the Purdue website itself, under the heading "Academics," which will take you directly to the faculty website. Finally, to update you on progress concerning our initial questionnaire issue, that of a faculty club, I am happy to tell you that our *ad hoc* committee on it has met and that a detailed initial proposal, involving a lot of work, has been drawn up by one of its members, Bernie Tao. I am very grateful for that and hope that it will bear fruit relatively soon.

I mentioned that there were two recent events about which I wanted to report to you. The other was a meeting of university and faculty senate leaders at Big Ten institutions that was held this past Friday afternoon and Saturday morning in Urbana, and that was attended by Tim Skvarenina and me. All the Big Ten institutions except Northwestern were represented by up to three participants, and so it was a sizable and, to my mind, very interesting group. The principal topics covered at the sessions were: problems of plagiarism and how to deal with them; codes of conduct; human subjects committees or, as they are called, IRBs; the work of the Coalition for Intercollegiate Athletics (a presumably temporary *ad hoc* committee preparing reform proposals in this area which operates out of Bloomington and has attracted interest nationwide; we have not officially joined although we are in regular contact with them); comparisons of different Boards of Trustees and Boards of Regents, as well as the different kinds of relationships between them and the leaders and committee chairs of the respective Big Ten senates; the question as to whether professors *emeriti* should be eligible to be elected senators; the issue of funding for universities – **of course!**; and finally, proposals for faculty development and for enhancing the prestige of faculty governance organizations and encouraging faculty members' interest in participating in them. I learned a number of new things, of course, and would be happy to answer, to the best of my memory, any questions about how these matters were dealt with. The single new fact that I found most surprising was that most of our sister institutions, as they are called, tend to allocate far more resources than does Purdue to faculty

governance. In some cases, senate chairs, vice-chairs, and even committee chairs are either subsidized, or given free time, or both; most of the other institutions have full-time staff members working on governance; and in the case of one institution, which I hesitate to name, there is an annual faculty governance budget of \$565,000. Here, by comparison, there are no subsidies (although Tim's and my travel and lodging on Friday night were paid for by the Provost's office), and the only directly budgeted governance costs of which I am aware are the one-quarter time salary of our Secretary of Faculties and the salary and related space and equipment, etc., costs of his secretary. But there is a strange part of my soul, for which I hope I may be forgiven, which is inclined not to reproach Purdue's generally more parsimonious, volunteer-based way of dealing with these matters. At some time in the future, our successors may have reason to demand a different governance structure and a different relationship between the faculty leadership and the Administration and Board of Trustees. For the moment, however, I would be content with an additional allocation of as little as \$100,000. (I'm only joking!)

TO: University Senate
FROM: Herbert L. Weith, Chairperson, Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Resume of Items Under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

STEERING COMMITTEE

Herbert L. Weith, Chairperson
weith@purdue.edu

The primary responsibility of the Steering Committee is the organization and distribution of the agenda for each meeting of the University Senate. This committee also receives communications from any faculty member or group of members and directs such communications to appropriate committees or officers for attention.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William L. McBride, Chairperson of the Senate
wmcbride@purdue.edu

The responsibility of the University Senate Advisory Committee is to advise the President and/or Board of Trustees on any matter of concern to the faculty.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Charles E. Kline, Chairperson
chuck@purdue.edu

The major task of the Nominating Committee comes in the spring in making nominations for senate and University committees. Nominations are made at other times to fill vacancies as they occur.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

George M. Bodner, Chairperson
gmbodner@purdue.edu

1. Final exam scheduling
2. Transfer credit
3. Distance learning courses

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

William J. Zinsmeister, Chairperson
wjzins@purdue.edu

1. Grade Appeals Process
2. Committee on Informetrics
3. Follow-up on faculty development review
4. Tenure Promotion Process

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Terry L. Davidson, Chairperson
davidson@psych.purdue.edu

