

UNIVERSITY SENATE
Third Meeting, Monday, 21 November 2005, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

AGENDA

1. Call to order Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina
2. Approval of Minutes of 17 October 2005
3. Acceptance of Agenda
4. [Remarks by the President](#) President Martin C. Jischke
5. [Report of the Chairperson](#) Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina
6. [Resume of Items Under Consideration](#)
by Various Standing Committees For Information
Professor Herbert L. Weith
7. Question Time
8. [University Senate Document 05-4](#)
Reapportionment of the University Senate For Discussion
Professor Herbert L. Weith
9. [University Senate Document 05-3](#)
Proposed Change to the University Regulations For Action
Professor George M. Bodner
10. New Business
11. Memorial Resolutions
12. Adjournment

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Third Meeting, Monday, 21 November 2005, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

Present: *President Martin C. Jischke, Timothy L. Skvarenina (Chairperson of the Senate) presiding, Professors Olayiwola Adeola, Kristine J. Anderson, Carol L. Baird, Alan M. Beck, Rodney J. Bertolet, Antonio Bobet, George M. Bodner, Mark D. Bowman, James E. Braun, Stephen R. Byrn, Joseph W. Camp Jr. (Secretary of Faculties and Parliamentarian), Natalie J. Carroll, Yan Chen, Susan E. Conners, John J. Contreni, Christine L. Corum, Otto C. Doering III, Linda M. Duttlinger, Janusz Duzinkiewicz, Richard O. Fanjoy, Scott L. Feld, Wendy S. Flory, Greg N. Frederickson, April J. Ginther, Alten F. Grandt Jr., James P. Greenan, Nathan W. Harter, Sally A. Hastings, L. Tony Hawkins, Jessica D. Hoffman, Wayne W. Kjonaas, Robert A. Kubat, Christine M. Ladisch, Michael L. Leasure, Morris Levy, Andrew U. Luescher, Sally Mason, James D. McGlothlin, David R. McMillin, Cary A. Mitchell, Robert E. Montgomery, Mark T. Morgan, Mark M. Moriarty, P. Jane Morris (Sergeant at Arms), Hisao Nakanishi, Cindy H. Nakatsu, Ganesan Narsimhan, Frank V. Paladino, Richard C. Penney, Carolyn C. Perrucci, Thomas B. Robinson, George E. Rogers, Alysa C. Rollock, F. Robert Sabol, John A. Sautter, Keith E. Schwingendorf, Louis A. Sherman, Timothy L. Skvarenina, A. Charlene Sullivan, Bernard Y. Tao, Volker K. Thomas, Alain S. Togbe, Marion T. Trout, Philip J. VanFossen, Ralph Webb Jr., H. Lee Weith, Clarence W. Wilkerson, David J. Williams, and Yuehwern Yih.*

Absent: *Professors Howard Adler, Ann W. Astell, Thomas Bauman, JennieMarie Blankert, J. Stuart Bolton, James R. Bottum, Charles A. Bouman, Patrick E. Connolly, Lawrence P. DeBoer, John P. Denton, Sharon DeVaney, Joseph C. Dorsey, David R. Gaskell, Gabriele F. Giuliani, John G. Graveel, Bruce R. Hamaker, William A. Harper, R. Neal Houze, Douglass F. Jacobs, J.L. Jenkins, Vicki J. Killion, Charles E. Kline, Daniel J. Kovenock, Ananthanarayan Krishnan, Thomas Kuczek, C.S. George Lee, Julie R. Mariga, Sean M. McDeavitt, Rabindra N. Mukerjea, David E. Nichols, Morgan R. Olsen, Michael R. Oliver, Barry R. Pittendrigh, Laura J. Pyrak-Nolte, Patrice D. Rankine, J. Paul Robinson, William T. Robinson, Jie Shen, Glenn G. Sparks, Gerald S. Wasserman, Sirje Laurel Weldon, G. Thomas Wilson, William J. Zinsmeister, and Michael D. Zoltowski.*

Guests: *Ben Arjomandi, Doug Christiansen, Wes Holdman, Lori Shipley, Ben Steckler, Mike Talbott*

1. The meeting was called to order by the chairperson of the senate, Professor Timothy Skvarenina at 2:35 p.m.
2. The minutes of the meeting of 17 October 2005 were approved as distributed.
3. The agenda was accepted as proposed.
4. The President deferred his remarks until the Faculty Convocation that followed the Senate meeting (see Appendix A for the President's remarks to the Faculty Convocation).
5. Professor Timothy Skvarenina presented the report of the chairperson (see Appendix B).
6. Professor H. Lee Weith, the chair of the Steering Committee presented, for information, the Resume of Items Under Consideration by Various Standing Committees. Professor

Morris Levy, chair of the University Resources Policy Committee, rose to provide an update to the items under consideration by his committee (see Appendix C).

7. At question time the secretary reported no questions had been submitted in writing and the chair invited questions from the floor. No questions were forthcoming.
8. Professor Weith, chairperson of the Steering Committee, presented for discussion, University Senate Document 05-4, *Reapportionment of the University Senate 2006-2007*. Professor Weith explained that the Senate bylaws call for reapportionment at least once per year and this document meets that requirement. Professor Weith noted that the College of Engineering will lose one senator while the School of Science will gain one senator. So that the Senate could act on the document during this meeting, Professor Weith moved to suspend the rules. His motion was seconded and passed unanimously on a voice vote. He then moved to approve Document 05-4. His motion was seconded and passed on a voice vote without dissent.
9. Professor George Bodner presented, for action, University Senate Document 05-3, *Proposed Change to University Regulations*. He reiterated that the document was created to address alleged student abuses of the "redlining" or grade index adjustment policy. His motion to approve the document was seconded. Professor Bodner then made a motion to amend the document as follows:

Proposed addition to Section E *Transfer of Credits between Curricula*

1. Courses can be removed from the calculation of the cumulative index for an undergraduate student as part of the transfer process, subject to the following limitations.
 1. The courses are not required for the new curriculum or cannot be used toward graduation in the new curriculum.
 2. The courses were taken during the student's freshman year at Purdue.
 3. No more than three courses or a total of 12 semester hours of credit can be deleted.
 4. The student is still classified as a 1, 2, 3, or 4.

His motion was seconded. Senator Hoffman spoke in favor of the amendment and presented the PSG (Purdue Student Government) resolution that also supports the amendment. The amendment addresses the concerns that PSG had with the original document and, in their view, is a good compromise that will limit abuse, but still allow students to remove some courses they took as first-year students when they change majors. Professor Fredrickson asked for and received clarification about the numbers "1, 2, 3, and 4" in the amendment. These refer to classification of the student whether a freshman (1 & 2) or sophomore (3 & 4). Professor Bodner stated that the limitation to the first 4 semesters was put in place because, currently, over 70% of the students who CODO do so before their junior year. Professor Duttlinger also spoke in favor of the amendment and stated that she could now support the amended document 05-3, and that she encouraged the other North Central senators to support it as well. Professor Nakanishi found the amendment to be unfair because it only pertains to CODO students and not to the student body as a whole. Professor Nakanishi made a motion to amend the amendment as follows:

- Remove "as part of the transfer process" from the first sentence of the proposed amendment.

- Remove bullet 1 from the proposed amendment (thus renumbering the rest).
- Change "three courses or a total of 12 credits" to "three courses and a total of 10 credits"

The amended amendment would read as follows:

- a) Courses can be removed from the calculation of the cumulative index for an undergraduate student, subject to the following limitations.
 1. The courses were taken during the student's freshman year at Purdue.
 2. No more than three courses or a total of 10 semester hours of credit can be deleted.
 3. The student is still classified as a 1, 2, 3, or 4.

