

**UNIVERSITY SENATE**  
Third Meeting, Monday, 17 November 2008, 2:30 p.m.  
Room 302, Stewart Center

**AGENDA (as amended)**

1. Call to order Professor Raymond A. DeCarlo
2. Approval of Minutes of 20 October 2008
3. Acceptance of Agenda
4. Remarks by the President President France A. Córdova
5. University Senate Document 08-4 For Discussion  
Resolution to Reaffirm the Campus Policies Professors Levy, Williams, & DeCarlo  
on Diversity
6. Report of the Chairperson Professor Raymond A. DeCarlo
7. Résumé of Items Under Consideration For Information  
by Various Standing Committees Professor Joan R. Fulton
8. Question Time
9. University Senate Document 08-3 For Discussion  
Reapportionment of the Senate Professor Joan R. Fulton
10. University Senate Report 08-1 For Information  
Considerations Concerning Plus/Minus Grading Professor Andrew Luescher
11. Results and Discussion of Issue Prioritization For Information  
by Electronic Voting Professor Raymond A. DeCarlo
12. New Business
13. Memorial Resolutions
14. Adjournment

## UNIVERSITY SENATE

Third Meeting, Monday, 17 November 2008, 2:30 p.m.  
Room 302, Stewart Center

**Present:** *President France A. Córdova, Raymond A. DeCarlo, (Chairperson of the Senate) presiding, Professors Salvador F. Acuña, James S. Almond, Janet M. Alsup, Eric M. Barnard, Alan M. Beck, James C. Becker, Ernest R. Blatchley, George M. Bodner, Lawrence W. Braille, James E. Braun, Jeffrey L. Brewer, Kristina K. Bross, Bernd W. Buldt, Christian E. Butzke, Patrice M. Buzzanell, Joseph W. Camp Jr. (Secretary of Faculties and Parliamentarian), Gary L. Carter, Brian G. Dillman, Nancy E. Edwards, Charlotte E. Erdmann, Joan R. Fulton, Nancy F. Gabin, Mark A. Green, John B. Grutzner, Chong Gu, Sally A. Hastings, L. Tony Hawkins, Michael A. Hill, Jeffrey D. Holland, Gerald C. Hyner, Richard Johnson-Sheehan, Robert J. Joly, Joseph F. Kmec, Morris Levy, Andrew U. Luescher, Stephen Martin, William G. McCartney, James D. McGlothlin, William D. McInerney, Robert E. McMains, Samuel P. Midkiff, Mark M. Moriarty, P. Jane Morris (Sergeant at Arms), Daniel K. Mroczek, Rabindra N. Mukerjea, Mary B. Nakhleh, Alyssa Panitch, Robert D. Plante, Phillip E. Pope, Gintaras V. Reklaitis, Melissa J. Remis, J. Paul Robinson, Tom B. Robinson, Alysa C. Rollock, Carolyn Roper, Charles R. Santerre, John A. Sautter, A. Paul Schwab, Robert Skeel, Glenn Sparks, John A. Story, A. Charlene Sullivan, Elizabeth J. Taparowsky, Thomas J. Templin, Volker K. Thomas, Bert Useem, Samuel S. Wagstaff, Whitney Walton, Mara H. Wasburn, Val J. Watts, Charles W. White, David J. Williams, William R. Woodson, Yuehwern Yih, and Howard Zelaznik.*

**Absent:** *Christopher R. Agnew, David C. Anderson, John E. Blendell, J. Stuart Bolton, Lynn A. Bryan, Donald D. Buskirk, Steve H. Collicott, Christine L. Corum, Wei K. Cui, Martin V. Curd, Lawrence P. DeBoer, John P. Denton, Shawn S. Donkin, Phillip S. Dunston, James P. Greenan, Steven G. Hallett, Kristine Holtvedt, David B. Janes, James L. Jenkins, Ravi Krishnan, Robert A. Kubat, Christine M. Ladisch, Scott Mandernack, Martin R. Okos, Morgan R. Olsen, Kathryn S. Orvis, Robert E. Pruitt, Teri Reed-Rhoads, Gintaras V. Reklaitis, Sivakumar Santhanakrishnan, Geoffrey Schultz, Thomas M. Sellke, Jie Shen, Marion T. Trout, Lefteri H. Tsoukalas, Herbert L. Weith, S. Laurel Weldon, G. Thomas Wilson, and William J. Zinsmeister.*

