PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Call to order
   Professor George M. Bodner

2. Approval of Minutes of 18 February 2008

3. Acceptance of Agenda

4. Remarks by the President
   President France A. Córdova

5. Report of the Chairperson
   Professor George M. Bodner

6. Résumé of Items Under Consideration by Various Standing Committees
   For Information
   Professor Raymond A. DeCarlo

7. Question Time

   Report of the ad hoc Committee on the Revision of C-22
   For Information
   Professor Raymond A. DeCarlo

9. University Senate Document 07-7
   Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the University Senate
   For Action
   Professor Natalie J. Carroll

10. University Senate Document 07-10
    Nominees for University Senate Steering and Nominating Committees
    For Action
    Professor Natalie J. Carroll

11. University Senate Document 07-11
    Nominees for Faculty Committees
    For Action
    Professor Natalie J. Carroll

12. University Senate Document 07-8
    Disbandment of the Collective Bargaining Committee
    For Discussion
    Professor David J. Williams

    Change to University Regulations
    For Discussion
    Professor James D. McGlothlin

14. University Senate Document 07-9
    CIC Statement on Publishing Agreements
    For Discussion
    Professor David J. Williams

15. Accreditation Visit
    For Information
    Interim Provost Victor Lechtenberg

16. New Business

17. Memorial Resolutions

18. Adjournment
UNIVERSITY SENATE
Sixth Meeting, Monday, 17 March 2008, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center


Guests: Steve Garbacz, Jim Mullins, Mark Pagano, Tim Skvarenina, and Brian Wallheimer.

1. The meeting was called to order by the chairperson of the senate, Professor George M. Bodner at 2:35 p.m.

2. The minutes of the meeting of 18 February 2008 were approved as distributed.

3. The agenda was presented and accepted by acclamation.

4. President France A. Córdova presented remarks to the University Senate (See Appendix A).

5. Professor Bodner presented the report of the chairperson (see Appendix B).

6. Professor DeCarlo presented, for information, the Résumé of Items under Consideration by Various Standing Committees (see Appendix C). Professor Williams, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), read a resolution from the FAC expressing its concern with the lack of faculty involvement in the revised Executive Memorandum C-22; Policy on Integrity in Research. The resolution received unanimous support from the FAC and reads:
“Be it resolved that the Faculty Affairs Committee believes the revised *Executive Memorandum C-22; Policy on Integrity in Research* should involve a significant role for the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee comparable to the role under the prior *Executive Memorandum C-22.*

7. At question time the secretary reported no questions had been submitted in writing and no questions came from the floor.

8. Professor DeCarlo briefly commented on Senate Report 07-5, the *ad hoc* report from the Steering Committee on C-22.

9. Professor Carroll presented, for action, Senate Document 07-7, *Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the Senate.* She called for nominations from the floor, but none were forthcoming. The candidates, Professors Robinson and Zelaznik, each provided brief remarks to the Senate. Voting by secret paper ballot followed these remarks. Professors Grutzner and Thomas served as tellers. Following the tally of votes, Professor Zelaznik was declared the winner of the election and will serve as Vice Chairperson of the Senate for 2008-2009.

10. Professor Carroll presented, for action, Senate Document 07-10, *Nominees for the University Senate Steering and Nominating Committees.* For the three vacancies on the Steering Committee, she nominated Professors John Denton, Chong Gu, Samuel Midkiff, Martin Okos, J Paul Robinson, and Mara Wasburn. For the two vacancies on the Nominating Committee, she placed into nomination Professors Michael Hill, Kathryn Orvis, Melissa Remis, and Wei Zheng. The motion was seconded and additional nominations were called for but none were forthcoming. The vote was by secret ballot. Based on remaining Senate term length, Professors Denton, Robinson, and Wasburn were elected to membership on the Steering Committee for terms of service of three, one, and two years, respectively. Professors Orvis and Remis were elected to membership on the Nominating Committee for terms of service of three years each.

11. Professor Carroll presented, for action, University Senate Document 07-11, *Nominees for Faculty Committees.* For the three vacancies on the University Grade Appeals Committee she nominated Professors George Bodner, Carol Ott, and Sharon Solwitz for terms of service ending May 31st, 2011. For the University Censure and Dismissal Procedures Committee she nominated, as regular members, Professors Linda Chezem, Jan Lugowski, Ralph Webb, and William Zinsmeister; and as alternate members, Professors Dan Mroczek and Joel Ebarb. The motion was seconded and additional nominations were called for. None were forthcoming and the foregoing were declared elected by acclamation.

12. Professor David Williams presented, for discussion, University Senate Document 07-8, *Disbandment of the Collective Bargaining Committee.* Professor Williams explained that the committee had not met in the memory of any of the current Senators and that the faculty members who helped form the committee are now all deceased. Based on the non-controversial nature of this document, Professor Williams made a motion to suspend the rules to allow a vote on the document during the current Senate meeting. His motion was seconded and the motion to suspend the rules passed by unanimous voice vote. Professor Williams then made the motion to disband the committee and this motion was seconded. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote and the committee was officially disbanded.
Professor James McGlothlin, chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) presented, for discussion revised Senate Document 07-5, *Change to the University Academic Regulations*. Professor McGlothlin explained that the revised document and its proposal calls for three grade indices: semester, cumulative, and a program GPA derived from a degree audit. Professor McGlothlin explained that the revised document provides a transparent means of reporting students’ grades and the EPC would like to move forward with the proposal. Professor DeCarlo stated that the revised proposal allows each school or college to decide what works best for their programs and provides the autonomy they require. Other professor expressed support or the simplicity and transparency in the revised documents while others were concerned about the absence of an official forgiveness proposal in the document. Professor Wasburn suggested that without a forgiveness policy the mistakes made by students early in their academic careers could influence future job success in a competitive market. Professor McGlothlin said that the proposal does have an element of forgiveness and meets the charge the Senate gave to the EPC. In addition, the revision fits well with the new Banner system component of OnePurdue and there will be full transparency on the student’s transcript. Finally, he suggested that the policy could be revisited in the future to evaluate its effectiveness and for consideration of modifications. Professor Tao encouraged the EPC members to consider some of the issues brought up during the various discussions of the iterations of the document that have come before the Senate. He suggested that there might be other ways to change the system without changing a grade to allow students to get “to the right place.” He also thanked the EPC members for their hard work which was greeted with a round of applause by the Senate members. The document will be voted on at the 21 April meeting of the Senate.

Professor David Williams presented Senate Document 07-9, *CIC Statement on Publishing Agreements*, for discussion. Professor Williams made a motion to suspend the rules to allow a vote on the document. His motion was seconded and the motion to suspend the rules was passed by unanimous voice vote. Professor Williams then made a motion to approve the document. His motion was seconded and a brief discussion occurred. Professor Williams noted that the document had the unanimous support of the FAC members and it has already been endorsed by several other CIC institutions. The document is designed to help faculty retain the rights to work submitted for publication. In response to questions from several Senators, Professor Bodner explained that the statement will be available for faculty use, but will not be required of faculty. Following the discussion, the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Interim Provost Vic Lechtenberg presented, for information, an update on the upcoming accreditation visit by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association (See Appendix D).

There was no new business.

There was one memorial resolution for, Professor David R. Ransom. At the chair’s invitation, the Senators stood for a moment of silence out of respect for their departed colleague.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.
REMARKS BY PRESIDENT FRANCE A. CÓRDOVA

Good afternoon and happy St. Patrick’s Day! I see some of you are wearing green. My own shamrock broach has a ladybug on it -- this is fitting since Westwood is infested (I mean blessed) this time of year with ladybugs; I even found one recently on the end of my cell phone cable connection -- undoubtedly trying to phone home!

I’ve heard it said that everyone is Irish on St. Patrick’s Day. I technically am about half Irish, half Latina, and 100% American.

I hope you all had a wonderful spring break. I spent mine with our elected officials in Washington, and attending a National Academies meeting on science, security, and prosperity in California.

I will be brief today having presented a State of the Campus address last month at the Faculty Convocation.

On March 6 I spoke to more than 1,000 people at the Economic Club in Indianapolis on the topic, “Purdue: A Global University For Indiana.” This address is posted on our Purdue website and I invite you all to read it.

Our new Strategic Plan, currently in formulation, will have a global emphasis. Purdue has used its land-grant mission well to help Indiana and our nation through the 20th century. We must continue doing this and expand our engagement globally.

But today we live in a new world, what New York Times columnist and author Thomas Friedman has described as a “flat world” leveled by transportation, communication and technology. This new century and the rapid changes we see all around us require a new model for land-grant research universities. To meet the challenges of our times and the needs and opportunities of our students and state, Purdue must become a global research university for Indiana.

Our students need international experiences and a global education to succeed in this century. We need to increase study abroad programs and international experiences directly related to the professions our students are pursuing. The leading research universities in the next several years will be those which may bring the world onto campus, and the campus into the world.

It is important for the future of our state that Purdue serve as a hub for global innovation and global collaboration. We have the opportunity as never before to link our business enterprises to a worldwide network of strategic partners for Indiana and to ensure that our students have global credentials.

Purdue’s enhanced role as a global hub directly helps the enterprises in this state by opening new markets, attracting new talent and helping match global partners to address large-scale challenges and access new opportunities.

We are moving forward in finding a new Provost. The Provost Search Committee has announced three finalists for this position, and they are speaking in open forums starting today. They are:
• Camilla Persson Benbow, dean of the Peabody College of Education and Human Development and professor in the Department of Psychology and Human Development at Vanderbilt University.

• Don Giddens, dean of the College of Engineering and Lawrence L. Gellerstedt Jr. Chair of Biomedical Engineering at Georgia Institute of Technology.

• William "Randy" Woodson, Glenn W. Sample Dean of Agriculture at Purdue.

The search committee headed by Peggy Rowe has done a wonderful job (thank you!). I hope you all take part in these fora. If you miss a forum, and wish to review it online, I’ll try to make that available or send you a CD; just let me know.

A major grant was announced earlier this month. The National Nuclear Security Administration has awarded a $17 million cooperative agreement for a research center at Discovery Park to develop advanced simulations for commercial and defense applications.

The center will focus on the behavior and reliability of miniature switches and is one of five new Centers of Excellence chosen by the NNSA.

About 35 researchers at Purdue, including faculty members, software professionals and students, will be involved in the new Center for Prediction of Reliability, Integrity and Survivability of Microsystems, or PRISM. The University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, and the University of New Mexico will collaborate in the center.

The center takes advantage of Purdue’s interdisciplinary strengths and considerable expertise in computational modeling and nanotechnology.

Jayathi Y. Murthy, (Jay-a-thee Moor-thee) a professor in our School of Mechanical Engineering, will be director of the Center. Congratulations to everyone involved with this.

