REVISED AGENDA

1. Call to order
   Professor Patricia Hart

2. Approval of Minutes of 17 November 2014

3. Acceptance of Agenda

4. Remarks by the Chairperson
   Professor Patricia Hart

5. Remarks by the President
   President Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr.

6. Résumé of Items Under Consideration by Various Standing Committees
   For Information
   Professor David A. Sanders

7. Question Time

8. Senate Document 14-5
   For Discussion
   Beaudoin Senate Resolution
   Professors Stephen P. Beaudoin and Levon Esters

9. Promotion & Tenure Documents
   For Information
   Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Alyssa Panitch and Professor Laurel Weldon

10. Senate Document 14-2
    For Discussion
    Evening Examinations Conflicts
    Professor Hal Kirkwood

11. Senate Document 14-3
    For Discussion
    Proposed CSDR Regulation Changes
    Professor Hal Kirkwood

12. Senate Document 14-4 Amendment to the Senate
    For Discussion
    Bylaws Concerning Term Limits
    PGSG President Christopher Kulesza

13. New Business

14. Memorial Resolutions

15. Adjournment
1. The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by Chairperson Patricia Hart.

2. The minutes of the 17 November 2014 Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

3. The agenda was accepted as distributed.

4. Professor Hart presented the remarks of the Chairperson (see Appendix A). In her remarks, Professor Hart posed questions for the President concerning the Student Growth Assessment instrument topic.

5. President Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr. presented remarks to the Senate (see Appendix B). In his remarks and presentation, President Daniels spoke to the questions posed by Professor Hart.

6. Professor David Sanders presented the Résumé of Items under Consideration (ROI) by various standing committees (see Appendix C). The chairs of the Senate standing committees briefly described the current activities of their respective committees. Professor Michael Hill, Chair of the Nominating Committee, emphasized that candidates for the Vice-Chair position are welcome to volunteer prior to the February Senate meeting.
7. At Question Time, President Daniels entertained questions from the floor.

Professor Linda Prokopy noted that Faculty were not listed as one of the stakeholders in the President’s presentation. President Daniels ensured her that Faculty have been an important part of the process for determining the assessment instrument that will be chosen and he will include the Faculty explicitly in future presentations. Professor Prokopy next said that in the President’s open letter to the Purdue University community, the Provost and Dean of Liberal Arts were specifically mentioned as the individuals in charge of reviewing and suggesting changes to the core curriculum. She asked if the Senate would be involved in providing input for the process. President Daniels assured her that the Provost and Dean of Liberal Arts will seek input from all of the appropriate individuals and groups on campus during the review process.

Professor Janusz Duzinkiewicz asked if the students on the regional campuses will be included in the assessment testing. President Daniels said the decision on which assessment instrument will be used had to be made first. After that, a determination will be made about the inclusion of the regional campus students in the assessment process.

Professor Wayne Campbell asked if the data gathered during the assessment program will be more important for internal or external use. President Daniels said the primary impetus has been to gather data for external comparison, i.e. comparison with other institutions that use a comparable assessment instrument. Internal use would be of limited value, in the President’s opinion. He also said that other assessment options will be considered such as a portfolio developed by each student appropriate to the discipline. Professor Campbell asked if the CLA+ assessment tool has been in use long enough to get data from students through their senior years. President Daniels said that some schools have been using it long enough to have such data and more institutions are gathering those data now. One concern is that students will have insufficient incentive to take the assessment test again when they are seniors. President Daniels suggested that assessment can be used to highlight high-achieving students and this possible résumé enhancement might be incentive enough to encourage students to participate as seniors. President Daniels also noted that all costs will be borne internally.

Professor Stephen Martin noted that former PSG President and University Senator Kyle Pendergast said that students resist mandates such as the mandate to participate in the former Common Reading Program and they are likely to do so in the case of the proposed assessment process. The President again pointed out the potential for résumé enhancement presented by the assessment process.

Professor Harry Targ was concerned that the assessment process was a fait accompli given the directive of the Board of Trustees (BoT). Professor Hart said that the BoT members have welcomed her in her role as a non-voting member of the Academic Affairs Committee and her role allows input from the Faculty. President Daniels said that other university systems have implemented an assessment program without any input from their Faculty and that Purdue University has included Faculty input throughout the process. Statutory authority given to the BoT does not require that input be sought from the Faculty, but the members of the BoT have sought input.
Professor Shawn Whiteman suggested that measuring student development merely by an examination will miss many other aspects associated with the maturation and development of college students, i.e. personal interactions with peers, Faculty and others. President Daniels said that the assessment process will include more than the examinations as the beginning and end of the students’ time at Purdue University.