**Guests:** *Richard Buckius, Sara Conn, Dan Howell, and Brian Wallheimer.*

1. The meeting was called to order by the chairperson of the senate, Professor Raymond A. DeCarlo at 2:35 p.m.
2. The minutes of the meeting of 20 October 2008 were approved as distributed.
3. Professor DeCarlo made a motion to approve the agenda. His motion was seconded. Professor Fulton then made a motion to amend the agenda by adding two items. The first item will be item number 5, University Senate Document 08-4, *Reaffirmation of Campus Policies for Appreciating Cultural Diversity and for Free Speech with Respectful Dialogue*. The second item will be item number 10, University Senate Report 08-1, *Considerations Concerning Plus/Minus Grading*. Her motion to add these amendments was seconded. The amendments were approved by voice vote. The amended agenda was then approved by acclamation.

4. President France A. Córdova presented remarks to the Senate (see Appendix A).
5. Professor Morris Levy presented Senate Document 08-4 and made a motion for its acceptance. His motion was seconded. During the discussion period, Professor David Williams addressed the Senate and encouraged the support of the Senators in approving the resolution supporting cultural diversity and free speech on campus. Professor Sellke rose and argued that the resolution was not necessary as he considered the recent events to be relatively minor and the response to the events to be an overreaction. It was his opinion that if the graffiti had been directed against another (specifically Caucasian) candidate, the university community would not have reacted in the same manner. Professor Sellke said he supported the expulsion or firing, as appropriate, of any individual who wrote/drew the graffiti. Professor Wasburn was granted the floor and spoke in favor of the resolution. She said that individuals perceive events through different lenses and thus have different perspectives on the importance of the events. She has spoken with minority students, staff and faculty who view the recent events as offensive. Hence, one's point of view is important when dealing with these issues. She mentioned that many minority individuals feel threatened by the recent events. Following the discussion, the vote was taken and the resolution was approved by voice vote with two votes in opposition.
6. Professor DeCarlo presented the report of the chairperson (see Appendix B).
7. Professor Joan Fulton's presented, for information, the Résumé of Items under Consideration by Various Standing Committees (see Appendix C). Professor Fulton asked for questions from the Senators, but none were forthcoming. Professor Levy asked for the floor and mentioned that he will be on sabbatical in the spring semester and that Professor Charles Santerre will serve as chair in his absence. Professor David Williams also mentioned to the Senators that he will be on sabbatical in the spring and Professor Charlene Sullivan will serve as chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee.
8. At question time the secretary reported no questions had been submitted in writing and no questions came from the floor.
9. Professor Joan Fulton asked for suspension of the rules in order to consider and vote on Senate Document 08-3, *Reapportionment of the Senate*. Her request was seconded. There was no discussion and the motion to suspend the rules was passed by unanimous voice vote. Professor Fulton then made a motion to approve this document. Her motion for approval was seconded. During the discussion time, Professor Martin Curd asked for clarification of the reapportionment numbers and calculation. Vice Chairperson Howard Zelaznik explained the algorithm that was used in the calculation to the satisfaction of Professor Curd. The motion to approve the document passed by unanimous voice vote.
10. Professor Andrew Luescher presented Senate Report 08-1, *Considerations Concerning Plus/Minus Grading*. This report was brought forth for information only and no vote was required. Professor White asked for clarification on the need for the various adjustments suggested in the document and Professor Luescher provided that explanation. Professor Schultz of the Calumet campus asked about the implications for the regional campuses. It was explained that the policy is in effect system-wide, but the choice to use the plus/minus grading system is up to the individual professor as it is an optional, not mandatory policy.