Purdue’s Teaching Academy inducted six new fellows, three new associate fellows and recognized two members at a ceremony in late February.

For outstanding contributions to teaching and learning on the West Lafayette campus, the inductees were:

• Four fellows by virtue of winning a Charles B. Murphy Outstanding Undergraduate Teaching Award: Patricia Hart, professor of foreign languages and literatures; Christine Hrycyna (her-SIN-uh), associate professor of chemistry; Richard Thomas, professor of visual and performing arts; and Karen Yehle (YAY-lee), assistant professor of nursing.

• The two other new fellows are: John Contreni, the Justin S. Morrill Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and Venkat Venkatasubrama, professor of chemical engineering.

The three new associate fellows are: Rebecca Bull, from organizational behavior and human resource management; Gregory Gibson, from sociology; and Kristina Walker, from agronomy.

Robert May, professor of history, and Timothy Newby, professor of curriculum and instruction, were recognized for receiving the Murphy Award in 2007. They are already members of the Teaching Academy.
Congratulations to all of these great teachers.

We are progressing on our Strategic Plan. Thank you all for the work you are doing in this. We were very pleased with the large number of people who attended the open fora and we’re looking forward to having a draft out for review by mid-April.

Thank you and I will be happy to take questions.
REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE - PROFESSOR GEORGE M. BODNER

Good afternoon and welcome to the sixth meeting of the University Senate for the 2007-2008 academic year. Once again, we have a full agenda for the meeting, including a report to the Senate from an ad hoc committee on the Revision of Executive Memorandum C-22, three items for action from the Nominating Committee, three items for discussion, and a report from the Provost. The first item for discussion — item 12 on the agenda — is so noncontroversial that I anticipate that we will be asked to suspend the rules to vote on it today. The second item for discussion reflects our decision at the previous Senate meeting to ask the Educational Policy Committee to reconsider their document on grade adjustment. The third item for discussion is a recommendation for endorsement by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the CIC statement on publishing agreements. The last item on today’s agenda is a presentation by Interim Provost Vic Lechtenberg about preparation for the accreditation visit by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association Commission on Accreditation.

In January, I distributed a draft of a new version of Executive Memorandum C-22, which outlines the university’s policy on research misconduct. On the basis of comments and suggestions I received, I drafted a four-page memo that was forwarded to the Office of the Vice President for Research and the Provost’s Office. That memo summarized nine favorable comments about the new policy and an equal number of reservations about certain aspects of the proposed draft of the new policy. It is a pleasure to report that all of the suggestions for revisions will be incorporated into the next draft of the policy. Please note that you have a memo from the Faculty Affairs Committee on your desks, this afternoon, that suggest that the FAC has unanimously voted to recommend that the chair of the FAC should play a similar role in the revised version of the C-22 memorandum as the role that individual played in the existing version of C-22.

In January, I also asked for comments and suggestions on a draft of a report on the interpretation of Purdue’s policy on intellectual property. The responses I received to that document were positive and I have forwarded a letter to the Office of the Vice President for Research recommending that the statement of interpretation of the policy on intellectual property be linked to the statement of the policy on intellectual property.

As many of you know, white papers have been submitted by each of the eight working groups that have been involved in the drafting of the new strategic plan for the University. The Strategic Plan Steering Committee has completed drafts of both a mission statement and a vision statement for the strategic plan and will begin work this week to incorporate recommendations from the eight working groups into a finished product.

I would like to remind you that the three Provost candidates are on campus this week: Don Giddens, from Georgia Tech and Emory; William R. "Randy" Woodson, the Glenn W. Sample Dean of Agriculture at Purdue; and Camilla Persson Benbow, who is dean of the Peabody College of Education and Human Development and professor in the Department of Psychology and Human Development at Vanderbilt University. Each candidate will be available at noon on the day of their visit for a presentation in the South Ballroom of the Purdue Memorial Union. Each candidate will start with a brief set of remarks and respond to questions from the audience. I hope that as many faculty and staff as possible can attend these sessions.
I would like to comment briefly on item 14 on the agenda for this meeting. At the January meeting, we broached the topic of intellectual property rights within the context of inventions, copyrightable works with potential commercial value, tangible research property and research data, and income derived from intellectual property. Today, we return to this topic in Senate Document 07-9 within the context of intellectual property rights associated with something that has been called the “lifeblood of a research university,” publications.

The nature of the problem has been defined by a variety of organizations, including the Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) and the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC).

SPARC notes the author or authors of a publication, book, or other work holds the copyright “unless and until” they transfer the copyright to someone else. SPARC notes that the copyright agreement received from most journals and publishers asks for “exclusive rights of reproduction, distribution, public performance, public display, and modification of the original work.” They note that “Authors who have transferred their copyright without retaining any rights may not be able to place the work on course Web sites, copy it for students or colleagues, ... or reuse portions in a subsequent work.” Finally, SPARC notes “The law allows you to transfer copyright while holding back rights for yourself and others.” (I suspect that many people in this room do not know that they are in formal violation of the traditional copyright agreement if they present data at a technical meeting that appeared in one of their publications without a formal request for permission to do so.)

Last year, Bernie Tao, Joe Camp and I attended a CIC Conference on Faculty Governance at which the CIC Statement on Publishing Agreements was discussed. As of June, 2007, faculty governance from six of the CIC campuses formally endorsed this statement and Addendum to Publication Agreements for CIC Authors, and I believe others have done so this year. This Fall, I asked the Faculty Affairs Committee to consider endorsing this agreement for use at Purdue University. As can be seen in Senate Document 07-9, the Faculty Affairs Committee has recommended that the Senate endorse this agreement.

The CIC Statement on Publishing Agreements has also been considered by the ad hoc Task Force on Scholarly Communication at Purdue that was created by the Provost and chaired by Jim Mullins, dean of Libraries.

If Senate Document 07-9 is passed, Purdue would join other CIC institutions such as the University of Illinois (both the UI-C and UIUC campuses), Indiana University, the University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison as endorsing faculty rights to retain use of their intellectual property. The Addendum to Publication Agreements for CIC Authors also would be available for use by Purdue faculty, if they chose to do so.

As someone who has served on the editorial boards of six journals as well as the Board of Publications of the American Chemical Society, which publishes 34 journals, I enthusiastically endorse the recommendation of the Faculty Affairs Committee contained in Senate Document 07-9.

Respectfully submitted,

George Bodner
Chair, University Senate
TO: University Senate
FROM: Ray DeCarlo, Chairperson, Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Résumé of Items under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

STEERING COMMITTEE
Raymond A. DeCarlo, Chairperson
decarlo@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
George M. Bodner, Chairperson of the Senate

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
Natalie J. Carroll, Chairperson
ncarroll@purdue.edu

The Nominating Committee is responsible for presenting nominations for the University Senate and University committees. In filling committee vacancies the Nominating Committee seeks to have all interested Senators serve on at least one committee.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
James D. McGlothlin, Chairperson
jdm3@purdue.edu

1. Evening exams
2. Implementation of Redlining Policy
3. Faculty Control over University Curriculum
4. Teaching Evaluation
5. Honors Program Report to the EPC

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
David J. Williams, Chairperson
diw@purdue.edu

1. Proposed Policy on Amorous Relationships
3. Revised Executive Memorandum C-22; Integrity in Research

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Lee Weith, Chairperson
weith@purdue.edu

1. Review of the Student Bill of Rights
2. Follow-up concerning the Student Conduct Code
3. Follow-up with Student Services Office concerning disciplinary process

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE
Morris Levy, Chairperson
levy0@purdue.edu

1. Faculty input into the budgetary process: enhancing excellence in research and graduate education
2. Review of campus energy sufficiency and other Physical Facilities operations
3. Review of Faculty Committees
4. Review of ITaP proposal to discontinue dial-up service for the Purdue community.

Chair of the Senate, George M. Bodner, gmbodner@purdue.edu
Vice Chair of the Senate, Raymond A. DeCarlo, decarlo@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., jcamp@purdue.edu
University Senate Minutes; http://www.purdue.edu/usenate
# CALENDAR OF STATUS OF LEGISLATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATE DOCUMENT</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*07-1</td>
<td>University Limits on Clinical/Professional Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Approved 10/15/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*07-2</td>
<td>Proposed Parental Leave Policy</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Passed 11/19/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-3</td>
<td>Change to the University Senate Bylaws</td>
<td>Professor and Chair, George M. Bodner</td>
<td>Defeated 10/15/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*07-4</td>
<td>Reapportionment of the Senate</td>
<td>Professor and Vice Chair, Raymond A. DeCarlo</td>
<td>Passed 11/19/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-5</td>
<td>Change to the University Academic Regulations- Grade Index Adjustment</td>
<td>Professor James D. McGlothlin</td>
<td>Amended 1/28/08 Referred to Committee 2/18/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-6</td>
<td>Evening Examination Schedule</td>
<td>Professor James D. McGlothlin</td>
<td>For Discussion 2/18/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*07-7</td>
<td>Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the University Senate</td>
<td>Professor Natalie J. Carroll</td>
<td>Approved 3/17/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*07-8</td>
<td>Disbandment of the Collective Bargaining Committee</td>
<td>Professor David J. Williams</td>
<td>Approved 3/17/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*07-9</td>
<td>CIC Statement on Publishing Agreements</td>
<td>Professor David J. Williams</td>
<td>Passed 3/17/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*07-10</td>
<td>Nominees for the University Senate Steering and Nominating Committees</td>
<td>Professor Natalie J. Carroll</td>
<td>Approved 3/17/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*07-11</td>
<td>Nominees for Faculty Committees</td>
<td>Professor Natalie J. Carroll</td>
<td>Approved 3/17/08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Approved
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATE REPORTS</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-1</td>
<td>Report of Policy on Research Misconduct</td>
<td>Professor George M. Bodner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-2</td>
<td>Report of Interpretation of Policy on Intellectual Property</td>
<td>Professor George M. Bodner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-3</td>
<td>Report of Response to Investigation of Proposed Termination of ITaP Dial-up Modem Services</td>
<td>University Resources Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-4</td>
<td>Report of Response to Petition from College of Agriculture re Physical Facilities Services for Construction and Renovation</td>
<td>University Resources Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-5</td>
<td>Report of the ad hoc committee on the Revision of C-22</td>
<td>Professor Raymond A. DeCarlo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Ad Hoc University Senate Committee  
From: Ray DeCarlo (Chair), Charles Bouman, Kristine Holtvedt, Charlene Sullivan, Alyssa Panitch, Lefteri Tsoukalas  
Subject: Revision of C22  
Disposition: Final report to the Senate for Information  

This report details comments on the revision of C22 on Research Misconduct. The report also compares some aspects of the policy with the University of Minnesota, Stanford, and MIT. The policy at the University of Minnesota was generated with a three pass interaction their senate executive committee before being approved by the senate and their board of regents. The Stanford policy also seems to have been approved by the University Senate. IU had its policy approved by the University Faculty Council.

