

**UNIVERSITY SENATE**  
Fifth Meeting, Monday, 20 February 2006, 2:30 p.m.  
Room 302, Stewart Center

**AGENDA**

1. Call to order Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina
2. Approval of Minutes of 23 January 2006
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 05-7](#)  
Nominees for Vice Chairperson  
of the University Senate For Information  
Professor Charles E. Kline
9. [University Senate Document 05-5](#)  
Alternative to Redlining For Action  
Professor George M. Bodner
10. [University Senate Document 05-6](#)  
Changes to University Grade Appeals System For Action  
Professor Mark Morgan
11. New Business
12. Memorial Resolutions
13. Adjournment

## UNIVERSITY SENATE

Fifth Meeting, Monday, 20 February 2006, 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, Ann W. Astell, Carol L. Baird, Thomas Bauman, Alan M. Beck, Rodney J. Bertolet, George M. Bodner, J. Stuart Bolton, Mark D. Bowman, Joseph W. Camp Jr. (Secretary of Faculties and Parliamentarian), Natalie J. Carroll, Yan Chen, Susan E. Conners, Patrick E. Connolly, John J. Contreni, John P. Denton, Sharon DeVaney, Otto C. Doering III, Joseph C. Dorsey, Linda M. Duttlinger, Janusz Duzinkiewicz, Scott L. Feld, Wendy S. Flory, Greg N. Frederickson, April J. Ginther, Alten F. Grandt Jr., John G. Graveel, James P. Greenan, Bruce R. Hamaker, Nathan W. Harter, Sally A. Hastings, L. Tony Hawkins, Jessica D. Hoffman, Vicki J. Killion, Charles E. Kline, Sivakumar S. Krishnan, 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, P. Jane Morris (Sergeant at Arms), Hisao Nakanishi, Cindy H. Nakatsu, Ganesan Narsimhan, David E. Nichols, Morgan R. Olsen, Carolyn C. Perrucci, Laura J. Pyrak-Nolte, Patrice D. Rankine, Thomas B. Robinson, William T. Robinson, George E. Rogers, Alysa C. Rollock, F. Robert Sabol, Keith E. Schwingendorf, Louis A. Sherman, Bernard Y. Tao, Volker K. Thomas, Alain S. Togbe, Ralph Webb Jr., Clarence W. Wilkerson, G. Thomas Wilson, and William J. Zinsmeister.*

**Absent:** *Professors Howard Adler, JennieMarie Blankert, Antonio Bobet, James R. Bottum, Charles A. Bouman, James E. Braun, Stephen R. Byrn, Ann Marie Clark, Christine L. Corum, Lawrence P. DeBoer, Richard O. Fanjoy, David R. Gaskell, Gabriele F. Giuliani, William A. Harper, R. Neal Houze, Douglass F. Jacobs, J.L. Jenkins, Wayne W. Kjonaas, Daniel J. Kovenock, Ananthanarayan Krishnan, Robert A. Kubat, Thomas Kuczek, C.S. George Lee, Julie R. Mariga, Sean M. McDeavitt, Mark M. Moriarty, Rabindra N. Mukerjea, Michael R. Oliver, Frank V. Paladino, Richard C. Penney, Barry R. Pittendrigh, J. Paul Robinson, John A. Sautter, Jie Shen, Glenn G. Sparks, A. Charlene Sullivan, Marion T. Trout, Philip J. VanFossen, Gerald S. Wasserman, H. Lee Weith, David J. Williams, Yuehwern Yih, and Michael D. Zoltowski.*

**Guests:** *Douglas Christiansen, Chris Leasure, Maria M. Levy, Sarah Michalos, Deb Sheets, Lori Shipley, and Mike Talbott*

1. The meeting was called to order by the chairperson of the senate, Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina at 2:30 p.m.
2. The minutes of the meeting of 23 January 2006 were approved as distributed.
3. Professor Skvarenina asked that the Senate accept a friendly amendment to swap the positions of Senate Documents 05-5 and 05-6 on the agenda. The Senate accepted this agenda by consent and a motion was made to accept the amended agenda. The motion was seconded and the agenda was accepted as amended.
4. President Martin C. Jischke presented remarks to the Senate (see Appendix A).
5. Professor Timothy L. Skvarenina presented the report of the chairperson (see Appendix B).