1. Review of the Student Bill of Rights
2. Follow-up concerning the Student Conduct Code
3. Follow-up concerning the OnePurdue system
4. Follow-up with Student Services Office concerning the proposed Disciplinary Process
5. Currently examining the proposed Exam Proctoring system

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE

John R. Rousselle, Chairperson
rousselj@purdue.edu

1. Faculty input into the budget process
2. Review of Faculty Committees

Vice Chair of the Senate, Timothy L. Skvarenina, tskvaren@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr.
University Senate Minutes; <http://www.purdue.edu/usenate>

CALENDAR OF STATUS OF LEGISLATION
--

SENATE DOCUMENT	TITLE	ORIGIN	SENATE
*04-1	Nominees for University Censure and Dismissal Procedures Committee	University Senate Nominating Committee	Elected 9/13/04
*04-2	Proposed changes to the University Senate Bylaws	Professor William L. McBride	Approved 9/13/04
*04-3	Proposed change to the University Senate bylaws	Professor William L. McBride	Approved 10/18/04
04-4	Proposal for Non-tenure Track Research Faculty within Purdue University	Professor William J. Zinsmeister	For Discussion 10/18/04
*04-5	Reapportionment of the University Senate	Professor Herbert L. Weith	Approved 11/15/04

***Approved**

To: The University Senate
From: Faculty Affairs Committee
Subject: Proposal for Non-Tenure Track Research Faculty within Purdue University
Disposition: University Senate for Discussion

INTRODUCTION

The research enterprise at Purdue University is facing significant challenges arising from changes in its environment, including increased competitiveness for external research funding, the need for strategic partnering with industry, and a greater focus and reliance on interdisciplinary efforts and multi-disciplinary proposals. Large multi-year multi-investigator research programs in particular require full-time senior-level personnel to provide continuity and a high level of uninterrupted research time. The same need for full-time attention also frequently occurs during preparation of proposals for large projects. Additionally, units which have major research projects requiring highly qualified full-time research specialists find it increasingly difficult to recruit and retain personnel in these positions due to the lack of a well-defined career ladder and corresponding reward system.

Many of our successful peer institutions have met these needs through the use of Research Professors. In most cases, these are senior researchers with outstanding research credentials who are not tenured or tenure track, are paid on soft (non-general) funds, and carry no teaching duties other than the supervision of graduate students. They are expected to be productive, independent investigators and are evaluated primarily on the basis of their scholarly achievements.

This document proposes the creation of a non-tenure track faculty appointment designated as “research professor”. This track will enable the university to recruit and retain top research scholars whose primary responsibilities will be to support and enhance the discovery mission of the university. These positions would (1) not be eligible for tenure, (2) be employed entirely on non-general (soft) funds, and (3) be continued depending upon the availability of soft funding and on performance.

PRINCIPLES

Non-tenured research faculty shall:

1. engage in activities which support the academic and scholarly life of the university, and particularly those which enhance the discovery mission of the university
2. possess the appropriate educational background and professional expertise to engage in research and research-related activities
3. participate in activities which enhance professional growth
4. have an opportunity to be considered for promotion in rank from assistant to associate to (full) research professor
5. possess scholarly research credentials comparable to those of tenured and tenure-track faculty at the same academic rank

6. be considered members of the university faculty
7. be compensated at salary levels roughly equivalent to those for tenure-track faculty at the same rank and in the same professional area.

RESEARCH FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

- A. Research faculty will be supported only from extramural or non-general funds. Fringe benefits are charged to the sponsored account.
- B. Appointments may be calendar year, academic year, or part-time. Part-time appointments in general should have at least a 0.5 FTE minimum. Appointments less than 0.5 FTE and short-term appointments will not be eligible for benefits.

Research faculty are appointed by a department or research unit for renewable terms not to exceed three years each, and continued appointments are contingent upon availability of funds and satisfactory performance evaluations. The appointment cannot extend beyond the period of availability of supporting funds. If the position cannot be supported at the approved level because of insufficient funds, the appointment will be terminated when funds are exhausted or the effort will be reduced to a level consistent with the salary that can be paid. Any commitment of salary support in the case of unanticipated loss of project funds will be the responsibility of the hiring unit. Bridge funding from general funds may be used for a period up to six months.