There are three parts to this report. Part 1 deals with the continued development process for the revision of C22. Part 2 deals with content issues on a revision of C22. Part 3 provides a footnoted sample structure with a detailed front end of a possible C22 policy revision.

PART 1. DOCUMENT GENERATION

1. Expectation/Recommendation: The continued development and revision of the “Revised C22” will take place within a “to be determined” faculty senate committee in conjunction with appropriate administrative officials. The motivation for a faculty based committee is that research integrity is a core principle of academic life and its negation, research misconduct, has damaging fall out to individuals, the entire Purdue community, and society at large.

2. Expectation/Recommendation: the full revised policy will be discussed at a senate meeting and be approved by the senate (as has been the case at other CIC and non-CIC institutions) prior to being submitted to the Board of Trustees. If the administration chooses to do otherwise, then the Senate may of course have its own post BoT approval discussions. Collegiality suggests a more cooperative development, approval, and implementation process.

3. Recommendation: Have the draft policy looked at by an external (legal) agency for compliance with federal and state laws/guidelines. Also, to what extent can the process be made consistent with sunshine laws? One expects the process to be public and the proceedings to be confidential.
PART 2. DOCUMENT CONTENT

1. The first item here is to set forth comparisons with University of Minnesota, Stanford, and MIT Documents. A common structure to all policies reviewed by this committee is the initial evaluation stage, an inquiry stage, and an investigative stage. Some articulations are more clear than others. The University of Minnesota document clearly identifies the various steps in a process of allegation reporting to its disposition in an easy to follow and understandable format. The Stanford document also has a clearly articulated process with well-stated definitions and objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Minnesota</th>
<th>Purdue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to submit a complaint?</td>
<td>Any form of communication to university official.</td>
<td>It would appear to be to the RIO either verbally or in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who reviews complaint/allegation?</td>
<td>*RIO must have no conflict of interest (COI)</td>
<td>*No procedures to that effect in PU document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*RIO determines if complaint/allegation is credible</td>
<td>*Rio determines if complaint/allegation is credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is inquiry handled?</td>
<td>*the RIO confers with the complainant and then the respondent.</td>
<td>*the RIO sends a written notice to the respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*subsequent decision to convene the inquiry personally or with a panel</td>
<td>*RIO nominates/forms a committee and certifies that members do not have a COI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Panel members made known to both complainant and respondent who may object to panel members</td>
<td>*No procedures appear to be in document in which the complainant and respondent are informed of or allowed to object to committee/panel members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is investigation handled?</td>
<td>*Same membership as Inquiry Panel; if more expertise is needed consults with Faculty Senate Research Committee.</td>
<td>*investigative committee are not members of the inquiry committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*RIO engages outside consultation if additional expertise is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*no checks and balances or formal consultation with a Senate Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is evidence examined?</td>
<td>*outlines what examining the evidence entails, what respondents defense is etc.</td>
<td>*No info provided on either point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is final disposition notification time line?</td>
<td>*stipulation to notify respondent(s) within 15 days of receiving report from investigative committee</td>
<td>*No time line whatsoever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the appeal process?</td>
<td>*none</td>
<td>*Appeal to President who can overrule the decision of the investigative committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*no elements of surprise</td>
<td>*allows president to use other (potentially political or dollar related) considerations to surprise university community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about “retaliation”/protection</td>
<td>*retaliation against a complainant not tolerated</td>
<td>*retaliation against a complainant not tolerated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**When a complaint has been brought in good faith, even if mistakenly, the University will provide appropriate support to the reporting employee. Individuals who provide information to assist in resolving of a complaint are also protected. ...**

*no protection provided by university except in the case of helping to restore a good name post proceedings.*

* The Minnesota process has much less of an element of "surprise to it" relative to PU. The respondent is given several opportunities to intervene in the process at Minn but it appears otherwise at PU.

* Ought not the Purdue policy to have both individual and institutional protections for participants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>MIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to submit a complaint?</td>
<td>Dean of appropriate school.</td>
<td>Any form of communication to university official.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who reviews complaint/allegation?</td>
<td>*Dean of appropriate school. *Dean decides whether provided info constitutes specific, credible and provable research misconduct.</td>
<td>Supervisor of the alleged offender notifies Vice President for Research (VPR) who appoints an impartial fact finding committee to conduct the inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is inquiry handled?</td>
<td>*Personally by Dean of pertinent college or by a dean appointed committee after informing Dean of Research (apparently equivalent to Purdue’s VPR). *Related external funding sources identified. *60 days to completion with report to Dean of Research *obtain, sequester, and review all relevant research records. *interview all pertinent persons.</td>
<td>*Inquiry promptly initiated promptly after written allegations/evidence become known and brought to VPR *Respondent notified in writing by the VPR relevant senior officer. *May require the involvement of the person bringing the allegation. *May include involvement t of relevant laboratory directors, department head, or vice president. *written report is produced summarizing the process, reviewing information and concluding whether or not an investigation is warranted. *draft copy of the report is provided to the alleged offender who may comment. *VPR forwards report to Provost (an possibly others) with a recommendation whether or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is investigation handled?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Start within 30 days of completion of Inquiry</em></td>
<td><em>VPR appoints a fact finder or Investigating Committee that may include members from outside MIT.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Completion with report sent to Dean of Research within 90 days.</em></td>
<td><em>Investigation final report is sent to VPR who notifies the alleged offender and Provost with a recommendation.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Complete review of all documents and interviews of all witnesses—including complainant.</em></td>
<td><em>Provost makes final decision on disciplinary actions.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Amass “…all necessary and appropriate information.”</em></td>
<td><em>Provost may mitigate the effects of misconduct by withdrawing MIT’s name and sponsorship from pending abstracts and papers and by notifying persons known to have relied upon any work affected by the misconduct.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How is evidence examined?</th>
<th>See inquiry.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigation Committee examines all relevant documentation and interviews all individuals who are involved or may have pertinent information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is final disposition notification time line?</th>
<th>Within 90 days of the initiation of the investigation allowing 30 days for disciplinary action.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No specific timeline. The Investigation should be initiated promptly and should be completed as expeditiously as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the appeal process?</th>
<th>Does not appear to be one.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What about “retaliation” and protection?</th>
<th><em>Good faith reporting will not jeopardize employment</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>None of any sort tolerated</em></td>
<td><em>Reprisal and any time against the person bringing the allegation is an act of misconduct subject to disciplinary actions.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Appropriate action should be taken against anyone found to have brought intentionally dishonest charges.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Unlike PU, the Stanford policy informs respondent about findings and offers opportunity to respond and have response appended to report; complainant is also given portions of draft report pertinent to his/her opinions and is given an opportunity to respond with responses appended to final report.
2. The proposed revision of C22 concentrates too much power and arbitrary decision making latitude and authority in the RIO, an administrative appointee of the university. The potential for “mishandling” is exacerbated by little if any oversight and accountability. Mechanisms need to be established to insure that research misconduct proceedings will (i) occur in a timely manner and (ii) fairly consider all evidence, all possible witnesses with information, etc. prior to any decision.

One speculates that the main concern of the University Administration and thus their preoccupation for being in charge of the whole process is that research misconduct puts so much future grant money at risk. The Stanford policy is particularly sensitive to this issue. Nevertheless, the process belongs with the faculty, who by their activities determine and constitute the research reputation of the university (not the administration) and who must take ownership of the process. Conclusion: the process should never be separated from faculty oversight. At the University of Illinois Chicago, a faculty member serves the role of RIO.

Recommendations:

(i) A flow chart and time line of the entire process from filing of an allegation/complaint to its disposition needs to be part of the document, possibly in an appendix. Specific time frames and notifications need to be clearly and concisely explicated.

(ii) Form a Committee on Research Integrity to cooperate with and provide faculty oversight of RIO decisions. Probably need to change bylaws of senate.

(iii) This (to be formed) Committee on Research Integrity would also insure that there are no conflicts of interest among any of the evaluators including the RIO.

(iii). Checks and balances (formal mechanisms) need to be established so that investigative and decision making power be distributed amongst the members of the aforementioned committee of the senate on academic/research integrity to maximize a fair and speedy process and minimize potential misuses of influence by all involved parties. Hence, the RIO should also be accountable to a senate committee as well as to the VPR.

3. The proposed revision of C22 puts a blanket of secrecy under the rubric of confidentiality over the entire process from the initial reporting of an allegation to the final disposition. It is important to respect privacy and confidentiality. Proceedings must be confidential. As much as possible of the process ought to be public, e.g., the names of inquiry/investigative committee members. These committee members must be indemnified by the university in exchange for their service. The final disposition ought to be made public whenever possible, e.g., a statement of the following form could be issued: the preponderance of evidence, by a unanimous decision of the investigative committee, is that no research misconduct took place, but rather unintentional errors of method and judgment led to the allegations.

This is a difficult issue and the preponderance of schools seems to lean toward the side of increased confidentiality. The Stanford University Policy reads:

The anonymity of respondents and, if they wish it, the confidentiality of complainants shall be protected (where feasible), and care shall be taken to protect the positions and reputations of those involved in the research (including research subjects) and in the research misconduct proceedings from harm (including retaliation). Except as required in the reporting provisions above, only those directly involved in an inquiry or investigation or with a need to know should be aware that the process is being conducted or have any access to information obtained during its course. Where appropriate, efforts will be made to restore the reputations of the respondent(s) when allegations are not confirmed.
And the University of Illinois at UC has the statement: “Protection of confidentiality does not preclude disclosures that are necessary in the process of handling allegations of misconduct, are in the public interest, or are a component of sanctions and/or corrective action in the resolution of allegations of academic misconduct.”

Nevertheless, while the process has to be transparent, there still needs to be a high degree of confidentiality. This is especially important given that mistakes are made and people may be wrongly accused. The senate has a lot of faculty members and there is real potential for information to “slip out.” Hence the formation of a senate committee on research would need to be carefully developed, and its members pledged to uphold confidentiality.

4. The revised C22 allows for a person to be accused of research misconduct by someone who would not be identified and the accused person would have to defend themselves with their own resources. As in a court of law, should not the accused know his/her accuser?

Given the competitive market for grants and distinguished professorships, what keeps someone from using this process to marginalize or eliminate a competitor. Are we so ethically pure or naive to think this could not happen?

