

UNIVERSITY SENATE
Fifth Meeting, Monday, 18 February 2008, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

AGENDA

1. Call to order Professor George M. Bodner
2. Approval of Minutes of 28 January 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
8. [University Senate Document 07-7](#)
Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the University Senate For Discussion
Professor Natalie J. Carroll
9. [University Senate Document 07-6](#)
Evening Examination Schedule For Action
Professor James D. McGlothlin
10. [University Senate Document 07-5](#)
Change to University Regulations For Action
Professor James D. McGlothlin
11. [University Senate Report 07-3](#)
Response to Investigation of Proposed Termination of ITaP
Dial-up Modem Service For Information
Professor Morris Levy
12. [University Senate Report 07-4](#)
Response to Petition from College of Agriculture
re Physical Facilities Services for Construction
and Renovation For Information
Professor Morris Levy
13. New Business
14. Memorial Resolutions
15. Adjournment

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Fifth Meeting, Monday, 18 February 2008, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

Present: *President France A. Córdoba, George M. Bodner, (Chairperson of the Senate) presiding, Professors Howard Adler, David C. Anderson, Alan M. Beck, John E. Blendell, Lawrence W. Braille, James E. Braun, Becky Brown, Andrew S. Buckser, Bernd Buldt, Christian E. Butzke, Stephen R. Byrn, Joseph W. Camp Jr. (Secretary of Faculties and Parliamentarian), Natalie J. Carroll, Steve H. Collicott, Christine L. Corum, Wei K. Cui, Martin Curd, Lawrence P. DeBoer, Raymond A. DeCarlo, John P. Denton, Phillip S. Dunston, Charlotte Erdmann, Scott L. Feld, Joan R. Fulton, William G. Graziano, James P. Greenan, John Grutzner, Chong Gu, Tony Hawkins, Jeffrey D. Holland, Kristine Holtvedt, Daniel Hsieh, Gerald C. Hyner, Richard Johnson-Sheehan, Robert J. Joly, Karen I. Kirk, Joseph F. Kmec, Daniel J. Kovenock, Christine M. Ladisch, Daniel E. Leaird, Victor L. Lechtenberg, Morris Levy, Andrew U. Luescher, Scott Mandernack, William G. McCartney, William D. McInerney, Samuel P. Midkiff, Joseph D. Mikesell, P. Jane Morris (Sergeant at Arms), Cindy H. Nakatsu, Mary B. Nakhleh, Morgan R. Olsen, Alyssa Panitch, Teri Reed-Rhoads, J. Paul Robinson, Carolyn Roper, Charles R. Santerre, John A. Sautter, A. Paul Schwab, Thomas M. Sellke, Louis A. Sherman, Robert Skeel, Glenn Sparks, Bernard Y. Tao, Elizabeth J. Taparowsky, Volker K. Thomas, Marion T. Trout, Phillip J. VanFossen, Eric Van Houten, Samuel S. Wagstaff, Mara H. Wasburn, Val J. Watts, Herbert L. Weith, S. Laurel Weldon. Charles W. White, David J. Williams, G. Thomas Wilson, and Howard Zelaznik.*

Absent: *Professors Olayiwola Adeola, Christopher R. Agnew, Jai P. Agrawal, James C. Becker, Antonio Bobet, Charles A. Bouman, Donald D. Buskirk, Patrice M. Buzzanell, Anindo Chatterjee, Shawn S. Donkin, Joseph C. Dorsey, Nancy E. Edwards, Steven G. Hallett, L. Douglass F. Jacobs, James L. Jenkins, Ananthanarayan Krishnan, Robert A. Kubat, Michael L. Leasure, Julie R. Mariga, James D. McGlothlin, Mark T. Moriarty, Rabindra N. Mukerjee, Robert D. Plante, Robert E. Pruitt, Gintaras V. Reklaitis, Tom B. Robinson, Alysa C. Rollock, S. Santhanakrishnan, Jie Shen, A. Charlene Sullivan, Lefteri H. Tsoukalas, Whitney Walton, Yuehwern Yih and William J. Zinsmeister.*

Guests: *Steve Garbacc, Mike Loizzo, Valerie O'Brien, Deb Sheets, 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 28 January 2008 were approved as distributed.
3. The agenda was presented and accepted by acclamation.
4. President France A. Córdoba deferred her remarks until the Faculty Convocation to follow after the Senate meeting (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).
7. At question time the secretary reported no questions had been submitted in writing and no questions came from the floor.