- C. Research faculty are hired at a rank commensurate with their professional experience and qualifications. These qualifications should be comparable to the research credentials of tenure/tenure track faculty at the same rank.
- D. The hiring unit will conduct an annual merit review of research faculty. The timing of this review will coincide with the regular annual review of tenure track faculty and other university employees. Research faculty will be subject to annual merit increases in accordance with the university's annual salary policy. The hiring unit must establish guidelines for annual review, reappointment, and promotion prior to hiring research faculty.
- E. Research faculty may be considered for promotion in rank. Criteria for promotion shall be similar to that for tenure-track faculty, but with much greater or singular focus on research accomplishment. Salary supplements for promotion should be consistent with those associated with promotion for tenure-track faculty. The promotion increment must be funded from the same funding source as the base salary. Appointments less than 0.5 FTE and short-term appointments will not be eligible for promotion in rank.
- F. The primary responsibilities of research faculty would be research and research – related activities such as proposal writing, project management, and service specifically linked to their research programs (e.g. supervision of graduate students and service to professional organizations). Research faculty may serve as principal investigators on research proposals.
- G. Research faculty may be members of the graduate faculty, subject to the policies and procedures of the Graduate School.
- H. Research faculty are not eligible for sabbatical leave.

- I. An individual holding a faculty or staff appointment at the university may apply for a research faculty position and will be subject to university search and screen policies in effect at the time of application. The same policies apply to research faculty seeking tenure-track positions. Time in non-tenured rank will not count toward sabbatical or the probationary tenure period if subsequently hired into a tenure-track position. Individuals may not hold tenure-track and research faculty positions simultaneously.
- J. Research faculty may not be elected to the University Senate and are not eligible to serve on promotion and tenure committees. Other voting privileges of research faculty will be decided by the unit in which they have their primary appointment.
- K. Research faculty may not have regular teaching duties except on an ad-hoc basis. In rare cases where a research faculty member is considered for a teaching assignment, a separate part-time teaching appointment is required.
- L. Research faculty are eligible for emeritus status, subject to the same eligibility criteria as outlined for tenure-track faculty.
- M. Except as noted previously, research faculty are subject to the policies, procedures, guidelines and regulations governing tenure track faculty.
- N. Research faculty will be eligible for all leaves of absence provided to faculty by university policy, with the exception of sabbatical leave and paid leave for outside activities.
- O. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Office of the Provost.

AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH RESEARCH FACULTY POSITIONS

Requests for the establishment of research faculty positions must originate within an academic unit or center. Requests from a department must have approval by the Department Head, School Dean and Vice Provost for Research. Requests from School-based centers must have approval by the center director, Dean, and Vice Provost for Research. Requests originating from a multidisciplinary center must have center director and Vice-Provost for Research approval. The request must be consistent with the guidelines established for research faculty, define the position responsibilities, and describe the source(s) of funding used to support the position. The request shall also include guidelines for performance evaluation and promotion. All approvals must be obtained before an offer is made.

GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

Review of candidates for hiring and promoting research faculty shall be conducted with the same rigor accorded hiring and promoting within the tenure track ranks. Qualifications for the three research faculty ranks are roughly equivalent to those of tenure track ranks, with primary or singular focus on research credentials. The ability to secure external funding does not automatically qualify individuals for research faculty appointments.

Assistant Research Professor

Candidates for appointment to the rank of assistant research professor must exhibit significant promise for the establishment of an independent research program and related scholarly endeavors which contribute to the discovery mission of the university.

Associate Research Professor

Candidates for appointment to the rank of associate research professor must have a significant and sustained record of scholarly accomplishment and externally funded research. The candidate must show promise of continued professional growth, recognition, and contribution to the discovery mission of the university.