5. The principle of "innocent until proven guilty" should be operative throughout.

In this regard all parties associated with allegations of misconduct should be treated with respect and impartiality. All parties should be provided with a "safe" neutral environment when interacting with the RIO or any inquiry/investigative committee or its members. Without evidence to the contrary, benefit of the doubt should be given. In the appendix of the revised C22, on page 4, item 6, "To make a finding of Research Misconduct, the committee must conclude the evidence before it establishes that it is more likely than not that: (a) ... (b) ... (c) ..." This statement seems to lean on the side of guilty and not be consistent with the principle of innocent until proven guilty. Item (b) is intrinsically problematic as noted in the draft template at the end of this report.

6. Appendix: page 5 item iv: should the respondent have the shorter of ? 15 days of the period specified by any applicable federal regulations? If 15 days is longer, can we exceed them?

7. Links on Academic Misconduct

   (i) AAUP
   http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementon+proceduralstandardsinfaculty+dismissal+proceedings.htm

   (ii) UIUC
   http://www.vpaa.uillinois.edu/policies/ai_document.asp

   (iii) Penn State
   http://guru.psu.edu/policies/RA10.html

   (iii) Univ of MI
   http://www.research.umich.edu/policies/um/integrity_policy.html
Notes: (a) The faculty governance structure would be involved secondarily if a grievance or dismissal proceeding were started. Each Vice President has a faculty governance advisory committee so there is input into the creation of these policies.

(b) There are a number of links on this site to government agencies with related policies.

(iv) IU

(a) IU’s research misconduct policies are incorporated as policy approved by the University Faculty Council. The University Faculty Council approved a revised version of the Policy and Procedures on Research Misconduct on April 24, 2007. The revised version of the Policy and Procedures on Research Misconduct was sent to the Board of Trustees for approval, and is awaiting further action.

(b) The Policy can be viewed at
http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/docs/policies/ResearchMisconduct.pdf
PART 3. SAMPLE FRONT END AND STRUCTURE OF A C22 REVISION

The draft below is a recommended template for how C22 ought to begin and be rewritten for coherency and content. After a detailed rewriting of the front end, a structure is presented for the revision of the remainder of C22. It is recommended that Purdue University develop its own policy, but borrow the best from other CIC universities and from Stanford University.

I would like to thank my committee members (Alyssa Panitch, Charlene Sullivan, Kristine Holtvedt, Lefteri Tsoukalas, and Charles Bowman) and especially Martin Curd, Senator from Philosophy, who have helped shape this sample draft of the front end of a possible policy on Research Misconduct.

PREAMBLE

Integrity with regard to discovery, scholarly investigations, and the recording and reporting of these activities is a core principle of university/professorial/student life and is essential to the scientific method. The proper conduct of scientific and scholarly research serves the best interests of the university community and society. Hence, a commitment to truth, objectivity, honesty, free inquiry, and fiscal responsibility in the use of research funds should guide all University research efforts. Those participating in research or scholarly efforts are expected to maintain careful research records, establish and follow well-defined protocols consistent with all state, federal and university guidelines, and to report discoveries and observations accurately and fairly.

The policy described below affirms the University’s commitment to research integrity and its responsibility to investigate and evaluate allegations of research misconduct (formally defined below) made against a member of the university community or against someone who collaborates with Purdue University researchers and has a claimed official affiliation.¹

POLICY STATEMENT

Purdue University shall provide a just, thorough, competent, and objective response to all Allegations of Research Misconduct by following the procedures outlined in this Policy pursuant to their compliance with all federal and state guidelines. Research Misconduct² means the fabrication or falsification of data, research procedures, or data analysis; destruction of data for fraudulent purposes; plagiarism; abuse of confidentiality; or other fraudulent actions in proposing, performing, reviewing, or reporting the results of research or other scholarly activity. Purdue

¹ The Stanford University policy on Research Misconduct.
² More or less verbatim from the University of Minnesota Policy.
University distinguishes between academic misconduct and unintentional error(s) and other ambiguities of interpretation that are inherent in the scientific and scholarly process, but are ordinarily corrected by further research. An allegation is a disclosure of possible academic misconduct by a written communication either directly or indirectly to the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) of the university (e.g., indirectly through a school head or college dean).

For the process detailed in this document to arrive at a finding of research misconduct, it must be demonstrated that:

(i) the allegation concerns misconduct as defined in this document;
(ii) the misconduct is committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; and
(iii) the allegation is proven by a preponderance of the evidence.

(Note that Purdue University’s disciplinary procedures may establish a different standard of proof for disciplinary actions.)

It is noted that some federal funding agencies have their own policies regarding research misconduct, and require notification to the agency in the event of such an allegation or investigation. Where required, this notification will be made by the VPR.

While federal funding agencies recognize that the primary responsibility for the prevention and detection of misconduct, and for the conduct of inquiries and investigations, rests with the awarded institution, a number of agencies have retained the right to initiate their own investigations at any time.

Pertinent definitions are now presented:

3 These criteria are from the Stanford University policy except for point (i). See footnote following point (i).
4 In the Stanford University policy, (i) reads as follows: there is a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant discipline. As was pointed out to the committee by Professor Curd, this is problematic at best: (i) The original Stanford policy statement of (i) seems misplaced since it appears to be part of a definition of research misconduct rather than one of the conditions that must be met before arriving at a finding of research misconduct; one imagines that the intention of (i) is to rule that a finding of misconduct will delivered only if the behavior of the researcher or scholar differs significantly (non sufficiently quantitative) from that of others in his or her field ("accepted practices"). This leads to the following problem: do we want to say that no misconduct has occurred if X has done what most other people in his or her field do, even though conditions (ii) and (iii) are satisfied? Given the wording of (ii) and (iii) that would mean that the preponderance of evidence might prove that there has been misconduct.
5 More or Less Verbatim from the Stanford University Policy.
6 More or less verbatim from the Stanford University Policy.
**Fabrication** means making up data or results and recording or reporting them.

**Falsification** means manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results so that the research involved is not accurately represented in the research record.

**Plagiarism** means the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.\(^7\)

**Research Integrity Officer (RIO)**
The RIO is the institutional official, with oversight by the VPR and the University Senate Committee on Research Integrity (to be created) has primary responsibility for directing the case from allegation review through disposition.

**EXCLUSIONS**
This policy does not apply to allegations of misconduct occurring outside the research setting. Allegations that do not constitute research misconduct are addressed by other University policies.

Further, conduct that took place more than six years prior to an allegation of Research Misconduct is not subject to this Policy unless (i) the public health, safety, or welfare may be threatened by a failure to address the allegation, or (ii) within the last six years such alleged research misconduct has been part of a continued pattern of fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism.

\(^8\)Scholastic dishonesty by a student in the performance of academic work is a violation of the Student Conduct Code. Complaints of alleged scholastic dishonesty are resolved in accordance with established collegiate and Student Conduct Code policies and procedures. In cases where a student is accused of misconduct while working on sponsored University research, the initial question of whether academic misconduct occurred will be determined according to the policy outlined in this document and the sponsor's regulations.

**PROCESS FOR FILING AN ALLEGATION OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT**
(a) Process details concisely: who, what, how
(b) Responsibilities of Complainant, concisely.
(c) Protections afforded to Complainant, concisely.

**INITIAL EVALUATION OF ALLEGATION**
(a) Principle of Innocent until Proven Guilty is operative.

\(^7\) In the original definition, this sentence is followed by another that says “Plagiarism does not include disputes about authorship or credit.” Thus the second sentence would at the least undermine the first sentence that ends with the phrase “without giving appropriate credit.”

\(^8\) Taken more or less verbatim from the University of Minnesota Policy.
(b) Process for evaluation of the merits of the allegation, concisely.
(c) Initiation of an inquiry process or termination of further consideration.
   (i) To whom and how is a report made?
(d) Responsibilities of RIO and Senate Research Committee Representative(s).

QUESTION: Who evaluates potential conflicts of interest?
(e) Rights and Responsibilities of complainant and respondent.
(f) Protections afforded to respondent, complainant, and Research Committee Representative.
(g) Time line for completion of each phase of initial evaluation.
(h) Procedures for dealing with false allegations. (Remark: The problem of false allegations must be handled effectively and efficiently to prevent tarnished reputations and wasted time.)

INQUIRY PROCESS

(a) Principle of Innocent until Proven Guilty is operative.
(b) Definition: “An inquiry consists of preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding to determine whether an allegation or an apparent instance of misconduct has substance. The outcome of an inquiry is a determination as to whether or not an investigation is to be conducted.”
(c) Concise Inquiry Process Description. This should include criteria for obtaining evidence and its evaluation. Evidence of allegations and rebuttal material needs to be provided along the legal lines of discovery—where both sides have access to all evidence. Should not the respondent be able to know who has provided an allegation?
(d) Responsibilities of RIO and Senate Research Committee Representative(s)
(e) Rights and Responsibilities of complainant and respondent
(f) Protections afforded to respondent and complainant.
(g) Initiation of an investigative process or termination of further consideration.
   (i) To whom and how is a report made?
(h) Time line from inception to completion of inquiry process.

REMARK: Should not all university individuals officially participating in the evaluation of an allegation be indemnified by Purdue University?

INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS (Flow and concerns similar to Inquiry Process)

(a) Definition: “An investigation is a formal examination and evaluation of relevant facts to determine whether or not misconduct has taken place.”

9 Taken verbatim from Stanford University Policy.
10 Taken verbatim from Stanford University Policy.
DISPOSITION AND REPORTING  
(a) Reporting of conclusions/decisions to the parties involved.  
(b) Reporting of conclusions/decisions to the university community and public.

PROCEDURES FOR CORRECTING RESEARCH MISCONDUCT AS WELL AS POSSIBLE PENALTIES.

APPEAL PROCESS

REMARKS:
1. *Should a decision be considered final in light of new evidence unless such is in violation of federal and/or state laws/procedures?*

2. An appeal to the Purdue University President could lead to a “surprise”? Would such be in the best interest of the faculty? Could Purdue University officials in wanting to preserve federal funding have a conflict of interest? If an appeal is allowed, should it not go to more than one person just as with the judicial system? Otherwise, the president would be granting a pardon? Should an appeal only be allowed if there is new evidence? There is concern here that a group of peers will spend time agonizing over material and make a difficult decision knowing that if they find a colleague guilty of research misconduct, then an appeal will be filed and the process is going to start over again. Much time would then have been wasted.

ARCHIVING OF REPORTS AND EVIDENCE.
TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Nominating Committee
SUBJECT: Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the University Senate
REFERENCES: Bylaws, Section 3.20b, c
DISPOSITION: Election by the University Senate

The Nominating Committee proposes the following slate of nominees to serve as vice chairperson of the University Senate for the academic year 2008-2009. The nominees for chairperson are:

J. Paul Robinson  Basic Medical Sciences
Howard N. Zelaznik  Health & Kinesiology

The resumes are attached.