Professor Nakanishi's amendment was seconded. Professor Bodner expressed concern that the language of the amendment to the amendment would not be internally consistent, although the idea of making the policy available to all students is attractive to many. Professor Paladino asked if the amendment applied to all student transfers or if it was limited to Purdue internal transfers. Professor Bodner explained that it was limited to the CODO process and internal transfers, from one Purdue college to another. Professor Yih expressed concerns about changes that occur within colleges or schools such as changes within a program or major. For example, would students who changes majors between two engineering majors be able to use the proposed system? Professor Bodner explained that the intent was for the process to apply to changes in majors that occur when a student leaves one school or college and enters a major in a different school or college. For example, a student who changed from a major in the College of Science to one in the College of Engineering would be able to utilize the proposed process. Professor Baird asked Professor Nakanishi where the amended amendment would fit in document 05-3. Professor Nakanishi said his amendment to the amendment would be best placed in *Scholastic Indexes*, Section J, Part 2, of the document. At the request of Professor Duttlinger, Professor Nakanishi clarified why he wanted to replace "or" with "and" in his amendment to the amendment. Professor McMillin stated that from his perspective, the intent of the original document was to make the process of eliminating grades and adjusting the grade index a rare rather than a common practice. He thought that the proposed amendment to the amendment would not have this effect, but would encourage the very practice the original document was intended to reduce. Professor Nakanishi said that his amendment to the amendment was not addressing whether the process would occur "too often," but that the proposed amendment was unfair. Professor McGlothlin asked why three courses were chosen as the maximum number that could be eliminated. Student Government Representative Benjamin Arjomandi explained that three was chosen as the number of courses because it would be helpful to the student, but would not encourage the type of abuse that has occurred with the current redlining system. At this point, the discussion of Professor Nakanishi's amendment to the amendment came to an end and the vote was taken. The amendment to the amendment failed on a voice vote.

The discussion of the original amendment continued at this time. Professor Feld spoke to the intent of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) when they took up consideration of the redlining issue. From his perspective, the members of the EPC wanted to eliminate redlining and replace it with something that is more in line with our peer institutions and a policy that is more consistent. He echoed the concern expressed at

the October Senate meeting that the Purdue University transcript is not a realistic representation of the grades a student has earned when redlining can be used to eliminate so many courses. Professor Sherman asked about benchmarking with peer institutions. Professor Bodner stated that some institutions do not require their student to declare a major until they are juniors. Other institutions have a freshman "forgiveness" policy and/or other grade replacement policy. The variability among universities makes comparison difficult, and some of these policies are described in the attachment to the original document. Professor Bodner also stated that currently at Purdue University there are three ways for a student to get grades modified: 1. redlining; 2. taking a course over, where the grade from the most recent iteration becomes the grade that counts in the grade point average, and; 3. transfer courses from other universities where no grade is recorded, but credit is given. Professor Conners said that with the amendment to the original document, she would now support its passage. Professor Nakanishi asked if there were any other institutions that coupled CODO with the GPA. No Senators knew of such a case. The discussion of the amendment ended and the vote was taken. The voice vote was inconclusive so Professor Skvarenina asked that those in favor of the amendment should stand and be counted. He then asked for those opposed to the amendment to stand and be counted. The vote was 24 aye and 32 nays. The amendment failed.

Professor Feld then proposed a second amendment to the initial document that would add the following paragraph.

The Senate approves The Elimination of Redlining with the proviso that it will not go into effect until the Educational Policy Committee proposes a policy of student forgiveness that is adopted by the Faculty Senate. The Senate directs the Educational Policy Committee to design such a policy immediately.

His motion was seconded. Professor Weith noted that in addition to the reasons already stated for eliminating redlining, the time constraints imposed by creation and implementation of the OnePurdue system require that a replacement policy be devised soon. If this does not occur, the OnePurdue project will be negatively affected. As process owner for the student module of the OnePurdue ERP, Vice President Christiansen spoke to the time constraints issues. His main concern is not the form of the policy, which is a faculty decision, but rather that a policy is approved by the end of January that would allow the OnePurdue project team to configure the blueprint for the student module. If the replacement policy could be created and approved by the February Senate meeting, it would allow the OnePurdue programmers to take the blueprint and move it to the realization stage. Delays beyond that point would threaten the proposed implementation of the student module which is currently scheduled for the fall semester of 2008. Vice Provost Ladisch mentioned that in the Educational Policy study done to develop the new process Registrar Kubat did survey all Big 10 universities and all benchmark universities. Only one university had a version of a redlining policy, Texas A & M University. Professor Levy said that he could not find the section in the policy that discussed taking a course a second time. Professor Bodner said that it is an item that has been discussed. Professor Skvarenina said that the item is not germane to the current discussion. The discussion of the amendment ended and the vote was taken. Again, the voice vote was inconclusive and Professor Skvarenina asked those in favor and opposed to stand and be counted, in turn. The amendment passed with 32 ayes and 22 nays.

Professor Feld rose to clarify the intention of his amendment that the elimination of redlining would occur when the replacement policy was in place. Professor Fredrickson expressed concern about how long the entire process would take as there was no deadline at all. Professor Paladino asked about the prevalence of forgiveness policies at other institutions. Registrar Kubat answered his question that there was only one institution in his survey that had a freshman forgiveness policy, but other types of policies exist. One institution allows students who have been out for a specified number of years to choose which courses they want to have eliminated from their transcript. This is a more general forgiveness policy, but not a freshman forgiveness policy. Professor Webb asked if the Senate was proposing to eliminate redlining until and unless a new replacement policy was in place. Professor Feld spoke to the spirit of his amendment that the present policy would stay in effect until a replacement policy is in place. Professor Flory asked if by redlining we meant only in the context of the CODO process. Professor Bodner explained that the term redlining is unique to Purdue University and arose because the policy, at one time, required that a red pen be used to cross out courses on the physical transcript. The process does refer to eliminating courses in the context of the CODO process. Professor Feld spoke some more to the spirit of the amendment and the policy. Professor Fredrickson proposed an additional amendment to the original document as follows:

The Educational Policy Committee is directed to present its proposed policy by the February meeting of the Faculty Senate, and The Elimination of Redlining will take effect after the February meeting even if a new policy is not adopted by the Faculty Senate at that time.

His motion was seconded. Professor Bodner stated that we needed to have a realistic deadline given the time constraints and the fact that the amendments and the original document had already been discussed and considered for quite some time. Professor Conners suggested that the current redlining policy be left in place until a replacement policy was approved. Professor Duttlinger suggested that the original document as amended by Professor Feld be left in place. Professor Paladino rose and stated that IPFW does not have a redlining policy and the faculty members on his campus are in favor of eliminating the policy. Professor Yih stated that the Senate needed to set a deadline. Once again, Professor Bodner expressed concern that the EPC would not be able to create a modified document in time to present it to the Senate by the January meeting. Professor McGlothlin offered to work over the semester break to ensure that a redlining replacement document was prepared for consideration by the Senate at the January meeting. Professor Fredrickson's amendment provides the opportunity for the EPC to devise a replacement policy while meeting the time constraints imposed by the OnePurdue project. Professor Skvarenina called for the vote and Professor Fredrickson's amendment passed on a voice vote.

Discussion of the main motion then continued. The document as twice amended would eliminate redlining and require that a replacement policy be brought to the Senate by February. Several Senators asked for clarification on the date on which the redlining policy would "disappear." The consensus was that the policy would end when the replacement document was approved by the Senate. Again, the target date for approval is the February Senate meeting. At this point the vote was taken on the main motion, as amended twice, and it passed on a voice vote.