11. Professor DeCarlo opened the discussion of the “DeCarlo 18” issue prioritization by asking the following question: What is the most important feature of a core curriculum? Professor Sally Hastings commented that the core curriculum could lead to an uneven distribution of teaching loads and expenses if the campus-wide core courses were concentrated in one school or college. This could place an undue burden on resources for that school or college unless all of the schools and colleges contributed financial and other resources to help staff core courses. Professor Yuehwern Yih said that flexibility would be required in engineering degrees as many faculty members feel there are insufficient credits currently available for most engineering B.S. degrees. Professor DeCarlo then asked: What is your worst fear concerning a core curriculum? Professor Yih said it was fear of too much additional work on top of already heavy workloads. Professor Martin Curd indicated crowding and lower standards. He said that from his past experience, teaching large (e.g. 200 students) philosophy classes is not a way to teach philosophy which he anticipates would result from a university wide core curriculum. Professor George Bodner reminded the Senators that the Indiana Commission for Higher Education (ICHE) is currently working on a list of approximately 70 courses that will have to be transferrable among all of the state supported institutions. ICHE has not issued a mandate yet, but it would behoove Purdue University to start working on a core curriculum with the potential for a mandate looming. The chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), Andrew Luescher, mentioned that EPC will soon meet with Vice Provost Christine Ladisch to begin the discussions on a core curriculum. Provost Randy Woodson and Vice Provost Ladisch will work closely with the Senate as the development of a core curriculum moves forward. They envision a faculty-driven curriculum development process. Professor Steven Collicott suggested that a core curriculum should move Purdue University forward and not in a backward direction. No additional questions or comments were forthcoming.

The next issue that was brought up was “Quality of Life.” Professor Janet Alsup asked what issues fall under this broad topic. One example is the work of Professor Charles Santerre, a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee, on the proposed “Fit Purdue” program. The intent is to encourage and enable faculty and staff to practice healthy lifestyle habits that will enhance wellness and bring down insurance and medical costs or at least slow the rise in these costs. Professor Santerre and his group are working with faculty groups, staff groups (APSAC and CCSAC), and Human Resources to develop this program. He would welcome any suggestions from the Senators and encouraged them to contact him. Professor Lynn Bryan recalled that a previous faculty survey (2003) had asked many questions about quality of life issues and it might be advantageous for Professor Santerre’s group to review that survey during the program development. Professor J. Paul Robinson suggested that a Faculty Club would increase the overall quality of life among faculty members of the campus by providing a relaxing place to meet colleagues from other departments, colleges or schools. Professor Samuel Midkiff expressed concern the tendency of department heads and administration in general to assign “minor” administrative duties to faculty which takes away from the total available time for work. These duties then interfere with the main teaching and research responsibilities and, thereby, decrease the quality of life within the university and with the family. Professor Stephen Martin suggested that the sheer number of people on campus makes it difficult to get around decreasing the quality of life and education. In addition, he suggested that faculty members should always be fully informed about decisions made by administrators and such full disclosure would enhance the quality of a faculty member’s professional life. Professor DeCarlo closed

the discussion by suggesting that faculty members could forward additional comments and questions to him ([decarlo@purdue.edu](mailto:decarlo@purdue.edu)).

12. There was no new business.
13. No memorial resolutions had been received.
14. The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

## **REMARKS BY PRESIDENT FRANCE A. CÓRDOVA**

Thank you, Ray.

It's great to be with the University Senate. I've been out of the country—in India and China—having very productive meetings, and I can truly say, “there's no place like home.”

Special thanks today to Ray, Howie, Joan, and Joe – and all of you who represent the faculty, staff, and graduate student body. The University Senate is important to all of Purdue. Thank you for that.

I want to first say a word about the offensive graffiti that appeared around campus. What took place is unacceptable and does not reflect the Purdue we are striving to create; one in which everyone feels welcome and supported. We don't know yet who was responsible and we're working with the police to find out. But the actions of a few people should not overshadow the strides Purdue is making on inclusion, nor should it reflect on the basic good nature and generosity of our students.

We have launched a national search for a Vice Provost for Diversity and Chief Diversity Officer. This dual-titled position will serve as a focal point for our efforts to foster an environment of inclusiveness at Purdue.

Dr. Carolyn Johnson, the Director of the Diversity Resource Office, has assumed the position as interim while a search is being conducted. She reports to Provost Randy Woodson in her role as Vice Provost for Diversity and to me as Chief Diversity Officer. In the latter capacity, she will sit on my Cabinet. Dr. Johnson will ensure that we coordinate diversity activities across our campuses, and that we address the diversity goals in the Strategic Plan. She brings a wealth of experience to this role, and we are glad she has taken it on.