Approving:
Patrice Buzzanell
Natalie Carroll
Phillip Dunston
Nancy Edwards
William McInerney
Mary B. Nakhleh
Yuehwern Yih

************************************************************************************************************

**J. Paul Robinson**

J. Paul Robinson is the SVM Professor of Cytomics in the School of Veterinary Medicine and a professor in the Weldon School of Biomedical Engineering at Purdue University. He received his Ph.D. in Immunopathology from the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia. He completed a postdoctoral fellowship at the University Of Michigan Medical School. He is currently the director of the Purdue University Cytometry Laboratories and Deputy Director for Cytomics and Imaging in the Bindley Biosciences Center in Discovery Park.

He is the current President of the *International Society for Analytical Cytology* and is the Editor-in-Chief of *Current Protocols in Cytometry*, Associate Editor of *Histochemica et Cytobiologica*, and Associate Editor of *Cytometry Part A*. He is an active researcher with over 125 peer reviewed publications, 20 book chapters, has edited 7 books and has given over 100 international lectures and taught advanced courses in over a dozen countries. Dr. Robinson was one of the first scientists to engage the internet when he established the PUCL public website in December 1993 and it became the foundation site for his field with over 10 million hits per year to the current day. Based on the same technology, he was an early adopter of web-based educational materials by publishing the first known published web-based-CDROM in April 1996. With over a dozen published CD-ROMs with a total distribution of 65,000 CDs and recently 20,000 copies of a double DVD set published in 2007 he has effectively utilized the power of multimedia technology in his field of science. He was elected to the College of Fellows, *American Institute for**
Medical and Biological Engineering in 2004, was the winner of the Pfizer Award for Innovative Research, 2004 and the Gamma Sigma Delta Award of Merit Research in 2002. He has participated in numerous NIH, NSF and private foundation review boards.

His research area has focused on reactive oxygen species primarily in neutrophils, cell lines such as HL-60 cells. His lab is currently studying the biochemical pathways of apoptosis as related to reactive oxygen species in mitochondria. Over the past several years, his group has expanded their interest in bioengineering with hardware and software groups developing innovative technologies such as the first high-speed hyperspectral cytometry, optical tools for quantitative fluorescence measurement and advanced classification approaches for clinical diagnostics and bacterial classification. His lab specializes in multidisciplinary research projects and this is reflected in backgrounds of the 66 graduate students committees he has sat on of which he was chair for 23 PHD and 12 MS students. A total of 19 students were in an engineering discipline.

A recent activity of Dr. Robinson was the creation of a new private foundation, “Cytometry for Life” with the goal of providing low cost CD4 technology to those nations most in need of these tools, initially focusing on countries in Africa where over 30 million people suffer from AIDS. The foundation activities include design and manufacture of appropriate low cost CD4 technology, and development of an on-the-ground effort in education and training in AIDS related activities in Africa. http://www.cytometryforlife.org.

In his 19 years at Purdue, Dr. Robinson has served on numerous university committees such as patents and copyright, senate steering, nomination and educational policy committees, executive committee of the Envision Center, Bindley Bioscience Center Executive Committee, Cancer Center committees, Purdue Libraries Research Committee, BMS Graduate Committee Chair, and Purdue Research Park Advisory Committee to name but a few. He has actively participated or chaired many faculty search committees and considers the participation of faculty in all of these university activities fundamental to the needs of an excellent institution.

******************************************************************************

Howard N. Zelaznik

Howard N. Zelaznik is a Professor of Health and Kinesiology, and currently a member of the University Senate. In addition, he is a member of the Purdue University Integrative Program in Neuroscience and holds an appointment in the Department of Psychological Sciences. Howie (as he is called) was a member of the Senate in the middle 1980s, serving on the Educational Policy Committee. He also served as a member of the Purdue IRB, serving as Chair from 1994 - 2002. From 1999 to 2004 he was Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education in the College of Liberal Arts. His research is focused on the behavioral and neural processes of human movement timing, and he is funded by NSF. He has also been a co-investigator on a 20-year continually funded NIH project on the physiological correlates of stuttering (Anne Smith, PI). One of his research papers has over 500 citations, one other over 100, and recently he has published in Science. He is a fellow in the Association for Psychological Science and fellow in the American Academy for Kinesiology and Physical Education. In his spare time he referees high school soccer, and trains for marathons with several Purdue faculty who wish to remain unnamed.
TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Nominating Committee
SUBJECT: Nominees for University Senate Steering and Nominating Committees
REFERENCE: Bylaws of the University Senate
DISPOSITION: Election by the University Senate

The Nominating Committee proposes the following nominees for service on the University Senate Nominating and Steering Committees. The persons elected are to serve the period of years shown following each name. Resumes of the nominees are attached.

A. For the three vacancies on the Steering Committee, the following six faculty members are proposed:

John Denton 3 Electrical & Computer Engineering Technology
Chong Gu 1 Statistics
Samuel Midkiff 2 Electrical & Computer Engineering
Martin Okos 3 Agricultural & Biological Engineering
J. Paul Robinson 1 Basic Medical Sciences
Mara Wasburn 2 Organizational Leadership & Supervision

B. For the two vacancies on the Nominating Committee, the following four faculty members are proposed:

Michael Hill 3 Veterinary Clinical Sciences
Kathryn Orvis 3 Youth Development & Agricultural Education
Melissa Remis 3 Anthropology
Wei Zheng 3 Health Sciences

Approving:
James Becker
Patrice M. Buzzanell
Natalie Carroll
Nancy Edwards
William McInerney
Mary Nakhleh
Yuehwern Yih
John P. Denton

John Denton is an Associate Professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering Technology. He teaches wireless communication and analog electronic courses to junior and senior undergraduates. He is the author of co-author of over 70 journal and conference papers ranging in topics from nanotechnology research to teaching methods. He is a member of IEEE and ASEE. He is currently active in the IEEE Communication Society certification program.

Chong Gu

Chong Gu is a Professor in the Department of Statistics. He teaches a variety of courses, including introductory statistics courses for undergraduate and graduate students in engineering and sciences and advanced graduate courses for statistics majors. His research concerns the development of theory, methodology, algorithms, and open-source software for nonparametric function estimation. His research has been supported by NSF and NIH and he has served as proposal review panelist for those agencies on multiple occasions. He is also an active member of the Purdue Badminton Club and has been serving as its faculty advisor since 2001.

Samuel Midkiff

Samuel Midkiff is an Associate Professor in the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE). Before coming to Purdue in 2002, he was at the IBM T. J. Watson Research Center, where he was a lead member of several projects and was awarded 4 patents and an IBM Outstanding Technical Achievement Award. He is currently the Director of Graduate Admissions for ECE, chairs the Computer Engineering Faculty Search Committee and is on the Computing Research Institute Steering Committee. Sam teaches compilers, software tools, and parallel programming, and has authored 43 journal and full-length journal quality conference publications. He has chaired or co-chaired 2 conferences, 8 workshops, and two Dagstuhl seminars in Germany.

Universities are largely self-governed institutions, and the decisions that are made by different groups, formal and informal, within the University significantly impact our ability to fulfill our core missions of learning, discovery and engagement. In particular, because faculty time is a limited resource, decisions made by the Senate can have a significant effect on the ability of the faculty and staff to advance these core missions. A major motivation for leaving IBM for academia was that I wanted the chance to have a more immediate impact on the lives of students and the institutions that prepare them for their professional life. Serving on the Steering Committee will allow me to have both a better understanding of the issues that confront the larger Purdue community, and the chance to positively influence the direction our university takes.
Martin Okos

Martin Okos began his career at Purdue in 1975 and is currently a Professor in the Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering with appointments in the School of Chemical Engineering and in the Department of Food Science. His primary responsibility is in teaching and research. He teaches the senior capstone design courses for the BFPE majors in the Department of Agricultural and Biological Engineering. Dr. Okos has authored or co-authored over 200 publications in the area of biological and food process engineering. He has developed the first ABET accredited Food Process Engineering undergraduate program in the country and has been recognized as the department’s outstanding counselor.

J. Paul Robinson

J. Paul Robinson is the SVM Professor of Cytomics in the School of Veterinary Medicine and a professor in the Weldon School of Biomedical Engineering at Purdue University. He received his Ph.D. in Immunopathology from the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia. He completed a postdoctoral fellowship at the University Of Michigan Medical School. He is currently the director of the Purdue University Cytometry Laboratories and Deputy Director for Cytomics and Imaging in the Bindley Biosciences Center in Discovery Park. He is the current President of the International Society for Analytical Cytology and is the Editor-in-Chief of Current Protocols in Cytometry, Associate Editor of Histochemica et Cytobiologica, and Associate Editor of Cytometry Part A. He is an active researcher with over 125 peer reviewed publications, 20 book chapters, has edited 7 books and has given over 100 international lectures and taught advanced courses in over a dozen countries. Dr. Robinson was one of the first scientists to engage the internet when he established the PUCL public website in December 1993 and it became the foundation site for his field with over 10 million hits per year to the current day. Based on the same technology, he was an early adopter of web-based educational materials by publishing the first known published web-based-CDROM in April 1996. With over a dozen published CD-ROMs with a total distribution of 65,000 CDs and recently 20,000 copies of a double DVD set published in 2007 he has effectively utilized the power of multimedia technology in his field of science. He was elected to the College of Fellows, American Institute for Medical and Biological Engineering in 2004, was the winner of the Pfizer Award for Innovative Research, 2004 and the Gamma Sigma Delta Award of Merit Research in 2002. He has participated in numerous NIH, NSF and private foundation review boards.

His research area has focused on reactive oxygen species primarily in neutrophils, cell lines such as HL-60 cells. His lab is currently studying the biochemical pathways of apoptosis as related to reactive oxygen species in mitochondria. Over the past several years, his group has expanded their interest in bioengineering with hardware and software groups developing innovative technologies such as the first high-speed hyperspectral cytometry, optical tools for quantitative fluorescence measurement and advanced classification approaches for clinical diagnostics and bacterial classification. His lab specializes in multidisciplinary research projects and this is reflected in backgrounds of the 66 graduate students committees he has sat on of which he was chair for 23 PHD and 12 MS students. A total of 19 students were in an engineering discipline.