10. There was no new business.
11. There were no memorial resolutions.

12. The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT MARTIN C. JISCHKE AT THE FACULTY CONVOCATION

Good afternoon. Thank you for joining me. I appreciate this opportunity to meet and talk with the faculty. I also want to use this occasion to thank all of you, and through you all of your colleagues, for the outstanding job you are doing. The Purdue University faculty does a truly world-class job of preparing our students for their futures. That means preparing them not only for the immediate needs of today, but for all of the possibilities of tomorrow. It means teaching students how to reach their full potential, how to become lifelong learners, how to study, think critically, evaluate and impact the world around them.

"I touch the future — I teach." Those are the words of Christa McAuliffe, the educator we tragically lost on the Challenger space shuttle in January of 1986. I believe we can readily see the impact of Purdue faculty today in graduation rates, in the number of students being hired in their fields, in student test scores, and the national and international rankings of our programs. But I believe the real impact of this faculty on our students will not yet be realized for many years to come. And I believe that impact will ultimately have wonderful implications for our graduates and for our world. As teachers, you are touching the future. Thank you for your dedication, your skills, your commitment to learning, and thank you for your partnership with this administration. I appreciate enormously all the support, assistance, and cooperation that I have received from each of you and from your colleagues as we work together to improve our learning community.

Sir William Osler was a 19th century British physician. He was highly respected in his day. Osler once spoke at a medical school convocation and said this, "I have a confession to make. Half of what we have taught you is in error. And furthermore — we cannot tell you which half it is!" It is a funny story. It is not the kind of statement a President wants to hear from the faculty at a commencement ceremony. But as we know, what Osler said one hundred years ago turns out to be absolutely true. A great deal of what medical students were taught at the end of the 19th century has been proven to be simply untrue. Knowledge continues to advance and grow at a faster and faster rate. C. Sidney Burwell wrote in a 1956 medical journal, "My students are dismayed when I say to them: "Half of what you are being taught will in 10 years have been shown to be wrong." In the 1800's, Osler understood knowledge would change over a century. In the middle of the 20th century, Burwell understood knowledge would change within the decade. Today, the world is changing by the year and sometimes it seems by the month, by the week, or maybe even by the day.

As educators in the 21st century, one of our primary responsibilities is to teach young people how to learn and pursue knowledge for the rest of their lives to keep pace with our changing times and our changing understanding. In the next 100 years, the world will change in ways we cannot imagine. Just 30 years ago we, certainly I, had absolutely no idea what a profound and major role computers would have in our daily lives. Today we have no concept of the most dramatic changes that lie ahead. We have to teach students to be lifelong learners so they can stay up with the world that will be rapidly changing and advancing around them. And we as teachers must be constantly updating our own knowledge as lifelong learners ourselves.

In 1912, Joseph Cotton Dana, a librarian, was asked to find a Latin phrase that could be inscribed on a new building at Newark State College, now Kean State College. He was unable to find a suitable quotation, so he simply made one up, thereby becoming a legend and perhaps even an inspiration for journalists around the world and people who give speeches and are

always in need of a good quote! Dana's quote became the motto for that college. His phrase is this, "Who dares to teach – must never cease to learn." This is what we must promote here at Purdue. And this involves more than advancing our knowledge in our own individual fields as important and central as that is. It means never ceasing in our efforts to learn how we can become better teachers, so that our students can become better learners. Dana's phrase could also easily be turned around to say, Who dares to learn – must never cease to teach! This is true whether we are talking about the mentor of a new, young employee in the business world or a member of our own faculty in the classroom. What good is the acquisition of knowledge if it is not shared as widely as possible to form the foundation for tomorrow? Without teaching, learning is lost. "And gladly wolde he lerne," Chaucer wrote. "And gladly teche."

Those of us privileged to work here at Purdue understand the dedication to teaching that exists in our faculty. Unfortunately, that dedication is not always understood outside the campus, among the public. Ernest Boyer, the president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, once said, "I'm troubled that many now view the campus as a place where professors get tenured and students get credentialed." Much to our chagrin, a segment of the public, has an image of major research universities as places where professors are absent from the classroom; where teaching is given a back seat to research and collaborative efforts with industry; where students are more of a chore than a charge. This does not sit well with a public that supports us with their tax dollars and donations;

- a public that pays rising tuition fees;
- a public that entrusts the future of their children to us;
- a public that entrusts the future of this nation in our hands.

And frankly, this image does not sit well with those of us in education. It does not sit well because while some individuals in our profession might place parts of their responsibilities over others teaching, I believe, is the reason the vast majority of us entered this profession. Teaching is among the things we enjoy most. Interaction with students is among our greatest joys – our greatest rewards.

I began my own career in higher education because I loved to teach. And I still have a passion for it. This is one of the reasons Patty and I teach a freshman leadership seminar in our home. We are renewed by our contact with students. It keeps us in touch with the reason we are all here. We ourselves learn enormously from our interaction with these amazing young people. Teachers occupy a special place in all of our lives. After our parents and spouses, the best of them have an extraordinary influence on us. And every faculty member I have come to know well has had such a teacher. I certainly did. One who had enormous influence on me was a fellow named Judson Baron who was my Ph.D. advisor at MIT. He died two years ago in October of 2003. Many of us returned to MIT for a Memorial Service. Jud was one of those once-in-a-lifetime, change-your-life teachers, whose influence on me persists through today. He was a very demanding professor. In classes he would assign, what I thought was an unbelievable amount of reading outside the class, fifty to one hundred pages of technical reading for every lecture. Later after I finished and had the courage to complain to him about it, he told me that he assigned five times as much reading as he thought we would normally do with the hope that we might do twice as much. High standards indeed. And there was no time wasted in the Red Baron's class. That was the nick name we gave him. Some of us worried whether the furious chalk work risked for him "white lung" as an occupational hazard. But we did learn.

And for me, the learning went beyond subjects such as high speed gas dynamics. I began to learn about teaching and motivating students – lessons that have now lasted for more than four decades. During the turbulent times of the late '60s, I had many discussions with this

remarkable teacher about the Vietnam War, about campus unrest, about the nature of dissent in a democracy. He was well read, interested in the world, and willing to spend time with a young graduate student who had questions that went beyond the bounds of his course. These broader topics:

- Forrester's work on the limits to growth,
- the changing economic development patterns within our nation,
- the changing environment for American universities--

were the stuff of a relationship that I treasured for over 40 years.

I have recently read a new book, What the Best College Teachers Do. It is written by Ken Bain. You might enjoy reading it. A great deal of what Bain has to say about the best teachers reminds me of Judson Baron. Bain is the director of the Center for Teaching Excellence at New York University and he studied great teachers. From his research, he has drawn some conclusions. It won't surprise you that Bain found that really great teachers really know their subject in great depth. They are aware of all of the big questions in the field, the ebbs and flows, and they are able to communicate all of this to their students. They understand the history of the field. So they have seen how it evolved and there is a sense of how it will continue to evolve and they share that with their students. They relate their subject to the world around us — more importantly to the world of their students. And they are passionate about what they are doing, including in particular a passion for the subject learning, distinct from the subject matter. That passion is clearly contagious when it comes to students. One of the great privileges I have experienced in my career came during the several years I spent working as a member of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. This commission was composed of 25 university presidents selected to look at the future and come up with proactive suggestions and plans for the 21st century. The first report of that commission, and there turned out to be six different reports, was entitled, "Returning to Our Roots: The Student Experience." The message of that first and defining report was quite clear and one that is very dear to all of us in education. It was a very simple message. It was "Put students first." Some people today believe universities have forgotten that message. It is my considered opinion that is not true at Purdue. Putting students first reflects certainly the top priority of everything that we are doing. And the starting point of "putting students first" is excellence in teaching and therefore learning. The Kellogg Commission addressed three broad ideals in learning:

- First — "our institutions must become genuine learning communities, supporting and inspiring faculty, staff and learners of all kinds."
- Second — "our learning communities should be student-centered, committed to excellence in teaching."
- And third — "our learning communities should emphasize the importance of a healthy learning environment that provides students, faculty, and staff with the facilities, support, and resources they need to make this vision a reality."