Structurally, we will form a Diversity Council, which I will chair. Provost Woodson, Executive Vice President and Treasurer Jim Almond, Interim Chief Diversity Officer Carolyn Johnson, and the Vice President for Ethics and Compliance Alysa Rollock will be among its members.

The Provost will appoint a campus-wide diversity working group that Dr. Johnson will chair to advance new ideas and encourage the implementation of diversity initiatives across Purdue. The focus is on achieving our goals. This new working group will likely replace a number of committees that have reported to the Provost in the past.

We have important work ahead and I look forward to your continued support of our diversity and inclusivity efforts at Purdue.

Chairman Ray asked if I could give you an update on the outcome metrics from the Indiana Commission for Higher Education. It's an important question because we view the ICHE as our partner, and we applaud the goals recently enunciated in its White Paper.

Vic Lechtenberg, in his engagement and governmental relationship roles, and Rab Mukerjea, as Executive Director for planning and assessment, are working with the ICHE to establish mutually agreeable metrics that are realistic, appropriate, and achievable. A critical component

will be the ability to provide ongoing assessments. That will take the coordination of multiple offices. For example, the provost's office is responsible for many of the ICHE metrics focused on student success, like graduation and retention rates; the VPR office is responsible for sponsored program dollars; and the PRF is responsible for patents and licenses. Rab says that while many of the initiatives for student success in our University Strategic Plan are aligned with the ICHE goals, we need to synchronize our metrics with those of ICHE. He says that this is a work in progress.

Presently our schools, colleges and other units are developing their own strategic plans within the framework of the University Strategic Plan. Workshops have been underway to help write and set their benchmarks and metrics. Defining these plans is a valuable process which focuses our efforts and gives us assessment tools that make progress clearer. I want to thank Rab Mukerjea for assisting the colleges and departments with benchmarks and assessment tools.

Speaking of the Strategic Plan, now seems like a good time to introduce to you Carolyn Curiel, my new Chief of Staff and member of the clinical faculty in the department of communication. Carolyn comes to us from the New York Times Editorial Board. She has been the Ambassador to Belize and a writer for the President of the U.S. Carolyn will oversee the implementation of the Strategic Plan, particularly in areas that are so new that there is no clear pathway to implementation. One such area is the proposed public policy institute, whose development she will facilitate with the assistance of a faculty committee appointed by the deans, under the leadership of Provost Woodson.

Other positive progress toward our strategic plan has been made through my recent travels. My recent trips to India and Hong Kong and my participation at the *Science and Technology in Society* Forum in Kyoto, Japan have reinforced for me how fast the world is changing: our researchers must race along the paths of innovation to keep Purdue at the forefront of discovery; our faculty and staff must be smart and ambitious to compete effectively for global talent, including the best faculty and students; and our administrators and faculty must be strategic in selecting partnerships to make an impact globally. We have the talent resident in our faculty to engage others to meet the global challenges that we described in our strategic plan; it's time to do deepen our current global partnerships, seek new ones, and involve more of our faculty, staff, and students in shaping our world.

The Kyoto forum was attended by more than 750 leaders in science, business, research, media and policy from 91 countries and regions, including 31 ministers of science and technology, from Africa, South America, and other continents. We discussed some of the challenges associated with how information and technology are affecting the world. I used my own remarks at this conference to write an op-ed piece that discusses how the United States is not alone in its struggle to compete for and retain the best minds in science and technology. As our world becomes increasingly interconnected, the competition for these individuals also expands. The challenge for our country, and for our neighbors around the globe, will revolve around retaining our talent pool while simultaneously encouraging collaboration for the benefit of all societies. I talk about how "brain circulation" is key to benefiting all countries, rich and poor.

Let me just mention a few things from my trip to India and Hong Kong.