A recent activity of Dr. Robinson was the creation of a new private foundation, “Cytometry for Life” with the goal of providing low cost CD4 technology to those nations most in need of these tools, initially focusing on countries in Africa where over 30 million people suffer from AIDS. The foundation activities include design and manufacture of appropriate low cost CD4 technology,

In his 19 years at Purdue, Dr. Robinson has served on numerous university committees such as patents and copyright, senate steering, nomination and educational policy committees, executive committee of the Envision Center, Bindley Bioscience Center Executive Committee, Cancer Center committees, Purdue Libraries Research Committee, BMS Graduate Committee Chair, and Purdue Research Park Advisory Committee to name but a few. He has actively participated or chaired many faculty search committees and considers the participation of faculty in all of these university activities fundamental to the needs of an excellent institution.

**Mara Wasburn**

Mara Wasburn is a 2nd year associate professor of Organizational Leadership in the College of Technology. Her research focuses on team-based mentoring, with two areas of particular interest: faculty mentoring and mentoring women in non-traditional disciplines. Wasburn developed a *Women in Technology* program for her College, and is on their Committee to Revise Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. She is also a member of the Purdue University Press and Campus Appeals Boards. Wasburn served as a consultant to the University Senate’s Faculty Affairs Mentoring Subcommittee, and helped draft the mentoring guidelines for Purdue’s Faculty Mentoring Network. She is Co-PI on a multi-university National Science Foundation grant investigating the relationship of climate and pedagogy to the retention of women engineering students.

**NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

**Michael Hill**

Michael Hill is an Associate Professor in the department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences. His primary responsibility is in coordinating and teaching in three courses related to Behavior, Husbandry, Diagnostic and Therapeutic Techniques in all the major domesticated species (food source animals, horses, and smaller companion animals). These are freshman and sophomore courses. He also coordinates and participates in a course Clinical Nutrition in Large Animals 1 for junior students. His specific species interest is in swine and he is part of the Production Medicine team. Lameness in pigs is his main area of research interest and he has authored/co-authored 21 articles related to bone and joint development and diseases and 3 book chapters related to lameness in pigs. Other research interests include infectious diseases in pigs and modulation of growth associated with various feed additives (12 articles both). He is a 4-H Council member in Clinton County and teaches some outreach classes in one of the county high schools.

**Kathryn Orvis**

Dr. Kathryn Orvis (B.S. Botany, Michigan State University; M.S., Ph.D Univ. Wisconsin, Plant breeding and genetics). Associate Professor for the Departments of Youth Development & Agriculture Education and Horticulture for Purdue University, 2000-present.

Dr. Orvis’s research program focuses on two areas: utilizing youth gardening and plants as teaching tools and biotechnology education. As the coordinator for Indiana Junior Master
Gardener program and 4-H plant science projects statewide, she provides state and regional training programs for Extension staff, volunteers, and teachers, and national leadership in research in youth gardening. In biotechnology education, Dr. Orvis teaches a University award winning distance education course Intro to Ag Biotech, and has worked on two collaborative projects to develop web based biotechnology educational materials and animations for middle and high school educators. Dr. Orvis also teaches HORT 101: Fundamentals of Horticulture in the fall semester. Additionally, she advises graduate students, and oversees Indiana plant related 4-H activities.

**Melissa Remis**

Dr. Melissa Remis is an Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology (PHD Yale 1994). Dr. Remis was named a Purdue University Faculty Scholar in 2006. Dr. Remis’ field-based research in the Central African Republic focuses on the behavioral ecology and nutrition of western gorillas, which were poorly known before she initiated her field research in the late 1980s. In addition to this ongoing work, she is currently engaged in a collaborative field program on human impacts on mammals and conservation in the Central African Republic. She also maintains an experimentally based research program on the evolution of feeding strategies among the African apes which employs research on captive apes in zoological facilities. She has authored or coauthored over 15 scientific articles in peer-reviewed journals such as the American Anthropologist, the *American Journal of Primatology*, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, *International Journal of Primatology*, and *Primates*. She has presented papers at national and international conferences and has been invited to participate at special conferences on gorilla ecology, primate locomotion and conservation that have resulted in additional publications in peer-reviewed books. She has served as a reviewer for granting agencies including NSF and academic journals in physical anthropology, primatology, ecology and conservation. She was named to the editorial board at *International Journal of Primatology* in 2003. At Purdue she teaches courses on Primate Ecology, Conservation and Behavior, Human Evolution, and Biological Anthropology at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. She has served as the primary advisor for 5 PHD students and 8 MS students and trained additional US and African graduate students in African field research and undergraduates from several institutions in zoo based research. She has served as Chair of search committees within her department, and currently serves as the undergraduate committee chair for Anthropology as it reworks its programs and assessment plans for its upcoming new department in ’08.

**Wei Zheng**

Dr. Zheng is a Full Professor of Health Sciences and a University Faculty Scholar in the School of Health Sciences. His research, founded by NIH and DoD since 1994, focuses on environmental causes of Parkinson’s and Alzheimer’s disease. He is currently the member of the Editorial Board of Experimental Biology and Medicine, Toxicology Letters, Cerebrospinal Fluid Research and Journal of Toxicology. He has been a regular member of several NIH study sections since 2003. Dr. Zheng also serves as a neurotoxicology consultant to both pharmaceutical industry and law firms for neurotoxicities of xenobiotics or drugs. He has organized, as the chair or co-chair, 9 international symposia, workshops, and conferences since 1999. In addition, Dr. Zheng is the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Life Plus, LLC, a toxicology service consulting firm based in Purdue Technology Park in West Lafayette, Indiana. For his expertise in environmental toxicology and public health policy, he was invited as the speaker for The George Bush China-U.S. Relations Conference in Washington D.C. in Oct 2007. Dr. Zheng has published one book, 94 peer-reviewed research papers, and more than 130 proceedings and conference publications.
Dr. Zheng obtained his Ph.D. degree at University of Arizona in 1991. After post/doc training, he started his career in 1993 as an Assistant Professor, in School of Public Health and College of Physicians and Surgeons at Columbia University in New York City, and was promoted to tenured Associate Professor in 2000. He came to Purdue University in 2003. He has since served in more than 10 committees (e.g., graduate committee-Chair, graduate program review committee-Chair, faculty search committee-Chair, faculty promotion and tenure guideline committee-Chair, schedule deputy, awards committee, grades appeal committee, faculty advisor to the pre-med club, faculty advisor to minority student association, college awards committee, college graduate committee, and Purdue University Toxicology Program-Associate Director). Above all these, He is an ardent tennis player at Purdue Schwartz Tennis Center.
TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Nominating Committee
SUBJECT: Nominees for Faculty Committees
REFERENCE: Bylaws of the University Senate
DISPOSITION: Election by the University Senate

The Nominating Committee proposes the following slates of nominees for service on the University faculty committees listed below. The faculty members elected are to serve for terms as specified:

A. **University Grade Appeals Committee**
   
   George Bodner  (CHM)
   Carol Ott   (Pharm. Pract.)
   Sharon Solwitz  (ENGL)

   for terms of service ending May 31, 2011.

B. **University Censure and Dismissal Procedures Committee**

   **As regular members:**
   Linda Chezem  (YDAE)
   (CDFS)
   Jan Lugowski  (MET)
   Ralph Webb  (COMM)
   William Zinsmeister  (EAS)

   **As alternate members:**
   Dan Mroczek
   Joel Ebarb   (VPA)

   for terms of service ending May 31, 2011.

**Approving:**
Jim Becker
Patrice Buzzanell
Natalie Carroll
Mary Nakhleh
Jie Shen
The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) recommends the disbandment of the Collective Bargaining Committee.

Rationale
It is believed the Collective Bargaining Faculty Committee was formed during the administration of President Arthur Hansen (1971-1982) at the request of members of the Purdue faculty who are now deceased. The committee seldom met and has not met in recent history.

Since the Purdue faculty is not unionized and collective bargaining is not soon coming, the Faculty Affairs Committee recommends disbanding the committee.

Approving:  
A. Beck
D. Buskirk
D. Jacobs
J. Mariga
C. Nakatsu
R. Plante
A. Rollock
V. Thomas
V. Watts
D. Williams
Y. Yih

Absent:  
V. Lechtenberg
C. Roper
E. Taparowski
W. Walton
The scholastic standing of all students enrolled in programs leading to a degree shall be determined by three scholastic indexes: the semester index, the cumulative index, and the graduation index.

1. The semester index is an average determined by weighting each grade received during a given academic session by the number of semester hours of credit in the course.

2. The cumulative index for an undergraduate student is a weighted average of all grades received as an undergraduate student. With the consent of his/her academic adviser, a student may repeat a course not intended for repeated registrations. In the case of such a repeated course, only the most recent grade received shall be included in the cumulative index. In the case of a course in which a conditional grade has been improved by examination, the most recent grade received shall be used. The cumulative index will be used by the University for reporting to external agencies.

3. The graduation index will be a modified form of the cumulative index and will be used by the University for all internal purposes. An authorized representative of the academic unit in which the student is registered or in which the student will be registered may approve the removal of no more than three courses totaling no more than 12 credit hours from the calculation of the graduation index under the following conditions: (1) the courses were completed during the first 24 months of the student’s enrollment as a full-time or part-time degree-seeking student, and (2) the courses are not required for the curriculum in which the student is enrolled. Courses that have been removed from the calculation of the graduation index can not be used to fulfill any requirements for graduation.

The scholastic standing of all undergraduate students enrolled in programs leading to a degree shall be determined by three scholastic grade point averages (GPA): The semester GPA (GPA), the cumulative GPA (GPA), and the program GPA (GPA).

1. The semester GPA is an average determined by weighting each grade received during a given academic session by the number of semester hours of credit in the course.

2. The cumulative GPA for an undergraduate student is a weighted average of all grades received as an undergraduate student. With the consent of his/her academic adviser, a student may repeat a course not intended for repeated registrations. In the case of such a repeated course, only the most recent grade received shall be included in the cumulative grade point average. In the case of a course in which a conditional grade has been improved by examination, the most recent grade received shall be used.

3. The program GPA is derived from a degree audit and will be used as a criterion to accept a student to a program during the process of Change of Degree Objective (CODO). The degree audit relevant to the program to which a student transfers is used to determine the program grade point average. In a case where no courses of the initial program apply to the new program, the same criteria for acceptance to a program may be used as for a student applying out of high school.
To: The University Senate
From: Faculty Affairs Committee, David J. Williams, Chair
Subject: CIC Statement on Publishing Agreements
Date: January 14, 2008
Disposition: University Senate for Discussion

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) recommends the Purdue University Senate endorse the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) Statement on Publishing Agreements.

Rationale
Last year, the Provost created an ad hoc Task Force on Scholarly Communication. In a recent document on key issues relating to scholarly communication, they noted:

Researchers, focused on their work and then publishing their findings in books and articles, are not always aware of their rights as authors and the issues surrounding intellectual property.