8. Professor Carroll presented, for discussion, Senate Document 07-7, *Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the Senate*. She called for nominations from the floor, but none were forthcoming.
9. Professor Luescher presented, for action, University Senate Document 07-6, *Evening Examination Schedule*. His motion was seconded. There was no discussion on the document and it passed by a unanimous voice vote.
10. The discussion of amended Senate Document 07-5, *Change to the University Academic Regulations* continued. Professor Grutzner presented a friendly amendment to reinstate wording that had been inadvertently removed from the document when it was amended at the 28 January 2008 Senate meeting. The specific wording is: "With the consent of his/her academic advisor, 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 Senate accepted this friendly amendment without discussion. Professor Grutzner then made a motion to refer the document to the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) for further consideration and discussion. He argued that a number of changes have been proposed for the document since the last meeting of the Educational Policy Committee suggesting that this issue is not something that should be hurried to completion. Referral to committee will allow the EPC members to reach a consensus prior to returning the document to the Senate. Professor Bodner stated that the document could be brought back to the Senate in March and be voted on in April. In addition, the Senate could hold a special meeting if needed to handle the document. Professor Feld said that the move to refer the document to committee would delay action and fail to yield new options. He stated that it was important to make the decision now especially with the new software that will be going live in the near future. In addition, there could be consequences to abolishing grade adjustment that will need to be taken into account by all of the concerned parties. Professor DeCarlo said that in recent weeks he has seen significant movement towards a compromise that should be considered and this movement justifies referring the document to the EPC. After additional brief comments, Professor Weldon called the question. A voice vote was inconclusive, so a vote by show of hands was taken. The vote was 40 in favor and 26 opposed to referring the document to the EPC. Therefore, the document will be returned to the EPC with the intent that it will return in a modified form at the March 2008 Senate meeting. It is hoped that the modified document will be the product of consensus and will be received favorably by the Senate.
11. Professor Morris Levy, chair of the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC), presented two reports for information only. Professor Levy said that through its discussion with ITaP, the URPC found that the existing dial-up modem equipment was outmoded and inefficient, used by few people, and would require \$125,000 to replace and \$83,000 for annual maintenance. Based on these figures, the committee members agreed with ITaP that cessation of the service is justified. However, this cessation should be delayed until the campus has notified all interested parties of the change as well as providing information about alternative commercial services that are available. As it stands, the service will be discontinued on 1 July 2008. The second report from the URPC involved the committee's investigation into a petition presented by 95 members of the College of Agriculture about problems obtaining construction and renovation services

from Physical Facilities. Professor Levy said that a preliminary investigation determined poor communication between administrative units and the Physical Facilities Department as well as ambiguous operational policies led to declining customer satisfaction. He said that planned focus group meetings with all of the Physical Facilities customers and feedback meetings with Deans and department head will identify need and expectations for construction and renovation projects. Physical Facilities will use the information to provide a report to the URPC that presents policy clarifications and changes. In addition, the report will include a set of metrics for evaluating customer satisfaction.

12. There were no memorial resolutions.
13. The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT FRANCE A. CÓRDOVA

Good afternoon. Thank you for joining me today at my first University Senate Faculty Convocation. I have looked forward to this opportunity to talk with you, and at the close of my remarks I would like to hear your questions and comments.

The excellence of Purdue stems directly from the excellence of its people. Thank you for everything you are doing to make Purdue the incredible university that it is.

I have thoroughly enjoyed working with the University Senate and its leadership and look forward to a long and productive collaboration.

I have been here six months, and in that time it is clear to me the state of our University is excellent. But we always aspire to new heights. This is a University that has thrived in three centuries by always building one brick higher.

When I arrived on campus last summer, I started with an ice cream social to meet our faculty, staff, and students for the first time. Last week I celebrated my first six months at Purdue with a cider social. It was a small way of saying that the listening and learning tour that engaged me from the start is not over.

Indeed, in the past few weeks I've been all over the country -- actually, the world. I've traveled to northern, central, and southern California, to Florida, and to cities in the Southwest to meet with alumni. I've traveled to the Middle East to look at educational opportunities for Purdue. And I've traveled to several of our colleges to meet with faculty, staff, and administrators and learn what makes our colleges so distinctive in research and education. I've enjoyed all of those visits, and sensed the excitement as we all plan for the future. There's a lot of change afoot, and a spirit that embraces it. That makes Purdue a very exciting place to be.