### **First, what did we do?**

- We visited companies and research institutes with which Purdue's faculty already maintain some connections to explore opportunities for deepening these research collaborations and extending them to include faculty and student exchanges, student internships, and international conferences. We got a sense of the comparative level of technology of these organizations as well as their strategic science and technology interests; this led us to propose new areas of potential collaboration. We evaluated the value of sending our students to these sites as part of their global credential.
- We hosted many receptions for alumni and parents of current students. Purdue students studying abroad attended some of these functions. We got feedback on what is important to our alumni and current international students about their experience at Purdue. We gave these people the sense that Purdue cares about them even after they've graduated, and welcomes their continued participation in Purdue life.
- We met with major donors to apprise them of the impact of their gifts and deepen our relationships with them. In some cases they introduced us to other potential partners who head important businesses. It will be important to maintain and enhance these contacts.

### **Why India? Why Hong Kong?**

- The success of our students and faculty figured prominently in this choice. Purdue has more students from India than from any other country (about 1260 out of an international population of about 5500, or 23%), as well as a large number of Indian faculty and research staff (72); many of these maintain collaborations with Indian institutions. There is a lot of "brain circulation" between our two countries.
- India is one of the giant emerging economies of this century, with a huge talent pool that can surely help address the world's science and technology challenges. India's own challenges as a country mirror many of ours, such as renewable energy sources; the quality of, especially, the urban environment; a widening economic gap between wealthy and poor; education, especially for the poor; quality and access to healthcare.
- India, for its lack of significant infrastructure (such as good roads and logistics, electricity in vast rural areas, a clean water system), is still producing some of the highest quality research facilities on the planet. These provide inspired models and good potential for collaboration. One company we visited was the inspiration for Thomas Friedman's book *The World is Flat*.
- Hong Kong is an international crossroads, with a huge investment in infrastructure. It represents a true melting pot of multi-national talent, and sustains a sense of momentum and entrepreneurship that put it on the innovation edge. Many Purdue graduates have spent some time in Hong Kong at one of its major research companies or universities. It represents an opportunity for an international cosmopolitan experience for our students, as well as fertile sites for faculty development through visits and sabbaticals.

### **How is the visit tied to Purdue's new Strategic Plan?**

- Our visit embraces all three major goals of the new Strategic Plan:
  - Student experience: Our students need global credentials at companies and universities abroad where they will be exposed to (a) uses of science and technology for humanitarian goals, in addition to economic development; (b) the

opportunities and impact of globalization; (c) job opportunities on an international scale; (d) exposure to other cultures and perspectives.

- Research: Our faculty, staff, and students have a multitude of opportunities for expanding their research enterprises by partnering with the best companies and universities abroad. There is abundant talent in these institutions, and research potential in every domain.

Of particular interest to India are: pharmaceuticals, nanotechnology and nanomedicine; cleaner coal technology and all renewable sources of energy, including converting biomass to fuel; water purification technology; health care science and engineering; fuel cell technology; lighting technology; biodetection global supply chain management, understanding genetic diversity as a key to individualized medicine. Of particular interest among the Hong Kong institutions we visited are: nanotechnology and biotechnology; tourism and consumer science; sustainable urban environments; gerontology.

- Meeting Global challenges: Institutions abroad realize, as we do, that it will take international partnerships to meet our challenges in healthcare, the environment, energy, poverty, and education. These partnerships go beyond research collaborations; they must involve government funding and collaboration, and societal awareness and commitment, which can only be done through policy change, incentives, and communication.

Based on this trip, I make a number of observations and recommendations in my report which, for lack of time here, I will share with you by other means.

Let me close my remarks with a topic closer to home, the economy and our State budget request. In spite of the current fiscal crisis, I am feeling positive about Purdue's opportunities and where we are going. On Wednesday, I will appear before the Indiana Legislature for the biennial Budget Committee Hearing. The messages I will communicate will be these:

- We will recognize the Legislative Committee's past efforts and the **realities of the current fiscal situation**
- We will highlight our **fiscal partnership with them**, rather than asking them to solve all our problems
- We will convey the rationale that went into our budget requests and describe how they will **advance all elements of our strategic plan, including keeping Indiana at the innovation front in economic development**
- We will recognize the critical **roles of all four of our Purdue campuses**

We may have a tough time through this biennial budget cycle. I'm prepared to defend our requests and reinforce the need to invest in higher education as a public good. Our strategic plan has the clear mission of advancing Purdue and the state of Indiana, and this is especially important during these difficult economic times.