Professor Sanders asked about the status of the restoration of the Common Reading Program that was approved by the Senate last year. Professor Sanders has consulted with Jared Tippets and Vice Provost Frank Dooley about this issue. It was noted that Dr. Tippets is no longer at Purdue University. President Daniels said that there are common reading components in the Boiler Gold Rush program and that when new leadership replaces Dr. Tippets, this topic will be considered further.

8. Professors Stephen Beaudoin and Levon Esters introduced Senate Document 14-5, Beaudoin Senate Resolution in Support of adding Coverage for Autism Spectrum Disorder to the University Health Plans. In order to vote on the document at this meeting, Professor Hart made a motion to suspend the voting rules. Her motion was seconded and the motion passed by consent of the Senate. Following the suspension of the rules, Professor Hart made a motion to approve the document. Her motion was seconded by Professor Heather Servaty-Seib. Professor Beaudoin read the resolution. During the discussion period, several Senators spoke in strong support of the resolution. Professor Richard Cosier spoke to the effects on his family of the diagnosis and subsequent treatment of Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) in his granddaughter. Professor April Ginther read a statement from a colleague about the effects of ASD diagnosis and treatment of her child on her family (see Appendix D). Professor Sandra Rossie asked if the coverage would apply to the health plans for the regional campuses. Professor Beaudoin said that it would provide such coverage. The document passed by unanimous voice vote. President Daniels rose to address the Senate and stated that this coverage had been under consideration for some time and has been approved by the administration for inclusion in the Purdue University Health Plans. A spontaneous round of applause was heard from the assembled Senators, Advisors and guests. President Daniels said that this action is timely as the preparation of the biennial budget is under way. One year of experience with the current menu of health offerings has been associated with a big uptake in consumer-driven benefits by Purdue employees leading to moderating our health costs. President Daniels said the cost estimate for coverage is about $1.6 million to premium payers and the university will pick up $1.4 million of this or 87.5%. His statement was met with a second round of applause.

9. Professor Esters in his role as Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee introduced the next agenda item, an update on the changes to the Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Alyssa Panitch provided the update. (see Appendix E). Following the presentation she entertained questions from the floor. Professor Patrick Kain expressed appreciation for the efforts made to change and update the Promotion and Tenure Policy. He also expressed concern about the addition to the policy of a new on “Professorial Conduct.” He believes the wording is vague and could lead to restriction of freedom of expression. This paragraph appears to be a move in the wrong direction and may present legal issues. Vice Provost Panitch offered to discuss his concerns. Professor Jody Banks asked if, in the cases of interdisciplinary promotions, the primary committee will include members from other departments and colleges. Vice Provost Panitch said that the policy will allow mixed primary committees.
Professor Evelyn Blackwood asked for clarification about the proposed change in the mix of administrators and faculty on the promotion committee. Vice Provost Panitch stated that this was in reference to the University Promotion Committee (Panel A). Currently, the membership of Panel A is weighted towards the College Deans, but the new policy will ensure a more balanced makeup of faculty and administrators. Professor Janusz Duzinkiewicz noted that the Purdue University North Central Faculty Senate had reviewed the documents and found them to be "quite good." He said that comments and suggestions will be passed to the Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) for consideration and communication with Vice Provost Panitch.