Research Professor

Candidates for appointment to the rank of research professor should be recognized nationally or internationally as authorities in their fields of specialization, have established significant and sustained extramural research funding, and have significantly contributed to the discovery mission of the university.

PROMOTION PROCESS

Research faculty are eligible for promotion in rank from assistant research professor to associate research professor to research professor. Recommendations for changes in rank will be considered during the normal fall and spring semester faculty promotion cycle in accordance with guidelines issued annually by the Provost.

Research professors hired by departments will be reviewed for promotion by the departmental primary committee and the school area committee, with the addition of one or more research faculty, as appropriate. Professors hired by a unit other than a department will be assigned to a departmental primary committee for review or to an ad hoc committee appointed by the Vice Provost for Research. The area committee will consist of five members appointed by the Vice Provost for Research.

At the university level, Panel C will review all research faculty promotion candidates. Panel C shall consist of the Provost as chair, the Vice Provost for Research, two academic school deans or associate deans for research from schools employing research faculty, and six faculty members. The Provost shall nominate three of these faculty from Panel A of the University Promotions Committee; the remaining three faculty shall be research professors appointed by the Provost.

Assistant research professor appointments are not subject to the seven-year probationary period applicable to tenure track faculty. Assistant and associate research professors must be reviewed at least every five years for retention in rank or for promotion. During the fifth year, the research faculty member must be informed by the unit administrator that he/she has the right to be reviewed for promotion; it will then be up to the faculty member to request a review.

Approving:

A.M. Beck
E. Blackwood
S. Broussard
J. Duzinkiewicz
V.J. Killion
G. Lee
D.R. McMillin
M.T. Morgan
A.C. Rollock
W.J. Zinsmeister

Absent:

L.D. Bentley
J.J. Contreni
S.F. Mason
A.C. Sullivan
J.A. Walcott-McQuigg
Y. Yih

University Senate Document 04-5

15 November 2004

As Approved 15 November 2004

TO: The University Senate
 FROM: University Senate Steering Committee
 SUBJECT: Reapportionment of the University Senate
 REFERENCE: University Senate Document 90-5; University Code D 3.00; Bylaws of the University Senate, Items 2.00 and 2.01
 DISPOSITION: Faculty Units

Section D 3.00 of the University Code, and the Bylaws of the University Senate, provide that the University Senate shall be composed of one hundred members. Eight of these are specified in the items 1 through 8 below. This leaves ninety-two to be apportioned among the faculty units, according to the number of faculty members, with the provision that no faculty unit shall have fewer than two senators. There are 2050 voting faculty members at the West Lafayette and North Central campuses. When this number is divided by ninety-two the result is 22.283. Therefore, to qualify for more than two senators, a faculty unit should have fifty-six or more voting faculty members. Since no faculty unit can have fewer than two senators, the Libraries unit qualifies for two senators. The remaining units have a total of 2012 voting faculty members with ninety senate seats remaining to be apportioned among them. The number 2012 divided by 90 equals 22.356. The apportionment of senators for each of these remaining units was obtained by dividing the number of voting faculty in the faculty unit by 22.356. The results are as follows: Agriculture, 14.537; Consumer and Family Sciences, 2.818; Education, 2.863; Engineering, 14.090; Liberal Arts, 16.998; Management, 4.205; North Central, 3.892; Pharmacy, Nursing, and Health Sciences, 4.607; Science, 12.882; Technology, 9.170; Veterinary Medicine, 3.936.