When our **Board of Trustees** met some time ago to launch the search for a new President, it too engaged in a listening tour within Purdue and around the State. It came up with a dozen strategic initiatives that it hoped the new President would address. I would like to share these with you, and describe how the actions I've taken to date and the Strategic Plan we've launched will address the Board's vision about what is important for Purdue going forward.

The Board stated that Purdue should depend on strategic planning for future direction. As you know, we are fully engaged in such planning. Eight working groups are meeting around the clock, and although weary they are also energized. Their white papers are due to the Steering Committee at the end of this week and I'm looking forward to the presentations of the groups summarizing their plans.

The integrated strategic plan will be ready for campus-wide discussion this spring, and presented to the Board of Trustees for its consideration in June. Once the Plan with its goals is approved, then implementation will get underway, using timelines, benchmarks, and measures for each of the goals.

The plans will represent a 21st century response to our land-grant mission. Our plans will position Purdue in new strategic areas. Our vision is to be among the great, top-ranked research universities in the world and I hope that the plan will be a roadmap to get us there.

To recap, the **eight working groups** are: Attracting Students to STEM Careers, Campus Design, Economic Development, Globalization, Large-scale Research and Infrastructure, Quality of Life in the Workplace, Student Success and the Student Experience, and Synergies Among the Disciplines.

Several well attended Strategic Plan **open forums** have been held. We have dedicated President's Forums to Strategic Plan issues. A forum was held last week exclusively for students. Several focus group meetings in the local community and around the state have been held to gather input for the working groups on Economic Development and Campus Design.

We have created a strategic planning **Web site**, and it is attracting a great deal of attention and input. We "went live" with the Web site on December 14. As of February 4, we had received about 700 comments on the site and almost 33,000 page views or "hits."

The Board of Trustees also listed as necessary the expansion of our research capacity and sponsored programs with an interdisciplinary emphasis.

Research plays an essential role in our efforts to position Purdue among the great national and global universities.

Purdue's sponsored program funding reached a high of \$300 million in awards during the last academic year. But that still left us at or near the bottom of the Big Ten.

This is a challenge that the Strategic Plan Working Group on Large Scale Research and its Infrastructure is addressing. The Group will likely recommend new areas of research for Purdue or areas of national momentum where Purdue could play a special role. This group will also look at ways to expand the research infrastructure to enable faculty to engage in larger partnerships.

The Working Group on Synergies Across Disciplines may also recommend innovative interdisciplinary areas for investment. And we can look forward to new global approaches for research from the Working Group on Globalization.

The goal of expanding our research portfolio will be assisted by the appointment of a new Vice President for Research; the national search for this person is underway. This position will report directly to the President. The new VPR will reorganize the Research Office for success, especially to significantly increase federal research and corporate funding and congressionally directed programs.

Success in our research agenda will depend on broader partnerships with government, industry, other universities and national labs. To do this, we will need increased support in governmental affairs and linkages to foundations, as well as a more robust infrastructure to support our faculty, including more proposal support and technical support for scientific instrumentation. We need to develop enhanced outreach and networks to program officers within foundations, federal agencies, and corporations.

Discovery Park is a complex with incredible potential for large-scale interdisciplinary research. We will develop a plan with Discovery Park leadership to augment funding for the operation of the Park and its centers.

Purdue and Indiana University are our state's major public research institutions. President McRobbie of Indiana University and I have agreed to work together for expanded state research funding for life and health sciences. We have shared our plan with a supportive Commission on Higher Education. Some of the centers within Discovery Park will be involved in this plan, as will be the Colleges of Engineering, Science, Technology, and Liberal Arts with its highly-ranked department of speech and hearing.

A third initiative on the Trustees' list was to increase financial resources. In the years ahead there will be a continued emphasis on fundraising from private sources and foundations. To date this Fiscal Year we have raised \$121.3 million towards our goal of \$175M.

During the week of January 24, we announced eight major gifts toward the Access and Success Mackey Arena Project. Pledges toward the project now total \$21 million as we near our fund raising goal of \$30 million.

The Mackey Complex project is designed to enhance the ability of Purdue's student-athletes to succeed in all aspects of their Purdue experience. This includes intercollegiate athletic contests. And it includes the classroom, where the future of these students is being determined. We give these student-athletes tremendous support when they are competing in games. We need to support them in their studies as well.

This is part of an overall campaign focused on student access and success. My vision for the next several years is a series of mini-campaigns focused on initiatives that will help bring students to Purdue and help them succeed once they arrive.