Today, many publishing agreements encourage authors to essentially sign away their copyrights. This transaction gives the publisher control of the material and limits an author's redistribution rights. It can even limit the author's use of his or her own work for teaching, research, Web site postings, or archiving in an institutional repository like Purdue's e-Pubs. Retaining author rights by requesting changes to the publishing agreements not only allows researchers to archive their work, but also allows other researchers at Purdue and within each researcher's discipline to have access to their work.

Last year, at the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) Conference on Faculty Governance, the leadership of the Senate became familiar with the “CIC Statement on Publishing Agreements.” This statement has been endorsed by the Faculty or University Senates at most CIC institutions.

A copy of this agreement is attached to this document.

Approving:
A. Beck
D. Buskirk
D. Jacobs
J. Mariga
C. Nakatsu
R. Plante
A. Rollock
V. Thomas
V. Watts
D. Williams
Y. Yih

Absent:
V. Lechtenberg
C. Roper
E. Taparowski
W. Walton
The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC)
STATEMENT ON PUBLISHING AGREEMENTS

The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC)\(^1\) is a consortium of 12 world-class American research universities, advancing their missions by sharing expertise, leveraging campus resources and collaborating on innovative programs. For 50 years, the CIC has created new opportunities for member universities to work together toward greater efficiency, effectiveness and impact. In 2006, the Provosts of the CIC member universities unanimously endorsed this statement and addendum to publication agreements. Since that time, faculty governance of 6 CIC campuses have also endorsed the statement and addendum.\(^2\)

Publication is the lifeblood of a research university. It is incumbent upon faculty, campus administrators and librarians to ensure the free flow of scholarly information in fulfillment of our campus missions to advance the public good through research and education. Toward this end, our campuses are committed to supporting a sustainable publication process and a healthy publishing industry. The "information revolution" has greatly expanded the means for disseminating and utilizing scholarly discourse, but this opportunity for extending the reach and impact of our campuses is countered by social and economic conventions of some sectors of the publishing industry. Suitable publishing partners for academic enterprises should be encouraging the widest possible dissemination of the academy's work, and the management of copyright should be directed to encouraging scholarly output rather than unnecessarily fettering its access and use. Without some important changes in publishing practices, authors and readers will continue to be frustrated by barriers to the free flow of information that is an essential characteristic of great research universities.

Faculty authors should consider a number of factors when choosing and interacting with publishers for their works. The goal of publication should be to encourage widespread dissemination and impact; the means for accomplishing this will necessarily depend on the nature of the work in question, the author's circumstances, available suitable outlets, and expectations in the author's field of inquiry. In general, authors are encouraged to consider publishing strategies that will optimize short- and long-term access to their work, taking into account such factors as affordability, efficient means for distribution, a secure third-party archiving strategy, and flexible management of rights.

Protecting intellectual property rights is a particularly important consideration, as many authors unwittingly sign away all control over their creative output. Toward this end, the CIC encourages contract language that ensures that academic authors retain certain rights that facilitate archiving, instructional use, and sharing with colleagues to advance discourse and discovery. Accompanying this document is a model CIC publishing addendum that affirms the rights of authors to share their work in a variety of circumstances, including posting versions of the work in institutional or disciplinary repositories. While the particular circumstances and terms governing publication will vary on a case-by-case basis, the underlying principle of encouraging access to the creative output of our campuses should inhere in all of our efforts.

---

\(^1\) The 12 CIC member universities are: University of Chicago; University of Illinois; Indiana University; University of Iowa; University of Michigan; Michigan State University; University of Minnesota; Northwestern University; The Ohio State University; Penn State University; Purdue University; University of Wisconsin-Madison

\(^2\) As of June 19, 2007, faculty governance from the following CIC universities have endorsed the statement and addendum: University of Illinois (both the Chicago and the Urbana-Champaign campuses); Indiana University; University of Minnesota; Northwestern University; and the University of Wisconsin-Madison
ADDENDUM TO PUBLICATION AGREEMENTS FOR CIC: AUTHORS

This ADDENDUM hereby modifies and supplements the attached Publication Agreement between:

Corresponding Author ____________________________________________________________

Additional Authors (if any) _________________________________________________________

AND

Publisher ______________

Related to Manuscript titled

To appear in Journal, Anthology, or Collection titled

PUBLISHER AND AUTHOR AGREE THAT WHERE THERE ARE CONFLICTING TERMS BETWEEN THE PUBLICATION AGREEMENT AND THIS ADDENDUM, THE PROVISIONS OF THIS ADDENDUM WILL BE PARAMOUNT. IN ADDITION TO THE RIGHTS GRANTED THE AUTHOR IN THE PUBLICATION AGREEMENT AND BY LAW, THE PARTIES AGREE THAT THE AUTHOR SHALL ALSO RETAIN THE FOLLOWING SPECIFIED RIGHTS:

1. The Author shall, without limitation, have the non-exclusive right to use, reproduce, distribute, and create derivative works including update, perform, and display publicly, the Article in electronic, digital or print form in connection with the Author’s teaching, conference presentations, lectures, other scholarly works, and for all of Author’s academic and professional activities.

2. After a period of six(6) months from the date of publication of the article, the Author shall also have all the non-exclusive rights necessary to make, or to authorize others to make, the final published version of the Article available in digital form over the Internet, including but not limited to a website under the control of the Author or the Author’s employer or through digital repositories including, but not limited to, those maintained by CIC institutions, scholarly societies or funding agencies.

3. The Author further retains all non-exclusive rights necessary to grant to the Author’s employing institution the non-exclusive right to use, reproduce, distribute, display, publicly perform, and make copies of the work in electronic, digital or in print form in connection with teaching, conference presentations, lectures, other scholarly works, and all academic and professional activities conducted at the Author’s employing institution.

THIS ADDENDUM AND THE PUBLICATION AGREEMENT, TAKEN TOGETHER, CONSTITUTE THE FINAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE AUTHOR AND THE PUBLISHER WITH RESPECT TO THE PUBLICATION OF THE ARTICLE AND ALLOCATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COPYRIGHT IN THE ARTICLE. ANY MODIFICATION OF OR ADDITIONS TO THE TERMS OF THIS AMENDMENT OR TO THE PUBLICATION AGREEMENT MUST BE IN WRITING AND EXECUTED BY BOTH PUBLISHER AND AUTHOR IN ORDER TO BE EFFECTIVE.

AUTHOR

(P Corporating Author, on behalf of all authors)

PUBLISHER

Date

Date

The 12 member universities of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) are: University of Chicago; University of Illinois; Indiana University; University of Iowa; University of Michigan; Michigan State University; University of Minnesota; Northwestern University; The Ohio State University; Penn State University; Purdue University; University of Wisconsin-Madison.
2009-2010
Institutional Reaccreditation Review
March 17, 2008
University Senate
Victor Lechtenberg, Interim Provost
Christine M. Ladisch, Project Director
and
Mark A. Pagano, Project Co-Director

• Review occurs every ten years
• Last review was in 1999-2000
• Purdue continually accredited since 1913

Purpose:
• Maintain the institution’s eligibility to receive federal funds for student financial aid.
• Assure the quality of the institution and its programs through enforcement of financial and administrative standards.
• Encourage improvement of the institution and its programs.
• Promote institutional accountability and provide consumers with information about the institution.
Types of Accreditation

1) Institutional
   • regional
   • national (e.g., religious or trade schools)

2) Professional
   • focuses on a discipline
     (e.g., engineering, business)

Who conducts institutional reviews?

There is no national, centralized “Ministry of Education” to enforce academic standards.
The Higher Learning Commission, which is part of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, has legal authority from the Department of Education to accredit colleges and universities.
HLC accreditation is based on a peer review process.

Regional Accreditation

North Central region – 19 states, 880 colleges/universities
**Review Stages and Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>HLC notifies Purdue to “get ready.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Purdue identifies self-study coordinators and suggests potential site visit dates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007-Fall 2009</td>
<td>Campus conducts self-study and prepares report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>Site visit by review team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>Team report and University responses reviewed by HLC panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
<td>Final decision by HLC. Periodic reporting to HLC might be stipulated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Criteria for Accreditation:**

- **Criterion One:** Mission and Integrity
- **Criterion Two:** Preparing for the Future
- **Criterion Three:** Student Learning and Effective Teaching
- **Criterion Four:** Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge
- **Criterion Five:** Engagement and Service

Criteria now place a much greater emphasis on assessment of student learning, efforts toward institutional improvement, and determining the impact of the institution on the common good.

**Assessment of Student Learning**

- What do you want students to learn?
- What did they learn and what evidence do you have that they learned it?
- Based on the evidence, what needs to be changed to improve learning, and how are you going to achieve these changes?
Purdue

Changes in Process/Study since 2000:

- Option to participate in HLC’s new Academy for Assessment of Student Learning.
- Option to frame self-study around a special emphasis.
- Self-study is more evaluative, rather than descriptive. It should be focused more on the future rather than on past accomplishments.

What hasn’t changed since 1999/2000 review?

- It is a HUGE amount of work.
- Must involve broad spectrum of campus constituencies.
- Process requires strong presidential and board support and involvement.
- Purdue will have the same HLC liaison – Dr. Robert Appleson

Advice from HLC in 1999/2000

- Initiate a strategic planning process as the new President assumes the helm.
- Make the budgetary process increasingly transparent through sharing info about, and seeking comment on, sources of funds and funding priorities and allocations.
- Prepare to launch a major development campaign with a goal no less lofty of other major public institutions. Process should be driven by academic priorities and guided centrally.
Advice from HLC continued....

- Continue commitment to sustained investment in research infrastructure.
- Grow commercialization technology efforts.
- Centralize management of information technology – hire a world-class CIO.
- Increase tuition/fees to support academic programming.

Preparing for 2009/2010 Review

- 1999-2000 HLC advice heeded – and then some!
- Fall 2007 – appoint leadership team and develop plan for self-study.
  
  Chris Ladisch, Project Director
  Mark Pagano, Co-Director
- Fall 2007 – determine special emphasis theme for self-study.

The Self-Study Emphasis:

- In-depth attention to a select group of issues critical to the institution’s pursuit of continuous improvement and educational excellence, especially as they pertain to the achievement of its mission and vision.
- Ideal if emphasis fits within strategic plans/goals.
- Must have prior HLC approval.
Advantages of a Self-Study Emphasis:
- Tailors self-study to institutional needs and priorities.
- Increases campus interest in self-study.
- Report is focused and more interesting to the review team.
- Allows greater flexibility in selection of site review team.