I need your help. I need your support as we explain to those who would question, what are motives are; to those who are confused, what are goals are; to those who doubt, what the promise is for our state and our nation. Now is the time to be clear – to our legislators and to our citizens broadly around Indiana -- about what Purdue stands for, and what it can deliver.

I am grateful to you for your engagement, your talent, your ambition, and your love for Purdue. Thank you!

17 November 2008

**To:** The University Senate  
**From:** University Senate Advisory Committee  
**Subject:** Reaffirmation of Campus Policies for Appreciating Cultural Diversity and for Free Speech with Respectful Dialogue  
**Disposition:** University Senate for Approval

**WHEREAS:** There have been graffiti displays on campus recently that are disrespectful and offensive to several cultural, ethnic and/or political groups within our diverse Purdue community

**WHEREAS:** President France Córdova has issued a letter to all students, faculty and staff condemning these displays and reminding us all of Purdue's commitment to inclusiveness and our tradition of fellowship and mutual respect

**WHEREAS:** Vice President for Ethics and Compliance Alysa C. Rollock has commented publicly that our exercise of free speech on campus is most effective, and most appropriate, when it is respectful dialogue

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:**

The Purdue University Senate reaffirms the views of President Córdova and Vice President Rollock that encourage an atmosphere of tolerance for the diversity of opinions and a respect for the diversity of all cultures within our Purdue community. Specifically, the Purdue University Senate is opposed to all expressions of racial, ethnic, religious or cultural bigotry.

Further, the Purdue University Senate encourages the faculty to recognize they have special responsibility, through their words, actions and deeds, to foster the spirit of tolerance and respect within the Purdue University community.

**Respectfully submitted on behalf of the University Senate Advisory Committee,**

**Morris Levy, Chair, University Resources Policy Committee**

**David Williams, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee**

## **REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE - PROFESSOR RAYMOND A. DECARLO**

Welcome everyone to another senate meeting. As promised my hope is to bring some humor to our deliberations. Professor Levy saved my skin with a series of puns that he emailed to a group of us.

1. The roundest knight at King Arthur's round table was Sir Cumference. He acquired his size from having too much pi.

2. I thought I saw an eye doctor on an Alaskan island, but it turned out to be an optical Aleutian.

And as for some self-deprecation, my mother-in-law used to remind me, especially around this time of year, to make myself useful as well as ornamental. From wherever she is after death, I hope my presence here is somewhat useful, as I know it is quite ornamental.

On the more serious side, there was a recent conference for senate officers from around the big 10. A number of issues of significance were discussed:

(i) University budgeting was an important topic. The vice provost at the University of Michigan for budgetary affairs indicated that the 10 year trend has been a 5.1% per year growth in the budgets of the academic units, a 2.9% per year growth in the administrative units, and a 4.5% per year increase in centrally funded utilities, debt service, insurance etc. Finally, they have sustained a 6.4% per year increase in centrally funded financial aid.

We are looking forward to learning about how Purdue has done and is doing in these areas partially of course from the Ad Hoc Budget transparency committee but also from central administration.

(ii) A second issue that was discussed was metrics of performance. The presentation was from the University of Minnesota where they have distinguished three sets of metrics:

(a) Central administration objectives and the associated audience (state legislatures, US News and World Reports, Other Universities ...) drive university level metrics.

(b) These are followed by dean/college level metrics. These metrics are adapted to the type of college and objectives of the college. They of course feed into the central administration level metrics.

(c) Finally there are the school/dept level metrics for success which can be widely different across the university (diversity). Thus each school/dept can adapt metrics that best fit the personality of the school/dept. I am told there is a similar set of distinctions within the Ag School. Could we not adopt this across the university?

(iii) A third issue was academic freedom and freedom of speech. After the steering committee has had a chance to discuss the issue, I will report back to you.

In view of the potentially lengthy discussion on the voting outcomes from the last meeting, let us move on with the agenda at this point.

And I would like to wish everyone a very happy holiday season as this is the last meeting of the semester.