Let me give you some examples of what we need to do.

First, we need to finish funding to fully endow the Purdue Opportunity Awards. Purdue Opportunity Award winners are Indiana students with high academic potential and who need the most financial help to attend college. These are students who would not receive a Purdue education without our help.

Second, we need to develop a scholarship program for middle-income students with family incomes of \$40,000 to \$70,000 who don't qualify for federal or state assistance.

Third, we need to create a scholarship program for students with high academic achievement.

The Purdue Research Foundation has accomplished a great deal and had tremendous successes. I will be looking in the months ahead at ways to expand the agenda of the PRF to include fund-raising from many sources.

A fourth strategic initiative of the Trustees' is to improve the quality of the faculty. Our national search for a new provost is ongoing and on-track. We are also hiring new deans for our College of Education and Graduate School. All of our departments are committed to hiring the very best faculty, and the appointments of these senior administrators are important in enabling us to recruit and retain a high-quality faculty.

I hope that our key senior hires will be world-class researchers and leaders in target areas recommended by the Working Groups. We need to promote our outstanding faculty for significant awards to retain them, and to bring increased visibility to the prominent faculty of Purdue. I am thinking of recent successes such as the National Medal of Technology, won by Professor Les Geddes and Professor Jerry Woodall, and the World Food Prize received last fall by Dr. Phil Nelson.

We also need to develop a strategy to promote faculty to membership in national academies. Congratulations to Kumares Sinha and Andrew Weiner on being recently named to the National Academy of Engineering.

At the same time we increase faculty quality, we also need to focus on a strategy to **increase faculty compensation** to at least the mean of the Big Ten. **This, too, is a goal of the Trustees.** We need to find a way to do it.

A stated goal of the Trustees is to enhance Purdue's role in Indiana's economic development. Our engagement has grown to the point that Governor Mitch Daniels said that he considers Purdue the pole star for our state. We are setting the course for Indiana in the 21st century.

We are building a 3-D highway through the state with research parks in Merrillville, West Lafayette, Indianapolis and New Albany. The three "D's" of this highway are discovery, development and delivery of our research to the marketplace.

Expanding the capabilities of Discovery Park and its connection to our Research Parks through strategic investments will be an important aspect of this. I look forward to the recommendations flowing from the **Working Group on Economic Development.**

Companies tell me that they need more students prepared in STEM careers and the **Working Group on Attracting Students to STEM** will advise on how we can be a national magnet for recruiting and retaining STEM students -- a goal that will impact economic development in Indiana, and enhance Purdue's role in keeping our nation globally competitive.

Another important initiative of the Trustees is to recruit and retain a diverse faculty, staff, and student body. In spite of some more recent success in enhancing faculty diversity, Purdue's student diversity is far less than the mean of our peer group.

We will implement the Mosaic program, expand diversity training, and institute a President's Diversity Council to strive to accomplish this goal.

Science Bound is an important program in this regard. We need to encourage other K-12 programs for academic preparedness. We have received a grant from Lilly Endowment for Woodrow Wilson fellows. We need to work hard to achieve the goal of this program, which is to increase the number of STEM teachers for rural areas.

I have asked that every strategic plan working group address the enhancement of diversity in putting forward its initiatives.

One of the key strategic initiatives of the Trustees' is to raise student quality. Our graduation rate has reached an all-time high. But it could be much higher.

Our most recent comparison of six-year graduation rates places Purdue 7th out of the 10 Big Ten public universities. We still lag more than 12 percent behind our peer mean. We will focus on further progress in our graduation rate and progress in student retention guided by research underway by our Admissions Office. We will implement best strategies of the **Strategic Plan Working Group on Student Success**. We have to carefully think about what access means for students of differing abilities and utilize our entire system of regional campuses to help us place students where they can best succeed.

To help us raise student quality we recently established a new scholarship program to attract best students. We need to raise substantial endowment money to pay for this scholarship program.

The Trustees are also concerned about the loans that our students take out, and the need for increased financial aid. We need to increase the transparency on net cost of higher education through website tools, and increase communication to parents and prospective students about financial aid opportunities.

Among the other goals of the Trustees is to expand our international efforts. They would like Purdue to make a global impact, in the tradition of its land-grant mission which has made such a difference for our State.