Self-Study Emphasis Examples:
- Indiana University: globalization
- Iowa State: undergraduate education
- Michigan State: internationalization
- Nebraska: strategic planning
- Central Michigan: seeking national prominence
- University of Chicago: research infrastructure
- Ohio State: graduate and professional education
- University of California Riverside: improving undergraduate student engagement; the first year experience; learning outcomes

Purdue’s Emphasis Area for Self-Study

Synergies Across the Disciplines

To be aligned with the Strategic Plan Initiative “Synergies between Science/Engineering and Liberal Arts”
Preparing for 2009/2010 continued…

• Develop campus plan for assessment of student learning activities.
• Join HLC Assessment Academy.
• Join Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA)
• Learn from Purdue faculty and staff serving as HLC peer reviewers.
• Learn from recent reviews of Big 10/peer institutions.
• Inform and engage campus in review activities.
• Appoint self-study team.

College Portrait: A Voluntary System of Accountability®

2009/2010 Self-Study Team

• Steering Committee
• Self-Study Document Committee
• 5 Criterion Committees
• Special Emphasis Committee
Purdue

Draft Self-Study Outline

I. Background – Justification for the Special Emphasis

II. Footprint on the Prairie: Purdue University 1869-1899

III. A Century of Progress: Purdue University 1900-1999

IV. Moving Toward Preeminence: 1999-2009
   a. Responding to the Previous NCA review
   b. Additional Progress Since 1999 Visit

V. Meeting the Criteria with Purpose: Addressing Criteria 1-5 with a focus on the Special Emphasis
   a. Mission and Integrity
   b. Preparing for the Future
   c. Student Learning and Effective Teaching
   d. Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge
   e. Engagement and Service

VI. Reaching for the Stars: Planning for Future Impact
   a. Synergies Across the Disciplines

VII. Conclusions

Proposed Self-Study Governance

- Accreditation Steering Committee
  This group will oversee the entire accreditation process including planning, self-study (SS) preparation, actual visit, and visit follow-up. A co-chair from each of the 5 criterion and the special emphasis task force will serve.

- 5 Criterion Committees
  Each of these committees is charged with reporting evidence related to their respective section of the SS in light of the special emphasis. These five sections will focus on accomplishments during 1999-2009 and future plans.

- Special Emphasis Committee
  This committee is charged with looking at the progress of the University from 1999-2009 and reporting to the SS document committee its findings regarding University progress related to the emphasis (SS Chapter V). A second task will be to shadow the parallel strategic planning effort and formulate an overview of how the University will continue to address the special emphasis in the future in light of the 5 criteria (SS Chapter VI).

- Self-Study Document Committee
  This group will operationalize the work of the six other committees and will oversee the actual SS formation.

NCA Accreditation Steering Committee

Chair: Chris Luedtke, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Co-Chair: Mark Pyatt, Dean, Continuing Education and Conferences, Current HLC/NCA Peer Review Corp Member

Members:
- David Williams, Professor, Veterinary Medicine, Representative to the University Faculty Senate
- Julie Rosa, Director, University Periodicals
- Andrew Koch, Director, Student Access, Transition and Success Programs, Student Services Representative
- Alysa Rollock (Criterion 1 Co-Chair), Vice President for Human Relations
- Craig Svensson (Criterion 2 Co-Chair), Dean, Pharmacy, Nursing, and Health Sciences
- Barbara Dixon (Criterion 3 Co-Chair), Associate Dean, Liberal Arts
- Melissa Darv (Criterion 4 Co-Chair), Professor, Computer and Information Technology and Assistant Dean for Planning and Research, Technology
- Jay Aldridge (Criterion 5 Co-Chair), Interim Vice Provost for Engagement
- Patricia Hart (Special Emphasis Task Force Co-Chair), Professor, Foreign Languages and Literature, Liberal Arts
- Lorinda Sorensen, Support, Office of the Provost
Criterion 1 Task Force - Mission and Integrity

Co-Chair: Alysa Rollock, Vice President for Human Relations
(Steering Committee Rep)

Co-Chair: Bernard Engel, Professor and Department Head, Agricultural and Biological Engineering (Subcommittee Convener)

Members:
Stephen Akers, Executive Associate Dean, Dean of Students
Diane Denis, Senior Associate Dean, Management
Margaret Grogan, CSSAC, Secretary, Engineering Administration
Jeffrey Gunsher, APSAC, Associate Director Industry Relations, Vice President for Research
Kiad Kedel, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Professor, Mechanical Engineering, Engineering

Suzanne Nielsen, Professor and Department Head, Food Science
Amy Penner, Graduate Student, Agricultural and Biological Engineering
Howard Weiss, Professor and Department Head, Psychological Sciences

Criterion 2 Task Force - Preparing for the Future

Co-Chair: Craig Svensson, Dean, Pharmacy, Nursing, and Health Sciences
(Steering Committee Rep)

Co-Chair: John Sautter, Vice President for Housing and Food Services
(Subcommittee Convener)

Members:
Nancy Bulger, Assistant Provost
John Collier, Director of Campus Planning, Office of University Architect
Thomas Ganz, Assistant Director Employee Relations and HR Policy, Human Resource Services
Jonathan Harbor, Associate Vice President for Research, Interim Director of the Discovery Learning Center, and Professor, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences
Richard Kuhn, Professor and Department Head, Biological Sciences
Joan Marshall, Senior Associate Dean, Liberal Arts
Rabindra Mukerjea, Director of Strategic Planning and Assessment, Office of the President
James Mullins, Dean, Libraries
Teri Reed-Rioux, Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Education and Associate Professor, Engineering Education, Engineering
Ken Sandel, Managing Director, Executive Vice President and Treasurer

Criterion 3 Task Force

Student Learning and Effective Teaching

Co-Chair: Barbara Dixon, Associate Dean, Liberal Arts (Steering Committee Rep)

Co-Chair: Craig Beyrouty, Professor and Department Head, Agronomy
(Subcommittee Convener)

Members:
Hans Aagard, Graduate Student, Curriculum and Instruction, Education
Susan Alderberth, Director, Undergraduate Studies Program
Gary Bertoline, Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies, Technology
John Campbell, Associate Vice President for Teaching and Learning Technologies
Audrae Fentiman, Associate Dean and Professor, Nuclear Engineering
Mauro Heiges, Director, Center for Instructional Excellence
Jane Kirkpatrick, Associate Professor, Nursing
Daniel Kopp, Undergraduate Student, Management
Gerald Lynch, Professor, Economics and Academic Director of Full-Time Master's Program, Management
Heather Stout, Associate Dean, Dean of Students
Criterion 4 Task Force
Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge

Co-Chair: Melissa Dark, Professor, Computer and Information Technology and Assistant Dean for Planning and Research, Technology (Steering Committee Rep)

Co-Chair: George Wodicka, Professor and Department Head, Biomedical Engineering (Subcommittee Convener)

Members:
Robert Bill, Professor, Basic Medical Sciences, Veterinary Medicine
Jean Chmielewski, Associate Dean for Graduate Education and International Programs, Science
Peter Dunn, Associate Vice President Research and Director of University Research Administration and Compliance
James Fiset, Professor, Foods and Nutrition, Consumer and Family Sciences
Jeffrey Gill, Associate Dean for Discovery and Faculty Development, Education
David Janes, Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Pablo Malavenda, Associate Dean of Student Activities/Organizations, Dean of Students
Sita Ramaswamy, Associate Dean, Graduate School
Steven Witz, Director, Regenstrief Center

Criterion 5 Task Force – Engagement and Service

Co-Chair: Jay Akridge, Interim Vice Provost for Engagement (Steering Committee Rep)

Co-Chair: Kathryn Newton, Professor and Department Head, Industrial Technology (Subcommittee Convener)

Members:
Robert Bennett, Professor, Pharmacy Practice and Director of Pharmacy Continuing Education
Kirk Cerny, Executive Director and CEO, Purdue Alumni Association
Karen Diamond, Professor, Child Development and Family Studies, Consumer and Family Sciences
Michael Eddy, Director, Continuing Education
Christian Foster, Director, Discovery Park K-12 Programs
Dave Harris, Director, Engineering Professional Education
Charles Hickman, Director, Cooperative Extension Service and Associate Dean, Agriculture
Elizabeth Liley, Director, University Foundation Relations, University Development
David McKinnis, Director, Technical Assistance Program and Associate Provost for Engagement
Julie Novak, Associate Dean, College of Pharmacy, Nursing, and Health Sciences, Professor and Department Head, Nursing, and Director, PU Nursing Clinics
Shirley Rose, Professor, English, Liberal Arts
William Walker, Director of Outreach, Engagement

Special Emphasis Task Force
Synergies Across the Disciplines

Co-Chair: Patricia Hart, Professor, Foreign Languages and Literature, Liberal Arts (Steering Committee Rep)

Co-Chair: Nicholas Giordano, Hubert James Distinguished Professor and Department Head, Physics (Subcommittee Convener)

Members:
Susan Curtis, Associate Dean, Interdisciplinary Studies and Engagement, Liberal Arts
Sarah Diaz, Undergraduate Student, Management
Michael Harris, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education and Professor, Chemical Engineering
Robert May, Professor, History, Liberal Arts
Beth Mitchell, Associate Dean, Information Resources and Scholarly Communication, Libraries
John Nien, Undergraduate Student, Management
Timothy Ready, Professor, Curriculum and instruction, Education
Chris Saile, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education, Science
Eric Stach, Associate Professor, Materials Engineering
Jan Story, Professor, Foods and Nutrition and Associate Dean, Graduate School
Abe Walton, Graduate Student, Organizational Leadership and Supervision, Technology

*Liaison to corresponding University strategic planning group
Self-Study Document Committee

Chair: Mark Pagano, Dean, Continuing Education and Conferences and Professor, Mechanical Engineering Technology
Co-Chair: Jacque Frost, Director, Office of Institutional Research

Members:
Kyle Bowen, Manager, Informatics, IT Teaching and Learning Technologies
James Gardner, Communications Coordinator/Writer/Editor, Continuing Education and Conferences
Chris Ladisch, ex officio, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Jim McCammack, Assistant Director for Graphic Design, Purdue Marketing Communications
Amira Zamin, College of Science Communications Coordinator, Purdue Marketing Communications
Kathy Greenwood, Support, Continuing Education and Conferences

Questions?

http://www.purdue.edu/accrreditiation/index.shtml
Memorial Resolution
For
David R. Ransom
1923-2008

Professor David R. Ransom died Wednesday, January 23, 2008 at his home in West Lafayette. Born in Denver, Colorado on September 14, 1923, Professor Ransom served in the Navy during World War II and joined the faculty of Purdue University in 1958. In the Department of English, Professor Ransom taught undergraduate writing and literature courses until his retirement in 1981. Professor Ransom is survived by two sons, John Farley Ransom and David Tobey Ransom and a daughter, Jane Ransom.

Respectfully submitted,

Irwin Weiser, Professor and Head, Department of English