**TO:** University Senate  
**FROM:** Joan R. Fulton, Chairperson, Steering Committee  
**SUBJECT:** Résumé of Items under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

**STEERING COMMITTEE**

Joan R. Fulton, Chairperson  
[fultonj@purdue.edu](mailto:fultonj@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**

Raymond A. DeCarlo, Chairperson of the Senate  
[decarlo@purdue.edu](mailto:decarlo@purdue.edu)

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

**NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

William D. McInerney, Chairperson  
[bmcinern@purdue.edu](mailto:bmcinern@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**

Andrew Luescher, Chairperson  
[Luescher@purdue.edu](mailto:Luescher@purdue.edu)

1. Implementation of +/- grading
2. Implementation of OnePurdue/Banner
3. Forgiveness policy
4. Course repeat policy
5. Internationalization initiative
6. Limit on credits for students on probation
7. Remedial 1-credit course for students on probation
8. Core Curriculum

**FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Charlene A. Sullivan, Chairperson  
[sullivaa@purdue.edu](mailto:sullivaa@purdue.edu)

1. Consideration of Fit Purdue Initiative with URPC
2. University Promotions Committee transparency
3. Future of Faculty Scholarship for Staff Program
4. Petition to allow noncontract funds be used for professional expenses
5. Purdue Retirement Plan Task Force

**STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

H. Lee Weith, Chairperson  
[weith@purdue.edu](mailto: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](mailto:levy0@purdue.edu)

1. Faculty input into the budgetary process: enhancing excellence in research and graduate education
2. Review of campus energy sufficiency, safety, and other Physical Facilities operations
3. Review of Faculty Committees

Chair of the Senate, Raymond A. DeCarlo, [Decarlo@purdue.edu](mailto:Decarlo@purdue.edu)  
Vice Chair of the Senate, Howard N. Zelaznik, [hzelaz@purdue.edu](mailto:hzelaz@purdue.edu)  
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., [jcamp@purdue.edu](mailto:jcamp@purdue.edu)  
University Senate Minutes; <http://www.purdue.edu/usenate>

<b>CALENDAR OF STATUS OF LEGISLATION</b>
--

<i><b>SENATE DOCUMENT</b></i>	<i><b>TITLE</b></i>	<i><b>ORIGIN</b></i>	<i><b>SENATE</b></i>
08-1	Nominee for University Senate Student Affairs Committee	Professor William McInerney	Approved 9/8/08
08-2	Change to Section C of the University Code	Professor David J. Williams	Approved 10/20/08
08-3	Reapportionment of the University Senate	Professor Joan Fulton	Approved 11/17/08
08-4	Reaffirmation of Campus Policies for Appreciating Cultural Diversity and for Free Speech with Respectful Dialogue	Professor Morris Levy	Approved 11/17/08

**\*Approved**

<b>SENATE REPORTS</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>ORIGIN</b>
08-1	Report on Considerations Concerning Plus/Minus Grading	Professor Andrew Luescher

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

Section D 3.00 of the University Code, and the Bylaws of the University Senate, provide that the University Senate shall be composed of one hundred two members. Eleven of these are specified in the items 1 through 11 below. The other slots will be apportioned among the West Lafayette faculty units, according to the number of faculty members, with the provision that no faculty unit shall have fewer than two senators. There are 2038 voting faculty members at the West Lafayette campus. When the number of voting faculty members within a faculty unit is divided by 2038 the number of faculty seats in the senate is computed. The only unit that falls below the minimum of two is Libraries (1.96). Thus, Libraries are assigned two seats, and there are now 89 seats remaining, 10 faculty units, and 1994 remaining faculty members. We do the division procedure again. The predicted faculty numbers are: Agriculture, 13.61; Consumer and Family Sciences, 2.58; Education, 2.99; Engineering, 14.77; Liberal Arts, 18.52; Management, 3.79; Pharmacy, Nursing, and Health Sciences, 4.95; Science, 14.99; Technology, 8.07; Veterinary Medicine, 4.69. In order to achieve the desired 89, Liberal Arts and CFS were closest to being below 0.500 and thus they were assigned values of 18 and 2 representatives, respectively. The remaining eight units were rounded to the nearest integer value.