10. Professor Hal Kirkwood, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), introduced Senate Document 14-2, *Evening Examinations Conflicts*, for Discussion. Professor Kirkwood noted the changes to the document (marked in red) and responded to questions and comments from the floor. Professor Linda Prokopy expressed concern that the changes would interfere with the activities of student organizations as they often meet in the evenings. Professor Yuehwern Yih noted that she is an advisor to a student organization but that evening examinations should take precedence over student organization activities. Professor Sanders expressed appreciation to the members of the EPC in making the changes to the document that were suggested by the members of the Senate. Professor Christine Hrycyna took issue with Professor Yih's statement. Professor Hrycyna believes that activities of officially recognized student organization should take precedence over evening examinations. Professor Michael Zoltowski spoke in support of Professor Yih. Professor Yih said that in a large enrollment class evening examinations are one of the few ways to try to prevent cheating. For example, each student can have an assigned seat in a large lecture hall which is difficult to do in smaller lecture rooms. The policy should allow professors the flexibility to make exceptions. Professor J. Mark Thom emphasized that faculty need clear definitions and guidelines in the policy to avoid the filing of grade appeals by students. Consistency is essential to avoid grounds for the filing of grade appeals. Senator Bobby Haddix presented the students' viewpoint and supported an instructor's ability to make exceptions to the policy and allow case-by-case discussion with students. Professor Yih noted that there are marked differences among student organizations with respect to attendance requirements and scheduling of meetings. Senator Kulesza suggested that linking the current event planning form with the policy would be a good idea. Registrar Frank Blalark said that we do not have official policies to cover these issues and that has led to the problems with timing and scheduling that exist.

11. Professor Kirkwood introduced Senate Document 14-3, *Proposed CSDR Regulation Changes*, for Discussion. Professor Sanders recommended some changes to the document concerning administrators’ titles and roles and how those can change over time. The proposal should allow flexibility to account for those changes. Professor Servaty-Seib stated that the administrative oversight for the CSDR has changed from the Office of the Dean of Students to the Office of Admissions. This change makes sense as the Office of Admissions is responsible for re-entering students as well as admissions. The proposal allows an appeals process for students beyond the department and school level should the decision at one of those levels go against the student. Professor Pamela Aaltonen asked for figures on readmissions and appeals. Senior Assistant Director of Admissions Robert Mate stated that the current system basically serves as a rubber stamp for the decision of a department or school. He estimated that 400 – 500 students are dropped from the University each semester. Of those, perhaps 250 – 275 apply for readmission. Of those, perhaps 50 – 60 are
12. Senator Kulesza introduced Senate Document 14-4, *Kulesza Bylaws Amendment Concerning Term Limits*, for Discussion. He explained the rationale for the proposed changes suggesting that research shows that term limits have a negative impact on governing bodies and the democratic political process. Professor Hill noted that the democratic process is not addressed in the Senate Bylaws. He suggested that 6 years of service are long enough to gain experience in the Senate. In his opinion, the main problem is that not all Senators are actively involved with the Senate and its committees. Finally, he noted that service on the Senate should not be viewed as a career. Professor Evelyn Blackwood said that in her time on the Senate she thought that the quality of legislation and Senate activities have improved since the implementation of term limits. Senator Kulesza rebutted these comments, but said that he would be willing to change the language in the document to address some of the concerns. Professor Sandra Rossie said that term limits for the Senate leadership hamper the activities of the Vice Chair and Chair of the Senate. Senator Kulesza said that something may be prepared to deal with that concern, too. Professor Thom suggested that there should be release time for faculty members serving on the Senate. We should also be wary of creating an academic aristocracy.

13. No New Business was brought to the Senate floor.

14. Memorial Resolution had been received for JoAnn L. Miller, Associate Dean for Engagement, College of Liberal Arts, and Head of School of Interdisciplinary Studies, as well as, Michael W. Watts, Professor of Economics, Director of Purdue Center for Economic Education. Out of respect for their departed colleagues, the Senators stood for a moment of silence.

15. The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.
Address to the University Senate
Patricia Hart
26 January 2015

Welcome to the January meeting of the university senate.

Today, we will have a chance to consider a resolution to include coverage in the Purdue Health Insurance for the recognized best treatments for autism as identified by our own faculty. The resolution is unusual, in that it comes to us with the unanimous support of three senate committees: Faculty Compensation and Benefits, Faculty Affairs, and Equity and Diversity. It is also sponsored by APSAC, CSSAC, and the entire Autism faculty in Health and Human Sciences, a number of whom are in attendance today. We are also joined by some families who have personal experiences. I’m very proud of the work you senators have done on this incredibly important issue.

Today we’ll also begin to study and fine-tune new documents on promotion and tenure. We will examine proposals regarding evening examinations. We will consider modifying the current policies on Scholastic Delinquencies and Readmissions. Finally, we will consider a resolution regarding senate term limits.

Now let’s take a moment to fully utilize our new format that we have introduced this year at your request, where the Senate Chair asks questions and the president responds.