The Kellogg Commission said universities must make learning more active. Universities' undergraduates should become more involved with research in collaboration both with faculty as well as graduate students. The commission also emphasized values such as tolerance, civility, and personal responsibility. They should be standard equipment — not options — on our students when they graduate and go out into the global community in which we all live today.

All of these ideals in teaching and learning have been incorporated into the Strategic Plans for Purdue. Our plans are based on our three land-grant missions for learning, discovery and engagement. And all are important. They are like the support of a three-legged stool. Take one of the legs away and the stool doesn't work. While all of these missions are essential, I always list learning first. Learning is job one at Purdue. In fact, everything we are doing in discovery and engagement itself has a learning element.

Through our Strategic Plans, we have ongoing efforts to increase the size of our faculty and reduce reliance on graduate teaching assistants. This does not mean eliminating graduate teaching assistants. They are very important to this university and they will continue to be. I, like many of you, was once a graduate teaching assistant. It had a big impact on me. It probably started me in the direction that I ultimately went. It was an incredible learning experience for me and I am going to guess for you as well. This program is very important to not only this learning community, but to our collective future in higher education. And it should continue stronger than ever. But here at Purdue we really do have a need to reduce our reliance on graduate teaching assistants and provide our students with even more exposure to tenured and tenure-track faculty. We are doing this by adding 300 new faculty throughout all our schools and colleges. As of this fall, 200 of these positions have been authorized. One hundred and eighty-four of these positions have been filled. This includes nearly 134 new assistant professors, 23 associates and 24 full professors. And we are on track to add 50 more faculty positions in each of the next two years and we will reach our goal of 300 new faculty positions.

We are impacting learning on this campus through many other initiatives in our Plans:

- First, we are working to facilitate student learning through the introduction of innovative instructional methodologies and integration of technology into instruction.
- Second, we systematically conduct program self-studies to assess learning outcomes and student success.
- And third, we are expanding student learning opportunities such as internships, study abroad and increased participation in what we call student service learning.

Programs to encourage more student participation in undergraduate research, study abroad, and service learning have increased quite dramatically. For example, participation in Study Abroad has increased over the past two years by almost 50 percent — over a 1000 students studied abroad last year. They were involved in 167 different programs in 47 different countries. If you haven't talked to one of the students who have been abroad, you should do so to gain some sense of the impact that this has on their view of themselves and their world and their confidence. It is a life changing experience. At the same time, one of the central missions of land-grant universities such as Purdue is to teach students their responsibilities to the world around them. Purdue has joined 421 other American universities in a national pledge of higher education. It states in part, "This country cannot afford to educate a generation that acquires knowledge without ever understanding how that knowledge can benefit society or how to influence democratic decision making." Even Albert Einstein talked about this; he said "The aim of education must be the training of independently acting and thinking individuals who . . . see in service to community their highest life achievement." Each year now we have \$100,000 fund in grant money for student service learning projects to support groups of students or individuals. It is my hope, our hope, that through this effort, students will not only learn what they are capable of accomplishing they will also learn a lifelong love for service. Last year, Community Service/Service Learning Grant programs increased by 50 percent to 79 different programs.

One of the most remarkable service learning efforts here at Purdue is Engineering Projects in Community Service, or what we call EPICS, it started at Purdue and it is now part of an expanding national program. Community service agencies here in Tippecanoe County, and around the country, face a future in which they have to take advantage of modern technology to improve, coordinate, account for, and deliver the services they provide. They need the help of people with strong technical backgrounds. And our undergraduate students face a future in which they will need more than solid expertise in their discipline to succeed. They will be expected to work with people of many different backgrounds to identify and achieve goals. I believe this is the beginning of critical thinking for students. The ability to see the world from the perspective of others. They need educational experiences that can broaden them and their skills. EPICS brings all of these needs together and everyone is a winner, the people in need that are served, our communities, and our students, and faculty. During the 2003-2004 academic year, more than 400 Purdue students from 20 different departments, well beyond the College of Engineering, participated on 25 multidisciplinary EPICS teams. More than 2,000 Purdue students have participated in EPICS since 1995. My guess is that EPICS has not only influenced the learning and Purdue education of these students — it is not a guess — I know that EPICS has influenced their lives and for many it has changed their lives. Students have discovered in these kinds of experiences impulses, passions, abilities, they never thought they had and they take a different direction.

Four years ago when we launched our Strategic Plans, Discovery Park was a dream. Today it is a \$250 million reality that is focused on interdisciplinary projects with the potential to impact our university and our state. Discovery Park is a research and learning area that is having a tremendous impact on our students. Through Discovery Park we are working, for example, to teach entrepreneurship to our students and even more important to fire an entrepreneurial spirit within them. We are moving forward with plans for our \$10 million Discovery Learning Center. The unique role of this Learning Center is to bring together teachers, learners, and scholars to explore new sometimes futuristic technologies and strategies that are relevant to improving the learning environment. This is the place where we are going to explore 21st century learning. The 20,000 square-foot learning center will focus on new approaches to teaching and learning science, technology, engineering and math. It will complement other projects in Discovery Park. It will provide laboratories and classrooms with cutting-edge technological capabilities. These classrooms are designed to be laboratories themselves, movable equipment will allow researchers to begin thinking about manipulating the environment in order to improve learning. About 850 faculty and more than 500 students have already been involved in learning and discovery at Discovery Park. Just this year with the new grant from the Lilly Endowment, we are now funding internships for undergraduate students to participate in the scholarship, the research that takes place here.

We are also involved in the most aggressive building campaign in the history of our university. There are 40 buildings in our six-year Strategic Plans and Campaign for Purdue. We truly are in the process of changing the face of our university. More than \$301 million worth of construction has been completed since 2001. Another \$300 million in construction will be completed by 2008. And more is in the planning stage. All of this has an impact on our mission for learning. An example, a key feature of the new Neil Armstrong Hall of Engineering will be the Caterpillar Team Learning Modules. These team-learning modules will be the first three of five that will form a network throughout the College of Engineering. These team-learning modules will give students a more integrated educational experience, easier access to the tools needed for classroom and lab assignments, rooms for groups to spread out, share ideas and actually build things.

In the Caterpillar Team Learning Modules, students will experience the entire engineering life-cycle from design to testing to manufacturing to ultimate disposal. We believe the Caterpillar

Team Learning Modules will set a new standard for engineering education in the 21st century. At the same time, we have revamped our freshman engineering program to meet the learning needs of students today. Unfortunately, the number of U.S. citizens entering so-called STEM areas — — science, technology, engineering and math — — is in decline. The number of underrepresented students in these fields is frankly alarming. Our country is facing a large and growing technology skills deficit strangely at the very time when these disciplines seem to be the ones that are driving our global economy. Our young people today are simply not studying and preparing for these careers, careers that offer considerable promise and opportunity.