We are already a university with global reach. We have partnerships in Europe, Africa, India and China. Purdue is a doorway to Indiana for the rest of the world. Likewise, Purdue is a doorway for Indiana as it steps into the international marketplace. With nearly 5,000 international students on campus, among the largest enrollments at any U.S. university, we can play an important role in what has been called this new “flat world.”

There will be a panel on the theme of the Global University during my inauguration, which takes place during Gala Weekend in April. This panel will be moderated by Purdue graduate and CNN Founder, President and CEO Brian Lamb and will have panelists from the United States, Mexico, Brazil, Chile, Germany, Canada and China.

We are examining opportunities abroad, and I'll look forward to the recommendations of the Strategic Plan Working Group on Globalization for further ideas about what it means to be a global university.

There is much more that I could elaborate on here, but the hour grows late, and I do want to leave a few minutes for questions.

I will conclude by mentioning a few additional things that have grown out of my own listening and learning tour, initiatives that I have added to the Trustees' list that I have shared with you. These are **improving student success in every dimension**; as you know, I've devoted a Strategic Plan Working Group to the goal of student success and the student experience. The Working Group on attracting students to the STEM fields is also coming up with some very important recommendations about increasing student success in the classroom.

Another goal is to **improve campus art and campus design** as we continue to build buildings, including our first “green building.” I've dedicated a working group to this effort too. And, finally, a goal to **enhance the quality of life in our workplace**. As our own Senate Chair told the board of Trustees a week ago, “Since I have no life outside of the workplace, the quality of my life in the workplace is very important to me.” I've devoted a Strategic Plan working group to this

effort, and I'm hopeful that the outcomes will benefit us all.

I'll conclude by saying Thank You. You've made my first semester -- and that of Purdue's First Gentleman -- a special one.

Hail Purdue, and -- anticipating tomorrow night at IU -- Go Boilers!

REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE - PROFESSOR GEORGE M. BODNER

Good afternoon and welcome to the fifth meeting of the University Senate for the 2007-2008 academic year. I would like to start by noting that the Board of Trustees recently approved the appointment of Bruce Hamaker as the Roy Whistler Chair in Carbohydrate Science in the Department of Food Science. This appointment increases to 150 the total number of named and distinguished professors at Purdue. It was at this meeting that the first public announcement was made that two of our colleagues — Kumares Sinha, Edgar B. and Hedwig M. Olson Distinguished Professor of Civil Engineering and Andrew Weiner, Scifres Distinguished Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering — have been recognized by election to the National Academy of Engineering.

I would like to note that most comments about University Senate Report 07-2 on interpretation of policy on intellectual property distributed at the previous Senate meeting have been positive and suggest that this document may have resolved some of the concerns raised about Executive Memorandum B-10, which was approved by the Board of Trustees in May.

I would also like to report that a draft of a four-page letter has been prepared that will soon be sent to the Vice-President for Research that summarizes some of the comments and suggestions that have been received on the revised version of Executive Memorandum C-22, which states the University's policy on integrity in research.

I would like to conclude my remarks by noting that drafts of the white papers from the eight working groups involved in the creation of the University's strategic plan are being completed this week. It is important to recognize the extraordinary efforts of the individuals involved in this process, who have invested literally thousands hours of their time in the preparation of these documents.

TO: University Senate
FROM: Ray DeCarlo, Chairperson, Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Résumé de 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
gmbodner@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

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
djw@purdue.edu

1. Proposed Policy on Amorous Relationships
2. Academic Procedures Manual
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
--

SENATE DOCUMENT	TITLE	ORIGIN	SENATE
*07-1	University Limits on Clinical/Professional Faculty	Faculty Affairs Committee	Approved 10/15/07
*07-2	Proposed Parental Leave Policy	Faculty Affairs Committee	Passed 11/19/07
07-3	Change to the University Senate Bylaws	Professor and Chair, George M. Bodner	Defeated 10/15/07
*07-4	Reapportionment of the Senate	Professor and Vice Chair, Raymond A. DeCarlo	Passed 11/19/07
07-5	Change to the University Academic Regulations- Grade Index Adjustment	Professor James D. McGlothlin	Amended 1/28/08 Referred to Committee 2/18/08
07-6	Evening Examination Schedule	Professor James D. McGlothlin	For Discussion 2/18/08
07-7	Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the University Senate	Professor Natalie J. Carroll	For Discussion 2/18/08

***Approved**

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.