	No. Voting Fac. Members October 21, 2003	Number of Senators 2004-2005	No. Voting Fac. Members October 26, 2004	Number of Senators 2005-2006
<u>Areas Represented</u>				
1. President		1		1
2. Chief Academic Officer		1		1
3. Chief Fiscal Officer		1		1
4. Calumet Campus		1		1
5. Fort Wayne Campus		1		1
6. IUPUI Campus		1		1
7. Undergraduate Student		1		1
8. Graduate Student		1		1
9. Faculty Units				
<i>Agriculture</i>	315	14	325	14
<i>Consumer & Family Sci.</i>	62	3	63	3
<i>Education</i>	59	3	64	3
<i>Engineering</i>	282	13	315	14
<i>Liberal Arts</i>	380	18	380	17
<i>Libraries</i>	34	2	38	2
<i>Management</i>	85	4	94	4
<i>North Central</i>	86	4	87	4
<i>Pharm, Nurs, & Health Sci.</i>	103	5	103	5
<i>Science</i>	286	13	288	13
<i>Technology</i>	202	9	205	9
<i>Veterinary Medicine</i>	84	4	88	4
	<u>1978</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>100</u>

Approving	Absent
John M. Connor	Martin C. Jischke
David R. Gaskell	Gabriele F. Giuliani
William L. McBride	Cindy H. Nakatsu
Timothy L. Skvarenina	Clarence W. Wilkerson
H. Lee Weith	
J. Paul Robinson	
Bernard Y. Tao	

A Developing Vision: Getting to Know Purdue & Its Libraries
Presented by James L. Mullins, Dean of Libraries.

During the past several months after arriving at Purdue I met with various constituencies: the Libraries faculty and staff, undergraduate and graduate students, faculty on the University Library Committee, department heads, deans, vice-presidents and the provost. It has helped me become familiar with the campus, and the critical role the Libraries perform in the learning, discovery, and engagement endeavors at Purdue.

There are three factors that combined make a library: well organized print collections and access to digital information resources; services provided by excellent faculty and staff, and facilities that support the learning and discovery processes. In order to be an excellent academic research library the first two must be exceptional, while the third becomes critical only when the facilities do not support and promote the first two.

The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) collects input/output data for 114 research libraries in the United States and Canada. Overall rankings are determined by weighting five variables: volumes held, gross volumes added per year, number of current periodical subscriptions, total expenditures and total professional and support staff. These variables are input/output only. In addition, the rankings do not take into account use of digital products. ARL is in the process of revising its data collection and its overall ranking system.

Purdue ranked: 1990 – 57th; 1995 – 69th; 2000 – 76th; 2003 – 75th.

Peer group comparison as of 2003: Arizona – 27th; California, Berkeley – 3rd; California – Davis, 46th; Cornell – 8th; Georgia Tech – 100th; Illinois, Urbana – 6th; Minnesota – 19th; Penn State – 13th; Purdue – 75th; Texas – 10th; Texas A&M – 34th; Wisconsin – 11th.

Two important ratios in 2003: total library expenditure per student, Purdue ranked 104th; total library staff per student, Purdue ranked 110th. (N = 114).

ARL collects data on the increasing cost of library resources: from 1986 to 2003 periodical costs increased a total of 260% and monograph costs increased a total of 66%, while the CPI increased 68%. At Purdue the Libraries budget for periodicals increased 252% and for monographs 74%. During the last several years, Purdue has continued to match and beat the inflation rate for periodicals and monographs while other universities mandated cuts in library materials budgets.

Use of Collections in 2003: Purdue ranked 43rd with 571,522 items circulated (N=112); 89th for circulations per student (N=112); and ranked 112th for current periodicals per student (N=114th).

Use of Digital Databases and Print materials:

Digital databases: 2001 – 1,879,092; 2002 – 2,263,730; 2003 – 2,052,020.

Print Materials: 2001 – 510,307; 2002 – 519,064; 2003 – 571,522.

Information Literacy Instruction to Purdue Students – 2003: classes taught Purdue ranked 109th; total number of students taught, Purdue ranked 108th (N=112).

Opportunities for the Purdue Libraries:

Discovery: by collaborating with colleagues in interdisciplinary sponsored research including areas such as: bioinformatics, database management and outreach, and semantic web. To facilitate this collaboration, two positions have been re-defined: first, director of technology and sponsored research and, second interdisciplinary research librarian. This will help the Libraries generate revenue by recovering costs and increased F&A revenue. The Libraries will also be actively involved in the scholarly communication discussion by finding solutions to the ever escalating costs of Science/Technology/Medical (STM) journals. One possible way will be to collaborate with ITaP in the development of an institutional digital repository and by working with ITaP and others in the development of a re-defined and expanded Center for Scholarly Communication.