Twenty years ago, the United States, Japan and China graduated roughly the same number of engineers, and roughly twice the number that South Korea did. Twenty years later, in the year 2000, Chinese engineering graduates had increased more than double, 161 percent to a total of about 210,000; Japanese engineering graduates had increased 42 percent to just over 100,000; Korean engineering graduates had increased 140 percent to just under 60,000. Credible, and I think very conservative, estimates place India's production of engineers at more than 100,000 a year, and meanwhile here in the United States production of engineering graduates dropped 20 percent to under 60,000 per year. More than 50 percent of the current engineering and science workforce in the United States are getting ready to retire. If these trends continue, credible estimates by the year 2010 say that 90 percent of the scientific and engineering personnel in the world will live in Asia. We've got lots of work to do.

Too many of our middle and high school students are unprepared in math and science and frankly uninterested in these careers. Of the nearly 1.1 million U.S. high school graduates who took the college entrance exams in 2002, it's the last year I have data, less than 6 percent had plans to study engineering. That's how you get about 60,000. But they don't graduate, that's going in. So if you look down the road the number surely will continue to decline and that is a 33 percent decrease from 10 years ago. So the decline is rather steep.

How are we responding to this at Purdue? The Department of Freshman Engineering underwent a sea change in 2004. The department celebrated its 50th anniversary, and in April 2004 the Purdue Board of Trustees created a brand new Department of Engineering Education. It's the first time any university in the country has created an academic department devoted and dedicated to engineering education. The Department of Freshman Engineering was renamed the First-Year Engineering Program and it merged with the Division of Interdisciplinary Engineering. This new Department of Engineering Education is still very early in its development. I will tell you the future looks quite bright. We have attracted some very talented new faculty. We are implementing what I think are groundbreaking initiatives and developing very exciting plans for the future. We are offering graduate degrees for students studying the science of learning and other topics in engineering education. We plan to add an engineering teaching certification program for high school teachers and to pursue accredited undergraduate degrees in engineering education and interdisciplinary engineering. We are very excited and pleased to create this new opportunity in engineering education reform as we prepare the future cadre of engineering leaders. It is an indication of how we as a University might respond to these trends that are taking place across our country. Teaching and learning are at the heart of every thing that is taking place as we transform this university for the 21st century through these Strategic Plans and our Campaign for Purdue. You know, students learn a lot from us. Some of it they learn from what we say but they learn a great deal more from how we act. The importance we place on teaching our students is a powerful lesson for them. It tells them, I think, in very clear terms exactly how we and society value them and their education. A commitment to excellence in teaching and learning is our visible and unmistakable commitment to our students and their future. We must demonstrate to these students that they are really what we call them — — the most valuable and important resource that we have for tomorrow. We have many programs and efforts underway to promote and encourage excellence in

teaching at Purdue. We are placing more emphasis on teaching excellence in the recruitment of new faculty and administrative leaders. Our highest priorities for the allocation of new resources are improving undergraduate and graduate education programs; in addition, we have launched several programs designed to help our faculty broaden and expand teaching experiences and skills including the Study in a Second Discipline for mid-career faculty and the mentoring of new faculty. The university is recognizing faculty who strike a desirable balance among their teaching, research and engagement efforts. We are improving our facilities to support effective teaching and learning, expansion of computer labs throughout the campus and in the residence halls as just one example. And we are looking for more that we can do in this regard. As a university we are ultimately be judged, I believe, by how well we prepare the next generation of leaders. It is an enormous responsibility. Behind the Purdue Memorial Union we are next to is Academy Park, at the entrance to the park is an obelisk with the inscription from the ancient Greek philosopher, Diogenes. The inscription reads, "The foundation of any state, is the education of its youth." That was true in Diogenes' time. It is true in ours. It will be always be true. Teachers build that foundation. Thank you for the work you are doing. We really do touch tomorrow. We teach! Thank you all. Thank you!

REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE - PROFESSOR TIMOTHY L. SKVARENINA

Good afternoon, I'll keep my comments brief today, as I expect we will have significant discussions on the later agenda items and I want to finish them before the convocation.

The Board of Trustees met on November 4th. Vice President Olsen gave a presentation concerning master planning for the Purdue Campus and President Jischke reported on the Strategic Plan. The presentations are available at the Board of Trustees website (<http://www.purdue.edu/bot>) and are very interesting. The Board ratified Dr. Randy Woodson as the Glenn Sample Dean of Agriculture.

I updated the Board on the actions of the Senate, especially our discussion of the index readjustment (AKA redlining) policy. I explained to them what redlining is and the current status and what the discussions last month entailed. They were very interested in the topic. I also advised them of another issue that arose subsequent to our October Senate meeting—the issue of pay schedules for academic-year faculty members.

Currently, as you are all aware, we receive ten equal checks -- nine at the end of each month from August to April plus a tenth about the middle of May. Faculty members who work during the summer get paid every two weeks during the summer. On October 19th, I was advised by John Beelke, the process owner for the finance module of One Purdue, that changes to this scheme will be required when the new ERP software goes live. Two new methods were proposed, one with nine equal checks, occurring midmonth from September to May. The other would provide ten checks at the end of each month from August to May, but the first and last would be partial checks, in proportion to how much of the month faculty worked in accordance with the academic calendar.

John asked that I help him arrange a meeting with a cross-section of the faculty to see which option would be preferred. I decided to call a special meeting of the Advisory Committee to meet with John and OnePurdue representatives. The Advisory Committee has representatives from each College and School, so that seemed like a logical choice. About seven members of the committee met on October 26 and provided some input. Those present preferred the 10 payment schedule, but indicated that for an issue of this importance it would be advisable to poll the faculty. As a result, Colleen Robinson set up a poll on a Calumet server using Test Pilot, and hopefully all of you received the notification to vote. (I received the email on November 7th). I have not been apprised of the final outcome, but I will let you know when I am.

Joe Camp and I met with members of ITAP earlier this semester to discuss the faculty and senate websites. ITAP has been working on changes and we will be meeting on December 2nd to review them.

Last Wednesday, the Advisory Committee met with President Jischke and Provost Mason. We had an interesting discussion concerning whether students are less polite than they used to be, as evidenced by playing game on computers in lecture, reading papers, etc. After the meeting, it occurred to me that it probably is not just the students. All of us have probably gone to meetings where faculty members were grading papers, working on a laptop, or doing something other than the meeting. I went to a military base with several faculty colleagues from several of the colleges here, including an Associate Dean, who spent the whole meeting and tour working on a Blackberry. Perhaps technology has had a major impact on how we relate to other people.

Finally, last Friday the Intercampus Faculty Council met for the first time in a couple years. The IFC is comprised of representatives from WL, Calumet, Fort Wayne, and IUPUI and a resource member from North Central. The IFC has a general charge to coordinate issues that might arise between campuses. Our primary topic at the meeting was to decide whether we needed to continue in existence. After some discussion, it was decided to maintain the IFC, but to conduct business by email to the maximum extent. A couple topics were brought up as possible items for the IFC. One concerned the coordination of course numbers, especially when departments change names and course identifiers. Another possible item for future implementation was a surplus equipment list. Members from outside WL felt like WL might be disposing of equipment they could use and would like to have a list of such items.