18 February 2008

TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Educational Policy Committee (EPC)
SUBJECT: Change in University Scheduling of Evening Exam Regulations
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Discussion
REFERENCES: University Regulations 2007-08, Section II, Academic Program, Part J

Introduction

Based on increasing demand for the administration of evening exams the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) worked with the Registrar's office to address this issue. The EPC was sensitive to avoiding conflicts with course offerings at the end of the day and to the security and safety issues of the students. The changes in scheduling included space availability and event planning such as the Purdue Christmas Show at Elliott Hall. Based on these considerations the earliest evening exams would be offered is 6:00 pm and the latest they would end is 10:00 pm.

Present	Proposal
<p>Part 2- Section XI – Scheduling of Examinations Section A. Evening Examinations</p>	<p>Proposed:</p>
<p>Current:</p> <p>5. Evening examinations may be scheduled during either of the following periods: 7 to 8 pm 8:30 to 9:30 pm As an exception, when the Hall of Music, Loeb Playhouse, or Fowler Hall is used for two examinations in a single evening, the examinations are to be scheduled for the following periods: 6:30 to 7:30pm 8:30 to 9:30pm</p> <p>In all cases, the testing period should be restricted to 60 minutes, unless a multiple-period evening examination has been requested.</p>	<p>5. Evening examinations may be scheduled during either of the following periods: <i>6:30 to 7:30pm</i> <i>8 to 9pm</i> As an exception, when the Hall of Music, Loeb Playhouse, or Fowler Hall is used for two 60-minute examinations in a single evening, the examinations are to be scheduled for the following periods: 6:30 to 7:30pm 8:30 to 9:30pm <i>Start times in these locations will change to 6:00pm and 8:00pm respectively on those occasions when they are scheduled for a 60 minute exam and an exam which exceeds 60 minutes. Requests for more than 60 minutes will be scheduled to start at the later hour.</i></p> <p>In all cases, the testing period should be restricted to 60 minutes, unless a multiple-period evening examination has been requested. <i>Requests for more than 60 minutes will be scheduled to start at the later hour.</i></p>
<p>9. b. Examinations coincident with convocations, intercollegiate athletic events, and student activities will be avoided if possible; but if necessary, such examinations may be scheduled on the premise that the examination process takes priority over any of these events. In this case, the Office of the Registrar has the authority to start the first period of evening exams as early as 6:30pm.</p>	<p>9.b. Examinations coincident with convocations, intercollegiate athletic events, and student activities will be avoided if possible; but if necessary, such examinations may be scheduled on the premise that the examination process takes priority over any of these events. In this case, the Office of the Registrar has the authority to start the first period of evening exams as early as <i>6 pm.</i></p>

Approving:

Steven H. Collicott
Scott L. Feld
John B. Grutzner
L. Tony Hawkins
Robert A. Kubat
Scott B. Mandernack
Mark M. Moriarty
Christine M. Ladisch
Andrew Luescher
James D. McGlothlin
Glenn G. Sparks
Douglas Cook (student)
Justin Nelson (student)

Absent:

Olayiwola Adeola
James L. Jenkins
Victor L. Lechtenberg
J. Paul Robinson
Jonathan Sandhu (student)

TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Educational Policy Committee (EPC)
SUBJECT: Change in University Academic Regulations
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Discussion
REFERENCES: University Regulations 2007-08, Section VII, Academic Program, Part J

Introduction

The University Senate is now being asked to vote on the amended proposal as included on the following page. Since the amendment was accepted by the Senate, the Dean of Students pointed out that this proposal replaces a section of the rules that described policy for retaking courses. Neither the EPC nor the proposer of the amendment intended to change that policy.

Therefore, as a friendly amendment, the Registrar, the EPC, and the amendment proposer all agree to insert the exact wording of the previous policy in the amended proposal to make it clear that this policy will continue as before. That wording is included in BOLD red in the following document.

Furthermore, we wanted to clarify that the intention of the proposal is that it will go into effect in Fall, 2008.

This proposal should be adopted without any further delay to give all concerned parties adequate and clear notification of the impending change. Such notification will allow all parts of the university to make any adjustments they deem appropriate by the time of the adoption of the new computing system.