Learning: by placing an increased emphasis on information literacy within the Libraries and departmental faculties. This can be accomplished by using technology to support classroom and library instruction sessions. Presently the Libraries are assessing the specific needs of the Krannert School and the Agricultural Economics Department through the creation of the Management/Economics Library (MEL) Task Force comprised of faculty from Krannert, AgEcon and the Libraries.

Engagement: recent formation of the Academic Libraries of Indiana (ALI) is fostering collaboration among Indiana's academic libraries. This will likely include cooperative purchase of databases and sharing of collections without charge-back. By improving collaboration among Purdue University libraries at all locations throughout Indiana and by strengthening the Libraries services to Indiana and to Purdue's alumni.

Opportunities: Facilities.

As I have mentioned, facilities become critically important when they restrict efficient and effective use of collections and/or the provision of services. Are our decentralized facilities supporting and/or enhancing access to our collections and services?

When I met with various constituencies I became aware of how the campus was generally configured: physical sciences and engineering in the north/northeast; liberal arts through the center; health and life sciences to the south/southwest; and business and economics in the southeast. I then mapped Purdue Libraries fourteen locations.

If you think of library facilities on a continuum from highly centralized to highly decentralized, the highly centralized library is typified by a large central library building, easily identified and "pointed-out" on campus. A highly decentralized library system is apparent when the answer to the question, "where is the library?" is, "which one?"

There are positives and negatives to each end of the continuum: a highly centralized library brings materials and library staff together in one place and increases effective use of collections and services by reducing redundant service points. While the disadvantages are that collections and services can be far removed from the students and faculty; library staff often think of the library facility as their "world" and are isolated from the larger academic community; and the library building becomes the identity for the library among its clientele, rather than the perception of the library as a source and access to information, both print and digital -- anytime, anywhere.

A highly decentralized library brings the collections and services closer to the end-user within a specific department or school. However, with the growth of interdisciplinary research, there is a greater likelihood of needing to visit more than one library to complete research projects. Library staff is more isolated from colleagues in other libraries with whom they collaborate in collection development and management, instruction, and reference services. Duplication of service and processing points increases overhead. Librarians spend more time managing facilities and less time instructing, researching and collaborating with library and departmental colleagues.

Where should the Purdue Libraries be on the continuum? Today, we are toward the highly decentralized end of the spectrum, we should move toward the middle. While the highly centralized libraries cannot move to the middle, the decentralized can. At Purdue we have the golden opportunity to make this transition.

By creating two new libraries that would bring together the Physical Sciences/Engineering and Health/Life Sciences into "interdisciplinary community libraries" we could have the best of both worlds. HSSE and Hicks Libraries would be the interdisciplinary community libraries for the Liberal Arts. With desktop delivery of many reference materials, indexes and abstracts, and journals, the need to have immediate access to the print versions (if existing) is reduced. But, there is still a need to have materials that exist in print only, available and easily accessible to minimize the opportunity cost for the researcher.

This "vision" will not proceed without considerable discussion and review on campus. It could be that a particular department/school could put-forth a thoughtful, well reasoned proposal for continuing a departmental/school library.

The interdisciplinary community libraries would be a total resource for information sources by integrating collections of related disciplines and all formats of information (print, microform and digital) using efficient high density storage. These libraries would also be a center for the exchange of ideas both formally and informally as well as a center for group and individual study. Instruction and consultation services would be provided by libraries faculty and staff. Finally, it would be a "cross-roads" where students and faculty could come together in a more social, informal environment.

Through economy of scale and increased collaboration the Purdue Libraries will be more efficient, effective, and creative in meeting the discovery, learning, and engagement needs of Purdue students and faculty and, ultimately, the citizens of Indiana and the national and international research communities.