Thank you, I would be happy to entertain any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy L. Skvarenina
Chair

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

STEERING COMMITTEE

Herbert L. Weith, Chairperson
weith@purdue.edu

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

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Timothy L. Skvarenina, Chairperson of the Senate
tskvaren@purdue.edu

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

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Charles E. Kline, Chairperson
chuck@purdue.edu

The 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

George M. Bodner, Chairperson
gmbodner@purdue.edu

1. Transfer credit
2. Distance learning courses
3. Evaluation of the University Honors Program
4. Redlining Policy

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mark T. Morgan, Chairperson
mmorgan@purdue.edu

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

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

April J. Ginther, Chairperson
aginther@purdue.edu

1. Follow-up on the Academic Integrity Assessment Project and "Integrity counts" video

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE

Morris Levy, Chairperson
levy0@purdue.edu

1. Faculty input into the budget process: Graduate staff fee structure & the Strategic plan
2. Review of campus way-finding and signage plans and campus energy sufficiency
3. Review of Faculty Committees

Vice Chair of the Senate, Bernard Y. Tao, tao@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., icamp@purdue.edu
University Senate Minutes; <http://www.purdue.edu/usenate>

CALENDAR OF STATUS OF LEGISLATION
--

<i>SENATE DOCUMENT</i>	<i>TITLE</i>	<i>ORIGIN</i>	<i>SENATE</i>
*05-1	Nominees for University Senate Standing Committees	University Senate Nominating Committee	Approved 10/17/05
*05-2	Proposed Change to the University Senate Bylaws	Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina	Approved 10/17/05
*05-3	Proposed Change to University Regulations	University Senate Educational Policy Committee	Approved as Amended 11/21/05
*05-4	Reapportionment of the University Senate	Professor Herbert L. Weith	Approved 11/21/05

***Approved**

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. Ten of these are specified in the items 1 through 10 below. This leaves ninety-two to be apportioned among the faculty units, according to the number of faculty members, with the provision that no faculty unit shall have fewer than two senators. There are 1995 voting faculty members at the West Lafayette and North Central campuses. When this number is divided by ninety-two the result is 21.685. Therefore, to qualify for more than two senators, a faculty unit should have forty-three or more voting faculty members. Since no faculty unit can have fewer than two senators, the Libraries unit qualifies for two senators. The remaining units have a total of 1959 voting faculty members with ninety senate seats remaining to be apportioned among them. The number 1959 divided by 90 equals 21.767. The apportionment of senators for each of these remaining units was obtained by dividing the number of voting faculty in the faculty unit by 21.767. The results are as follows: Agriculture, 13.281; Consumer and Family Sciences, 2.951; Education, 2.905; Engineering, 14.388; Liberal Arts, 17.478; Management, 4.011; North Central, 3.966; Pharmacy, Nursing, and Health Sciences, 4.842; Science, 13.742; Technology, 9.131; Veterinary Medicine, 3.643.

Areas Represented	No. Voting Fac. Members November 8, 2005	Number of Senators 2006-2007
1. President		1
2. Chief Academic Officer		1
3. Chief Fiscal Officer		1
4. Chairperson of the Senate		1
5. Vice-Chairperson of the Senate		1
6. Calumet Campus		1
7. Fort Wayne Campus		1
8. IUPUI Campus		1
9. Undergraduate Student		1
10. Graduate Student		1
11. Faculty Units		
<i>Agriculture</i>	288	13
<i>Consumer & Family Sci.</i>	64	3
<i>Education</i>	63	3
<i>Engineering</i>	312	14
<i>Liberal Arts</i>	379	17
<i>Libraries</i>	36	2
<i>Management</i>	87	4
<i>North Central</i>	86	4
<i>Pharm, Nurs, & Health Sci.</i>	105	5
<i>Science</i>	298	14
<i>Technology</i>	198	9
<i>Veterinary Medicine</i>	79	4
	1995	102

Approving (via email):

Gabriele F. Giuliani
 Martin C. Jischke
 Julie R. Mariga
 Cindy H. Nakatsu

Carolyn C. Perrucci
 J. Paul Robinson
 Timothy L. Skvarenina
 Bernard Y. Tao

Ralph Webb, Jr.
 H. Lee Weith
 Clarence W. Wilkerson

TO: The University Senate
FROM: University Senate Educational Policy Committee
SUBJECT: Elimination of Redlining (Grade Index Adjustment)
REFERENCES: University Regulations 2004-05, Section II, Academic Program,
Parts E and J
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Action

Introduction

Redlining is the term used to describe what happens when grades in certain courses are deleted from students' GPA during the Change of Degree Objective (CODO) process by which students move from one School or College to another. The term "redlining" comes from the practice of crossing out the deleted courses with red ink on the form that was sent to the Registrar's Office. The official term for this process is "index adjustment."

Slightly more than 3000 students go through the CODO process each year and an average of two courses are redlined per student during this process. About 70% of the students who undergo CODO do so while classified as a 1, 2, 3 or 4; in other words, in their freshman or sophomore years.

Courses that are redlined fall into two categories: (1) courses that were taken to meet the requirements of the student's original plan of study but are not required for the program or major into which the student is transferring, and (2) courses that cannot be counted toward graduation requirements in the new program or major.

Roughly 85% of the grades that are deleted during the redlining process in the last two years were grades of D or F. But roughly 11% of the index adjustments were done for grades of C and 3% were done for grades of A or B.

There is a general consensus among academic advisors and representatives of the various Dean's Offices that the present redlining system is characterized by a significant amount of abuse. A study of Big Ten and other peer institutions that is attached to this document suggests that most peer institutions do not use any form of redlining and that the few that do, do not associate redlining with CODO as Purdue's system does. A study of redlining practices by the Academic Progress and Records Committee, which is also attached to this document, suggests that there are significant differences in policies and practices among the Schools and Colleges and even among programs in a given School or College.

The Educational Policy Committee considered three options: (1) retaining the present system, (2) creating an alternative to the present system with limits on the courses that could be redlined to eliminate at least some of ways in which the present system is abused, and (3) eliminating redlining. By a majority vote, the EPC brings the following proposed changes in the University Rules and Regulations to the Senate for action.

ENDNOTE: Two amendments to the document were passed by the Senate.

Professor Feld proposed an amendment as follows:

The Senate approves the Elimination of Redlining with the proviso that it will not go into effect until the Educational Policy Committee proposes a policy of student forgiveness that is adopted by the Faculty Senate. The Senate directs the Educational Policy Committee to design such a policy immediately.

Professor Frederickson proposed an amendment to the amended proposal.

The Educational Policy Committee is directed to present its proposed policy by the February meeting of the Faculty Senate, and The Elimination of Redlining will take effect after the February meeting even if a new policy is not adopted by the Faculty Senate at that time.

The second amendment supersedes the first and sets a date for elimination of the redlining policy at Purdue University.

Present	Proposed
<p><i>E. Transfer of Credits Between Curricula</i></p> <p>When a student transfers from one curriculum to another leading to a different associate or baccalaureate degree, the courses that have been completed and are acceptable in satisfying the degree requirements of the new curriculum shall be determined as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An authorized representative of the dean of the school into which the student wishes to transfer shall cause to be entered upon forms provided by the registrar a list of those courses previously taken which may be used in satisfying the degree requirements of the curriculum into which the student is transferring. These courses shall include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) All courses completed, regardless of grade received, which are required courses in the curriculum to which he/she is transferring or which are substantially equivalent to and are acceptable as substitutes for such required courses. b) Courses completed but not required for his/her new curriculum which are admissible for credit as elective courses in the new curriculum. The decision to transfer such credit for elective courses shall be made by the student at the time of transfer and upon the consent of an authorized representative of the dean of the school to which the student is applying for transfer. 2. A graduation index as of the date of transfer shall be computed using only grades in courses transferred as specified above. 3. When a student transfers between markedly different curricula within a school offering a single degree, the dean of the school shall be empowered to grant an exception which extends the benefits of this section. 	<p><i>E. Transfer of Credits Between Curricula</i></p> <p>When a student transfers from one curriculum to another leading to a different associate or baccalaureate degree, the courses that have been completed and are acceptable in satisfying the degree requirements of the new curriculum shall be determined as follows:</p> <p><i>by</i> an authorized representative of the dean of the school into which the student wishes to transfer. shall cause to be entered upon forms provided by the registrar. a list of those courses previously taken which may be used in satisfying the degree requirements of the curriculum into which the student is transferring. These courses shall include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) All courses completed, regardless of grade received, which are required courses in the curriculum to which he/she is transferring or which are substantially equivalent to and are acceptable as substitutes for such required courses. b) Courses completed but not required for his/her new curriculum which are admissible for credit as elective courses in the new curriculum. The decision to transfer such credit for elective courses shall be made by the student at the time of transfer and upon the consent of an authorized representative of the dean of the school to which the student is applying for transfer. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. A graduation index as of the date of transfer shall be computed using only grades in courses transferred as specified above. 3. When a student transfers between markedly different curricula within a school offering a single degree, the dean of the school shall be empowered to grant an exception which extends the benefits of this section. <p><i>J.</i></p>

*J. Scholastic Indexes**

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 graduation index.