Present	Proposal
<p data-bbox="203 222 440 249">J. Scholastic Indexes*</p> <p data-bbox="203 252 732 359">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.</p> <ol data-bbox="203 390 732 1373" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="203 390 732 497">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. <li data-bbox="203 529 732 879">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. <li data-bbox="203 911 732 1373">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. 	<p data-bbox="1015 195 1110 222">Proposal</p> <p data-bbox="789 222 1026 249">J. Scholastic Indexes*</p> <p data-bbox="789 252 1318 359">The scholastic standing of all students enrolled in programs leading to a degree shall be determined by two scholastic indexes: the semester index, and the cumulative index.</p> <ol data-bbox="789 390 1318 919" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="789 390 1318 497">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. <li data-bbox="789 529 1318 919">2. The cumulative index will be a weighted average of all grades received as an undergraduate. 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.

It is recommended that this policy go into effect beginning in the Fall 2008 semester.

When this proposal is adopted, the EPC should be directed to:

- a) Determine appropriate adjustments in the cumulative GPA probation/suspension requirements that will avoid an increase in the numbers of students who are suspended based upon their cumulative GPAs.
- b) Advise all colleges that currently use cumulative GPAs for admissions that they now might want to change to using the mechanism of the degree audits to obtain a selective GPA for admissions purposes.
- c) Examine any other policies that might be considered for revision in response to the elimination of redlining.

To: The University Senate
From: University Resources Policy Committee
Subject: Response to Investigation of Proposed Termination of ITaP Dial-up
Modem Services
Disposition: Report to the Senate for Information

In November, 2007 the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC) received a request from the University Senate Steering Committee to investigate complaints from faculty, students and staff regarding a termination of Dial-up Modem services provided by Information Technology at Purdue (ITaP). A phone call to Mr. Michael Rubesch of ITaP confirmed that the subject had been discussed internally at ITaP for more than six months and that termination of service was scheduled for January 8, 2008. However, the justification for the termination of service and the scheduled date of termination had not been circulated widely among the Purdue community.

The URPC invited VP Gerry McCartney, Director of ITaP, to discuss the situation at its December 13, 2007 meeting. VP McCartney explained that the modem equipment in use is antiquated and inefficient and that only 75 concurrent and 300 unique users per day are now using this system. Replacement costs would be \$125,000 with annual operating costs of \$83,000. The URPC agreed with ITaP's decision to discontinue this service.

We also agreed that it would be appropriate to more broadly notify the university community about this service change and to extend the phasing out of the modem bank service to approximately July 1, 2008. This would give current users ample time to obtain alternate commercial services. ITaP already has prepared a list of commercial services that would provide state of the art dial-up or broadband service. The notification process will be initiated early in the Spring 2008 semester.

This report will be emailed to all original complainants to the URPC for information purposes.

To: The University Senate
From: University Resources Policy Committee
Subject: Response to Petition from College of Agriculture re Physical Facilities
Services for Construction and Renovation
Disposition: Report to the Senate for Information

Background:

In March of 2007 the Chair of the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC) received petitions signed by 95 faculty from the College of Agriculture requesting an investigation of problems of obtaining construction and renovation services from Physical Facilities. The petition read:

"Members of the faculty in the College of Agriculture are submitting this petition due to concern about the high cost in money and time of doing business with Physical Facilities. Projects commonly require two to four times more than the project would cost if outside contractors are used and usually take longer than necessary. This impedes productive research, education and extension work, particularly for projects on outlying Purdue farms and research centers. We believe a faculty subcommittee should be established within the University Senate to investigate this issue."

The URPC served as a preliminary investigatory panel by inviting commentary from Professor George Parker (Forestry & Natural Resources), spokesperson for the petitioners, and VP Wayne Kjonaas, Director of Physical Facilities, and other members of his staff. Over the course of the next several months, the URPC examined a large volume of documentary evidence of specific cases of alleged problems with Physical Facilities for designing, pricing and supervising off-campus construction and renovation as well as rebuttal evidence from Physical Facilities of the failure of requesting departments to follow appropriate State of Indiana mandates for University construction.

By the Fall 2007 semester, the preliminary investigation had confirmed that poor communications between various administrative units and Physical Facilities as well as some ambiguous operational policies had led to declining customer satisfaction. At this time, VP Joe Mikesell assumed the duties of Interim Director of Physical Facilities and joined the URPC to seek a remedy for better customer relations. VP Mikesell initiated development of a response aimed at improving communications and clarifying policy that has been reviewed favorably by the URPC.

In summary, this response involves forming a focus group among representatives of all Physical Facilities customer groups (Colleges and Schools, Athletics, Business Services and Housing) with Physical Facilities administrative leadership, as well as feedback sessions with Deans and Department Heads, to identify needs and expectations for construction and renovation. After gathering this information, Physical Facilities will draft a report to the URPC discussing policy clarifications and changes as well as a set of metrics for evaluating customer satisfaction.