	<b>No. Voting Fac. Members November 16, 2007</b>	<b>Number of Senators 2008-2009</b>	<b>No. Voting Fac. Members November 6, 2008</b>	<b>Number of Senators 2009-2010</b>
<b><u>Areas Represented</u></b>				
1. President		1		1
2. Chief Academic Officer		1		1
3. Chief Fiscal Officer		1		1
4. Chairperson of the Senate		1		1
5. Vice-Chairperson of the Senate		1		1
6. Calumet Campus		1		1
7. Fort Wayne Campus		1		1
8. North Central Campus		1		1
9. IUPUI Campus		1		1
10. Undergraduate Student		1		1
11. Graduate Student		1		1
12. Faculty Units				
<i>Agriculture</i>	298	13	305	14
<i>Consumer &amp; Family Sci.</i>	59	3	58	2
<i>Education</i>	71	3	67	3
<i>Engineering</i>	323	15	331	15
<i>Liberal Arts</i>	403	18	415	18
<i>Libraries</i>	47	2	44	2
<i>Management</i>	87	4	85	4
<i>Pharm, Nurs, &amp; Health Sci.</i>	110	5	111	5
<i>Science</i>	322	14	336	15
<i>Technology</i>	195	9	181	8
<i>Veterinary Medicine</i>	<u>105</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>5</u>
	2019	102	2038	102

**Approving (via email)**

Raymond DeCarlo	J. Paul Robinson
Joan Fulton	Mara H. Wasburn
Robert Joly	Howard Zelaznik
Alyssa Panitch	

Considerations Concerning  
**Plus/Minus Grading**

Educational Policies Committee

The Educational Policies Committee of the University Senate would like to make all faculty aware of an implication of the plus/minus grading system. Letter grades translate into index points as follows:

A, A+	4.0 x semester hrs = index points
A-	3.7
B+	3.3
B	3.0
B-	2.7
C+	2.3
C	2.0
C-	1.7
D+	1.3
D	1.0
D-	0.7
Other	0.0 x semester hrs = index points

The Semester GPA is the sum of all index points for one semester, divided by the sum of all corresponding semester hours.

Since the University requirement for students with a classification of 4 and higher is a minimum GPA of 2.0, a student performing at the C- level would be failing. That is, the optional nature of the new +/- grading can create situations where, unless care is taken by faculty and administrators, some students with comparable performance will be treated inconsistently with regards to very important academic advancement decisions.

In addition, there are a variety of programmatic requirements across campus that may be currently set at a minimum of C. Many of these policies are being reviewed under the new grading scheme. One issue that arises in considering these policies is that the minimum C in particular courses is often coupled with the minimum GPA requirements. Programs need to decide if a C- with its associated GPA (1.7) meets the spirit of these requirements as long as students have enough offsetting credit with higher index points to meet the minimum programmatic/university GPA.

Additional considerations are:

1. that the numerical weighting in the +/- scale has A and A+ as the same GPA value.
2. consider the cases in the table below. student B receives a C- with a 72% while student A, with the same 72% in the same Chemistry course, but different semester or section, receives a C because the +/- is not being implemented. Given a requirement of a minimum of 2.0 programmatic GPA to proceed, Student A could proceed but Student B could not proceed, although they had the same percentage in the Chemistry course. Student C is another example of a student who also achieved a C- in Chemistry but has credit from other courses to offset the C-. Thus, if various sections or semesters of a course treat the same academic performance differently, then students will be treated inconsistently and quite probably in some certain cases, unfairly..

<b>Student A</b>			<b>Student B</b>			<b>Student C</b>		
Course	Grade	Hours	Course	Grade	Hours	Course	Grade	Hours
Chemistry	C	4	Chemistry	C-	4	Chemistry	C-	4
English	B	3	English	B	3	English	B	3
World History	D	3	World History	D	3	World History	C	3
<b>Semester GPA</b>		<b>2.0</b>	<b>Semester GPA</b>		<b>1.88</b>	<b>Semester GPA</b>		<b>2.18</b>

Thus, the EPC recommends that colleges, schools, departments, programs, etc., all examine their grade-based and GPA-based criteria to minimize the possibility of unfairness in important academic advancement decisions. Verifying that your current written and numerical statements of minimum requirements are in agreement is likely one effective way to begin the process.