1. The semester index is an average determined by weighting each grade received during a given academic session by the number of semester hours of credit in the course.
2. The graduation index for an undergraduate student is a weighted average of all grades received by the student while in the curriculum in which he/she is enrolled plus all other grades received in courses taken in other curricula offered by the University and properly accepted under procedures established in Section II-E for satisfying the requirements of the school in which the student is enrolled. 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 graduation index. In the case of a course in which a conditional grade has been improved by examination or for which a course of substantially equivalent content and level, as designated and properly authorized by the department offering the original course, has been substituted, the most recent grade received shall be used. The grade in a remedial level course, as identified by the student's school, may be deleted from the graduation index upon the recommendation of the student's school.
3. The graduation index for a student enrolled in the professional curriculum in veterinary medicine is a weighted average of all grades received by the student while in the professional curriculum.

*J. Scholastic Indexes**

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 ~~graduation~~ **cumulative** index.

1. The semester index is an average determined by weighting each grade received during a given academic session by the number of semester hours of credit in the course.
2. The ~~graduation~~ **cumulative** index for an undergraduate student is a weighted average of all grades received **as an undergraduate student** ~~by the student while in the curriculum in which he/she is enrolled plus all other grades received in courses taken in other curricula offered by the University and properly accepted under procedures established in Section II E for satisfying the requirements of the school in which the student is enrolled.~~ 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 ~~graduation~~ **cumulative** index. In the case of a course in which a conditional grade has been improved by examination ~~or for which a course of substantially equivalent content and level, as designated and properly authorized by the department offering the original course, has been substituted,~~ the most recent grade received shall be used. ~~The grade in a remedial level course, as identified by the student's school, may be deleted from the graduation index upon the recommendation of the student's school.~~
3. The ~~graduation~~ **cumulative** index for a student enrolled in the professional curriculum in veterinary medicine is a weighted average of all grades received by the student while in the professional curriculum.
4. The ~~graduation~~ **cumulative** index for a student enrolled in the professional curriculum in pharmacy is a weighted average of all grades received by the student while in the professional curriculum plus all grades included in the student's undergraduate ~~graduation~~ **cumulative** index. ~~as defined in section J.2 above, prior to entering the professional curriculum.~~ 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 ~~graduation~~ **cumulative** index.

<p>4. The graduation index for a student enrolled in the professional curriculum in pharmacy is a weighted average of all grades received by the student while in the professional curriculum plus all grades included in the student's undergraduate graduation index, as defined in section J.2 above, prior to entering the professional curriculum. 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 graduation index.</p> <p>5. The graduation index for a graduate student is a weighted average of all grades received by the student in graduate-level courses (those numbered 500 or higher) since entering a graduate program, plus all grades received in undergraduate-level courses, taken while in the graduate program as part of the graduate plan of study. With the consent of his/her major professor, a student may repeat a course not intended for repeat registrations. In the case of such a repeated course, only the most recent grade received shall be included in the graduation index. Grades received in foreign language courses to establish reading knowledge as specified by the Graduate Council are not used in computing graduation indexes.</p> <p>6. For the purpose of averaging, each grade shall be weighted in the following manner:*</p> <p>GRADE WEIGHT</p> <p>A+, A 4.0 x semester hours = index points A- 3.7 x semester hours = index points B+ 3.3 x semester hours = index points B 3.0 x semester hours = index points B- 2.7 x semester hours = index points O 2.3 x semester hours = index points C 2.0 x semester hours = index points C- 1.7 x semester hours = index points D+ 1.3 x semester hours = index points D 1.0 x semester hours = index points</p>	<p>5. The graduation <i>cumulative</i> index for a graduate student is a weighted average of all grades received by the student in graduate-level courses (those numbered 500 or higher) since entering a graduate program, plus all grades received in undergraduate-level courses, taken while in the graduate program as part of the graduate plan of study. With the consent of his/her major professor, a student may repeat a course not intended for repeat registrations. In the case of such a repeated course, only the most recent grade received shall be included in the graduation <i>cumulative</i> index. Grades received in foreign language courses to establish reading knowledge as specified by the Graduate Council are not used in computing graduation <i>cumulative</i> indexes.</p> <p>6. For the purpose of averaging, each grade shall be weighted in the following manner:*</p> <p>GRADE WEIGHT</p> <p>A+, A 4.0 x semester hours = index points A- 3.7 x semester hours = index points B+ 3.3 x semester hours = index points B 3.0 x semester hours = index points B- 2.7 x semester hours = index points O 2.3 x semester hours = index points C 2.0 x semester hours = index points C- 1.7 x semester hours = index points D+ 1.3 x semester hours = index points D 1.0 x semester hours = index points D- 0.7 x semester hours = index points E, F, EF, IF 0.0 x semester hours = index points P, N, I, PI, SI, W, WF, WN, WU, IN, IU Not included</p> <p>7. The semester index is the sum of all index points for one semester for the grades A+/A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, E, EF, IF and F, divided by the sum of all corresponding semester hours. This index is represented by the following formula: $S = \frac{4NA_+ + MA_- + 3.7NA_+ - 3NB_+ + 3NB_+ + \dots}{NA_+ + NA_+ + NA_- + NB_+ + NB_+ + \dots}$ In the formula, NA+, NA, NA-, NB-K ^c. are, respectively, the number of credit hours of A+, A, A-, B+, etc.</p> <p>8. The graduate <i>cumulative</i> index is computed similarly using the grades specified in Section VII-J2 and VH-J3.**</p> <p>9. The registrar shall compile and report semester and graduation <i>cumulative</i></p>
--	---

<p>D- 0.7 x semester hours = index points E, F, EF, IF 0.0 x semester hours = index points P, N, I, PI, SI, W, WF, WN, WU, IN, IU Not included</p> <p>7. The semester index is the sum of all index points for one semester for the grades A+/A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, E, EF, IF and F, divided by the sum of all corresponding semester hours. This index is represented by the following formula: $S = \frac{4NA^+ + 3NA^- + 3.7NB^{++} + 3NB^{+} + \dots}{NA^{++} + NA^+ + NA^- + NB^{++} + NB^+ + \dots}$ In the formula, NA⁺, NA, NA⁻, NB^{-K} ^c. are, respectively, the number of credit hours of A⁺, A, A⁻, B⁺, etc.</p> <p>8. The graduate index is computed similarly using the grades specified in Section VII-J2 and VH-J3.**</p> <p>9. The registrar shall compile and report semester and graduation indexes after the close of each academic session.</p>	<p>indexes after the close of each academic session.</p>
--	--

Approving:
K. Anderson
A. Astell
C. Baird
D. Bowling
P. Connolly
S. Feld
J. Grennan
L.T. Hawkins
C.M. Ladisch
M. Moriarty
H. Nakanishi
R. Penney
R. Kubat
R. Waterson
S. Weldon

Disapproving:
G. Bodner
R. Montgomery
M. Talbott

Abstain:
O. Adeola

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 7, 2005

To: ESAAC Subcommittee to explore 'red lining' best practice

From: Robert Kubat, University Registrar
Lori Shipley, OnePurdue Functional Lead, ESA

Subject: Big Ten and Peer Institution Benchmarking

The following paragraphs describe available information from Big Ten and Purdue University's peer institutions regarding current practices on excluding courses from a student's GPA. The Big Ten information was obtained via an email survey and specifically asked if courses were excluded for the student's GPA when the student changed majors. In addition, questions were asked about use of multiple GPA's. The remaining peer institutions were compiled from the institution's web sites.