The text of the response follows. It has been sent by email from the URPC to each of the original petitioners.

Physical Facilities Initiative in Response to the Petition from Faculty Members

The purpose of this initiative is to improve Physical Facilities processes for facility renovations, improve communications of processes, provide customers more options for procuring renovation services including self-performance of work and to develop metrics for customer satisfaction.

To accomplish this, a focus group will be formed including representation from the colleges of Agriculture, Consumer & Family Sciences, Education, Engineering, Liberal Arts, Pharmacy, Technology and Science, the schools of Management and Veterinary Medicine, the departments of Housing & Food Service, Intercollegiate Athletics, Business Services and Physical Facilities. The group meetings will be facilitated by Alvin Lee, Training Specialist for Purdue Human Resource Services. In addition, University Architect Larry Fusaro, Senior Director Martha May and Interim Vice President for Physical Facilities Joe Mikesell will meet with various deans and department heads to gather direct feedback on needs and expectations.

It is expected that the focus group meetings and the feedback meetings with deans and department heads will occur during the months of January, February and March. At the conclusion, a report will be submitted to the University Resource Policy Committee that will

- Define Purdue's legal requirements and policies regarding construction (public works)
- Propose changes in process and related roles and responsibilities
- Present a plan for implementation of changes to process
- Outline alternatives for facility renovations available to the various colleges, schools and departments including or self-performing
- Establish a set of metrics to measure customer satisfaction and compliance with state law and university policy.

- **Facilitated “focus group” of stakeholders and customers discussing facility renovation means and methods and possible changes**

Suggested group makeup:

Facilitator – Alvin Lee, Training Specialist, Human Resources Services

1. Agriculture – Rob Swihart, Head/Professor of Forestry and Natural Resources
2. Consumer and Family Sciences – Marlene Troyer, Assistant to the Head of Foods and Nutrition
3. Education – Jim Auter, Clinical Associate Professor Educational Studies
4. Engineering - Vincent Bralts, Associate Dean of Engineering
5. Liberal Arts – Tom Berndt, Associate Dean of Liberal Arts
6. Management – Logan Jordan, Associate Dean of Administration
7. Pharmacy, Nursing & Health Sciences – Val Watts, Associate Dean for Research/Associate Professor of Medicinal Chemistry and Molecular Pharmacology
8. Science – Jeff Bolin, Associate Dean College of Science
9. Science – George McCabe – Associate Dean Academic Affairs College of Science
10. Technology – Gary Bertoline, Assistant Dean of Graduate Education
11. Veterinary Medicine – Lee Ann Happ, Executive Assistant to the Dean & Building Deputy
12. Housing & Food Service – Tim Gennett, Director of Physical Facilities for H&FS
13. Intercollegiate Athletics – Al Capitos, Sports/Turf Maintenance Superintendent
14. Business Office – Doug Smith – Director of Fiscal Affairs, College of Agriculture
15. Business Office – Jolene King, Fiscal Director Physical Facilities
16. Office of the University Architect – Mark Townsend, Director of In-House Design
17. Office of the University Architect – Bob Olson, P.E., University Engineer
18. Office of the University Architect – Owen Cooks, Director of Project Management
19. Buildings & Grounds Operations & Maintenance – Doug Edging, Project Coordinator
20. Buildings & Grounds Operations & Maintenance – Ted Brink, Director of Operations & Maintenance

Likely discussion topics:

Explain University policies, State law, jurisdiction having authority, responsible party.

Discuss customer wants vs. needs, customer complaints, and customer satisfaction levels.

Describe Physical Facilities In-House Construction, Small Public Works, Design/Bid/Build and Job Order Contracting project delivery methods.

How can communications with customers be improved and the process made more transparent?

How can departments outside of Physical Facilities be permitted to self-perform renovations? Written agreement requirement.

What part(s) of the in-house estimating and design process needs to change? Other desirable changes?

Define metrics for measuring results – e.g. accuracy of estimates, project delays, customer requested changes, customer satisfaction, compliance with University policy, and legal requirements.

Review Frequently Asked Questions and discuss responses

Discuss a proposal for Departmental Liaison, benefits for departments and Physical Facilities and schedule for implementation

Note: The complete response also contains five pages of text detailing answers to frequently asked questions that have been deleted from this communication.