Today I’d like to invite the president to speak to us about an initiative that has been underway to generate reliable data about how students grow during their time at Purdue. To give you some background, under President Daniels’ guidance we have been looking at new and creative ways to evaluate student growth, always with the goal of making a Purdue education as valuable as it can possibly be. A plan evolved to administer an entrance exam to a group of students, and an exit exam to the same students to measure their growth while here.

As you all know, we Purdue faculty constantly perform lots of assessments. In classes, students do assignments and projects and quizzes and exams and papers. We evaluate portfolios and journals, and supervise internships. We help them design machines, paint pictures, and perform in theater. Programs like EPICS help students develop compassion and ingenuity. Studying abroad vastly widens student horizons. We give grades and confer degrees. Many of the skills we teach can’t be evaluated by multiple-choice tests. Still, when a new idea is proposed to enhance the assessment student growth in their college experience, we faculty are eager to know more. First we want to ask, what will be collected and why? How will these results be used? Will this be an evaluation of individual majors, departments, or colleges? How do we go about this in order to guarantee that potentially high-stakes results are based on unimpeachable methods, so that the results cannot be discredited outside the university and will positively enhance Purdue’s reputation? Before the Purdue faculty wants to support and sign off on a large student growth assessment project, we must insist on an assurance that there are clearly-stated objectives and a solid research design.

Various people have been working on this assessment idea for some time, and one of the things that a faculty committee was asked to do a while back was to go out and see if there was a test instrument that might be used. This was a distinguished committee, and they came back with a series of misgivings, basically saying that there were a number of bad tests, and one that was pretty good, depending upon how you wanted to use it.
In December, an oversight committee, composed of equally distinguished faculty, concurred with the earlier committee that there was one test available that might be ok, but it all depended on how you planned to use it.

In retrospect, we can probably all agree that picking a test instrument before the study was designed was getting the cart before the horse.

Maybe I can speak metaphorically to say that if you want to build a house, first you want to get an architect to design it then you get together all of the materials and craftspeople and tools. In other words, a multiple-choice test is only one of the tools that we will need for a serious longitudinal assessment of student growth.

Since the matter came to our attention, the senate leadership has spent a lot of time talking to various people who understand this type of longitudinal psychometric research, and they have told us several main things that they feel are important as Purdue faculty designs and oversees such a study. I have provided each of you with a very brief summary of the collective wisdom we have gathered from you and your colleagues. You are responsible for evaluating this, because, clearly, I am only your humble servant in this matter, not an expert.

First, and most importantly, we want a transparent statement of our objectives. What is the exact purpose of this testing?

Second we must address validity. For the faculty to approve a serious longitudinal study of student growth, we need to see a plan that guarantees validity. Next, reliability must be guaranteed.

There are Purdue faculty members who are world-renowned experts in these matters, so surely they should select and supervise those who should be involved.

Sampling must be done appropriately. We need to explain in advance how attrition will be dealt with, and how we can assure that seniors taking the post-test will have motivation to take the test at all, let alone do well on it.

Finally, we have to have a basis for comparison. If we plan to administer an examination that purports to show the growth that results from a Purdue education, we have to say, “compared to what?”

President Daniels, I suggest that the next step is to assemble a blue ribbon task force led jointly by the Provost’s office and the senate to identify the experts who will design and implement this study. Then we will want this proposed plan to be evaluated by Purdue faculty, just as granting agencies evaluate any proposal large or small before funding it.

President Daniels if you can commit to giving the resources necessary to carry out the project with the greatest possible dispatch and the autonomy to make the key design decisions, we are in a solid position to move forward together as soon as possible.

May we ask you to respond?

MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

JoAnn L. Miller
July 12, 1949 – December 25, 2014
Professor of Sociology
Associate Dean for Engagement, College of Liberal Arts, and Head of School of Interdisciplinary Studies

Michael W. Watts
November 3, 1950 – December 5, 2014
Professor of Economics
Director of Purdue Center for Economic Education
36% of students showed no statistically significant gains in critical thinking, complex reasoning, or writing skills over four years.