Texas A&M

Texas A&M has a 'First Year Grade Exclusion Policy'. The 'First Year Grade Exclusion Policy' allows an undergraduate student who entered as 'first time in college' to elect to have grades of D, F, or U excluded from GPA calculations. A maximum of three A&M courses may be excluded and the enrollment for the courses must be within 12 months of the first date of enrollment. All courses remain on the official transcript. Only currently enrolled students may invoke first-year grade exclusion. More details regarding the policy can be found at the following web site: http://www.tamu.edu/admissions/records/GEP_Jan2005.html

UT Austin

No academic policies were found which allowed exclusion of course work from the cumulative GPA other than changes made in 1999 which impacted credit by examination. Prior to 1999 the GPA was calculated on the basis of all work undertaken at UT Austin, including credit by examination, correspondence, and extension. Grades in courses transferred from other institutions are excluded from the calculation. The change in 1999 excluded letter grades for credit by examination from the GPA. More details regarding the change in 1999 can be found at the following web site:

http://www.utexas.edu/faculty/council/1999-2000/legislation/credit_by_exam.html

Worth noting is UT Austin's policy on repeated courses, All grades earned in University courses, whether repeated or not, count in a student's GPA.

University of Arizona

All grades for repeated courses are calculated in the major GPA, with the exception of grades that are replaced by the Grade Replacement Opportunity (GRO) and those removed from the grade point average through Academic Renewal.

Grade Replacement Opportunity (GRO)

Graduate students may apply to retake courses for which they received a grade of C or below. Undergraduates who have not received a bachelor's degree may repeat under the Grade Replacement Opportunity (GRO), only once, certain courses in which they received grades of C, D, or E. A total of 3 courses, not to exceed a maximum of 10 semester hours, may be repeated under GRO. The University of Arizona's Grade Replacement Opportunity policy can be found at the following web site: <http://catalog.arizona.edu/2004-05/policies/gro2.htm>

Academic Renewal

Under certain circumstances, an undergraduate student may apply for academic renewal. Academic renewal allows students to have grades for a particular period of time excluded from their GPA. If the qualifications are met, the student may have a maximum of four consecutive semesters of course work disregarded in all calculations regarding academic standing, grade-point-average, and eligibility for graduation. To qualify for academic renewal a minimum of five years must have elapsed since the most recent course work to be disregarded was completed. If the student satisfies the conditions for Academic Renewal, the student's permanent academic record will indicate that no work taken during the disregarded semester(s) or term(s) applies toward graduation. All work remains on the record, ensuring a true and accurate academic history. The University of Arizona's Academic Renewal policy can be found at the following web site: <http://catalog.arizona.edu/2004-05/policies/acadrenw.htm>

University of California - Berkley

No academic policies were found which allowed exclusion of course work from the cumulative GPA other than the normal incompletes, pass/no pass types of scenarios.

University of California - Davis

No academic policies were found which allowed exclusion of course work from the cumulative GPA other than the normal incompletes, pass/no pass types of scenarios.

Georgia Tech

Grade Substitution became effective with the entering Fall 2005 first-time freshman class. First-time freshman students who receive a grade of D or F in a course within their first two terms in residence are eligible to repeat the course and have the original grade excluded from the computation of academic average. Grade substitution may be used only once per course, with a maximum of two courses total. The course must be repeated at Georgia Tech within the student's first four terms in residence. The original course and grade will continue to appear on the student's transcript, with a notation that the course was repeated and that the original grade is not included in computation of the academic average.

Cornell

No academic policies were found which allowed exclusion of course work from the cumulative GPA other than the normal incompletes, pass/no pass types of scenarios. Cornell offers the *S-U System* to encourage students to explore courses without risk to their academic record. The *S-U System* assigns a satisfactory or unsatisfactory grade for course work.

Illinois

No exclusion of course work occurs when a student changes majors. The transcript system provides an overall GPA as well as a term GPA and transfer GPA. Departments use DARwin for additional GPA's.

Penn State

No exclusion of course work occurs when a student changes majors. Only one cumulative GPA exist for a student which includes all course work.

Michigan State University

No exclusion of course work occurs when a student changes majors. The transcript does not include a major or program GPA. In accordance with the requirements for certain majors, major or program GPA's are calculated by the college or degree-offering unit.

Northwestern University

The academic transcript is a complete academic record that shows all work and a cumulative GPA. In the degree audit, there can be a major GPA that includes or excludes courses as the program area wishes - they define it and it can differ by major.

The University of Iowa

No exclusion of course work occurs when a student changes majors. Up to five courses can be repeated and the original grades are not included in the GPA. DARwin can provide a major GPA.

Indiana University

A modification was made to PeopleSoft to accommodate a program GPA as well as a cumulative GPA.

Summary of Responses regarding Redlining practices May 18, 2001

In January 2001, the Academic Progress and Records Committee sent out a request to the Schools at Purdue University to provide information describing their current redlining policies and practices (where "redlining" means a course is deleted from the student's grade point average). The following table provides a brief overview of the responses received regarding redlining policies and practices across the Schools at Purdue University. Supporting written documentation and/or oral confirmation statements were obtained from the head academic advisor from each School. –N. Denton, AP&R chair

School	Description of Redlining Policy/Practice
Agriculture	All remedial courses are redlined, regardless of grade. Any course with grade of F or WF taken for the previous curriculum can be redlined if the course does not apply to the student's current School of Agriculture plan of study. (F and WF courses will be reinstated if student changes to a plan of study where these courses apply).
Consumer and Family Sciences	Redlining is allowed for all courses not required in the current curriculum. Previously redlined courses are reinstated if they are required in the new curriculum.
Education	Redlining is allowed for any courses not listed in the School of Education core or not in Education if the student receives a grade of D or F. Redlining is not allowed for courses where the student received a grade of C or higher, for core courses, and for Education courses.
Engineering	Each School sets its own policy. ChemE, ECE, and IDE do not redline courses. Other Schools redline all courses that do not apply towards their specific degree requirements, regardless of grade. Previously redlined courses are reinstated if they are required in the new curriculum.
Liberal Arts	The Liberal Arts policy is fairly complex (5 pages of documentation). A brief summary is that all courses that are not listed in the Liberal Arts core and all courses that do not apply to a new choice of Liberal Arts major may be redlined.
Management	Up to three courses with a grade of D or F may be redlined. Remedial courses will be redlined. An applicable course with a grade of D or F may be redlined AFTER the substitute course is completed.
Nursing	All courses that are not in the nursing curriculum may be redlined.
Pharmacy	Up to three courses that are not in the pharmacy curricula or on the elective list may be redlined.
Science	All remedial courses will be redlined. Non-Science free elective courses with D or F grades may be redlined.
Technology	Variations exist between departments. Typically, redlining is allowed for any course with a grade of D or F that is not applicable to the new curriculum.
University Division	Up to three courses or 20% of the courses may be redlined (whichever is greater), for courses with grades of D or F only. This applies to courses that are not applicable to most majors (e.g., ENGL 101 cannot be redlined).
USP	This program does not accept CODO students, so redlining does not apply.