Arum and Roksa, 2010
Employers who say recent graduates are well prepared in:

- Locating, organizing, evaluating, information — 29%
- Written communication — 27%
- Critical/analytical thinking — 26%
- Analyzing/solving complex problems — 24%

(“Falling Short?” AAC&U, January 2015)

“Four in 10 US college students graduate without the complex reasoning skills to manage white-collar work”

(Wall Street Journal / Council for Aid to Education, 2015)

“If you’ve got a student at or applying to college, ask the administrators these questions: ‘How much do students learn? How do you know?’”

(New York Times, April 2012)
TRUSTEES’ CALL FOR ACTION

• Empirical evaluation of student intellectual growth — especially in critical thinking— while at Purdue

• Ability to compare Purdue results with peers
169 colleges and universities used the CLA+ alone in 2013-14:

- Entire California State system
- All CUNY campuses
- Entire University of Texas system
- George Mason
- Kansas State
- Ohio State
- Texas Tech
- University of Kentucky
- University of Missouri
- University of Nebraska
STUDENT GROWTH TASK FORCE

Jeff Karpicke, Psychology (co-chair)
Dale Whittaker, formerly Vice Provost (co-chair)
Diane Beaudoin, Director of Assessment (ex-officio)
Frank Dooley, Vice Provost
Heidi Diefes-Dux, Engineering
Brent Drake, Institutional Research (ex-officio)
Andy Hirsch, Physics
Neil Knobloch, Agriculture
Chantal Levesque-Bristol, Center for Instructional Excellence
Yukiko Maeda, Educational Psychology
Sara Mustillo, Sociology
Rab Mukerjea, Institutional Research (ex-officio)
David Rollock, Psychology
Bill Watson, Curriculum and Instruction
Gabriela Weaver, Chemistry
PROJECT CHRONOLOGY

- **Feb 2013:** Student Growth Task Force named
- **March 2013:** 1st Task Force meeting
- **Sept 2013:** Task Force conducts *town hall meetings*
- **Nov 2013:** Task Force invites input from Educational Policy Cmte (EPC)
- **Nov 2013 - Jan 2014:** Task Force & EPC discuss report / process
- **Jan 2014:** Task Force submits final report
- **April 2014:** Student Growth Oversight Committee named
- **July 2014:** Oversight Committee approves pilot
- **Aug 2014:** Three critical thinking tests piloted
- **Dec 2014:** Oversight Committee presents to BOT Academic Affairs Cmte, recommends final reporting at Feb meeting
WHAT IT IS FOR

- Demonstrate what we know: A Purdue degree has high value

- Document student learning in:
  - Critical thinking
  - Reasoning
  - Communication

- Track our progress over time

- Make information transparent to all stakeholders:
  - Students
  - Potential students
  - Fellow citizens
  - Governmental decision makers
WHAT IT IS NOT FOR

• RATE COLLEGES OR INDIVIDUAL MAJORS
• RATE PROGRAMS
• RATE INDIVIDUAL FACULTY
NEXT STEPS

1. Extend reporting timeline by two months

2. The university will provide the resources needed by the faculty committee

3. The committee will present a final report to the provost at least one week prior to the April meeting of the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee
The Report of the Task Force recommends the following:

- Create an **Oversight Team**, appointed by the University Senate, to evaluate several aspects of the assessment plan: Are the instruments actually measuring what we want them to measure? Are the results being used in an appropriate way?

- Create an **Implementation Team**, facilitated by the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Effectiveness, to develop specific plans for implementing assessment tools and collecting data from students.

- Initiate a **Research Team** of faculty (open to all who are interested) to extract meaning from the assessments, find correlations between activities and outcomes, correlations among outcomes, and develop hypotheses for further study. Are there other instruments on the horizon we should investigate? Research may also be shared in a larger context in an effort to inspire national improvements in higher education.
Under Indiana law, the Board of Trustees is empowered to “do all acts necessary and expedient to put and keep Purdue University in operation.”

This includes, among other things, the power:
- to “make all bylaws, rules and regulations required or proper to conduct and manage Purdue University,”
- to “prescribe curricula and courses of study,” and
- to “define the standards of proficiency and satisfaction within the curricula . . .”

While the Board of Trustees has delegated power and responsibility to the faculty to propose or adopt policies, regulations and procedures intended to achieve the educational objectives of the University, the exercise of that power and responsibility is subject to the ultimate authority of the Trustees.
1. The primary responsibility for establishing and assessing curricula, student learning outcomes, and student intellectual growth rests with the Faculty of Purdue University.

2. Assessment efforts must remain sensitive to the proper diversity and variety of programs and instructional contexts and objectives at Purdue, and shall avoid unnecessary centralization, standardization, or oversimplification of curricula or assessment.

3. Assessment instruments and their use must be credible and appropriate, especially when widely disseminated and relied upon.

4. Assessment must be fiscally responsible, weighing the potential benefits of assessment with the time and money they require.

5. Purdue, as a leading University in the 21st Century, should remain committed to identifying and reporting useful information about its many contributions to students’ lives (its “value-added,”) in a variety of balanced, credible, and fiscally responsible ways.
TO: University Senate
FROM: David A. Sanders, Chairperson of the Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Résumé of Items under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

STEERING COMMITTEE
David A. Sanders, Chairperson retrovir@purdue.edu

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Patricia Hart, Chairperson of the Senate phart@purdue.edu

NOMINATING COMMITTEE
Michael A. Hill, Chairperson hillma@purdue.edu

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Hal P. Kirkwood, Chairperson kirkwood@purdue.edu

1. Evening Exam policy
2. Changing Committee on Scholastic Delinquencies and Readmissions
3. Transfer Credits
4. ‘In Residence’ & Academic Regulations
5. Educational Policy Holistic Review

EQUITY AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE
Alberto J. Rodriguez, Chairperson alberto-rodriguez12@purdue.edu

1. Meeting with key personnel to discuss Purdue’s equity and diversity main web page presence
2. Preparing a list of recommendations to improve equity and diversity web presence across campus
3. Reviewing university-wide data on recruitment and retention of faculty and students
4. Seeking additional senate members

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Levon Esters, Chairperson lesters@purdue.edu

1. On-line Course Evaluation
2. Draft Promotion and Tenure Policy Documents
3. Limited Term and Continuous Lectures Policy (with regional campuses – will resume discussion in January, 2015)
4. Honorary Doctorate Criteria
5. Autism Insurance

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Sandra Rossie, Chairperson rossie@purdue.edu

1. Communication gaps between international and domestic students.
2. Organize discussion with Athletic Affairs Committee.

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE
Michael Fosmire, Chairperson fosmire@purdue.edu

1. Long-term energy plan for University
2. Space management and utilization
3. Concur
4. Graduate Student Health Coverage
5. Faculty retention

Chair of the Senate, Patty Hart, phart@purdue.edu
Vice Chair of the Senate, Kirk Alter, alterk@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., jcamp@purdue.edu University Senate Minutes: http://www.purdue.edu/senate
I am very sorry to miss the meeting today; I am currently en route from Seattle to Indiana with our eight-year-old autistic daughter, who has been participating in a study at Seattle Children’s Hospital on the impact of oxytocin on autistic children. I know many people here have plenty to say, so I will keep my remarks brief.

When our daughter suddenly and dramatically regressed into autism at 15 months, we were told that the best chance we had of recovering and helping her was to get her into intensive, aggressive, frequent therapy. We did this, but we estimate that 99 times out of 100, we had to pay for most or all of those therapy sessions out of our own pocket. We had to fight Purdue’s insurance tooth and nail for every penny, and in most instances, we lost the fight and had to pay out of pocket. When we could, we took advantage of the research Purdue’s SLP department was conducting and participated in all their studies and activities. You may have seen, in particular, that Purdue’s own Oliver Wendt has developed a speech application for the ipad—the Speakall—which has helped our daughter and numerous other children, and which is getting all kinds of glowing write-ups in places like the Economist and the Wall Street Journal.

1. We now have a quarter of a million dollars of debt related to medical expenses; we can’t imagine how we will ever get out from under it, and we couldn’t keep existing without the support of our families.

2. All that debt is totally worth it, because our daughter, who had been completely non-verbal and disengaged from the world around her, now talks, goes to school in a mainstream classroom, is learning to make friends, and continues to make exciting progress. Because we intervened early and aggressively, she is much more likely to grow up to become an independent, productive member of society; had we not intervened so intensely, she would have been much more likely to have become a burden on our tax-system. The number of autistic children is 1 in 68. If you do the math, you can see from a cost-benefit stand point, it makes much more sense to provide financial assistance and insurance coverage for families with autistic children NOW, as that will save our government and society potentially millions later.

Dorsey Armstrong and Ryan Schneider, Associate Professors of English
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