6. Professor Skvarenina presented, for information, the Resume of Items Under Consideration by Various Standing Committees (see Appendix C). Professor Morris Levy, chair of the University Resource Policy Committee, rose to provide an update on the issue of graduate student fees (see Appendix D). This issue is currently under consideration by his committee. As increasing fees have the potential to impact graduate student enrollments, this is an important item and may come forth for Senate consideration in the future.
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 Mark Morgan presented, for action, University Senate Document 05-6, *Changes to University Grade Appeals System*. His motion was seconded. There was no discussion of the document and the vote was taken. The document passed unanimously on a voice vote.
9. Professor George Bodner presented a friendly amendment from the Educational Policy Committee to University Senate Document 05-5, *Alternative to Redlining*. The friendly amendment was accepted by consent. Professor Bodner then made a motion to approve the amended document. His motion was seconded. During the discussion, Professor Bodner provided clarification to several Senators on items of concern. Most of the Senators' questions revolved around issues of timing for students to remove courses, the timing of implementation of the freshman forgiveness policy that will replace redlining, and the timing of inclusion of the graduation and cumulative indices on the transcripts.

Professor Bodner stated that the friendly amendment allows students to remove a course completed during the first 24 months after they have declared as degree-seeking students, provided that the course is not required for their plan of study. This compromise allows students who do not get into a major as freshmen to have a window in which to make potentially life-changing decisions. The compromise also allows part-time students the opportunity to have courses removed.

The implementation will be based on an administrative policy that will probably be issued in the next few months. This policy will set the effective date for the new freshman forgiveness policy as well as the date for use of the cumulative and graduation indices. Until then, the current redlining policy will continue thus allowing students who are in the CODO process to work through the system. However, the current legacy system cannot accommodate or calculate the cumulative index, which means it will have to be hand calculated. On the other hand, it appears that the graduation index can be accommodated by the legacy system and can be included in the transcript. The calculation of the cumulative index may entail an increased workload for those individuals who actually have to perform the calculations. At this time, the cumulative index will probably not go on the transcript on a routine basis. Currently, the cumulative index is hand calculated for athletes and other students who are not allowed to redline courses. Once the OnePurdue student module is on-line, it will be able to calculate and report both indices. Provost Mason emphasized that if the document is passed it will place some burden on the advisors and the personnel in the Registrar's office. The

exact nature of the burden will not be known until these individuals and groups assess the Senate document and determine how to implement it prior to the OnePurdue student module implementation. Vice President Doug Christiansen also spoke about the impact of implementation of policy prior to the “go-live” for the OnePurdue student module. He mentioned that there could be potential issues because of the lack of an automatic audit trail during the hand calculation of an index. OnePurdue will have an automatic audit trail associated with any calculations that are done. These issues will have to be worked out among the various groups and individuals that are impacted by the Senate document.

Professor Bodner made it clear that if the document did not pass, there would be no redlining policy, no forgiveness policy, and no separate cumulative or graduation indices as defined in the document. Several professors spoke in favor and several against the proposal echoing the comments made at the two previous Senate meetings. After Dr. Bodner’s presentation and question session, Professor Skvarenina called for the vote. The document passed on a voice vote with only a few dissenting votes.

10. There was no new business.
11. There were no memorial resolutions.
12. The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

### **REMARKS BY PRESIDENT MARTIN C. JISCHKE**

Thank you very much and good afternoon to all of you. I appreciate this opportunity to speak with you and I appreciate the continued support that this administration receives from the faculty. Faculty truly are the heart of the university. I never lose sight of that. I came from a faculty position myself. I actually hold a faculty position proudly here at Purdue and I know that for everything we do, the buildings, the fund-raising, and all of our events, it is the people of Purdue that are the most important. The quality of a Purdue degree depends essentially on the quality of our faculty. We are very fortunate at Purdue to not only have excellent teachers and researchers on our faculty, we are fortunate to have people who truly are dedicated to this University and dedicated to our students.

We have been saying for several years now that Purdue is at a tipping point. A central aspect of this is our Strategic Plans that are focused on

- increasing the size of our faculty,
- increasing the diversity of our faculty,
- increasing the number of named faculty and faculty chairs,
- increasing faculty research, and
- increasing faculty salaries.

We are working to accomplish much of this through our private fundraising efforts in the Campaign for Purdue. That campaign runs through June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2007. Our goal, as you know, is to raise \$1.5 billion. As you may have heard, we recently passed the \$1.3 billion mark. That actually was our original goal. This campaign has been very successful. We have received a tremendous response from alumni, friends and corporate partners. The faculty and staff of Purdue have provided incredible support for this campaign. We are very grateful to all of you for everything you are doing in this regard. The enormous faculty and staff response to this campaign is one of the most inspiring aspects of our fundraising. When I tell people that we have raised nearly \$50 million from faculty, staff and retirees, they are really rather stunned by that level of generosity. You are having a huge impact through these gifts. And when we approach major donors to tell them of this kind of support, it helps them understand the significance of what we are doing and the kind of commitment that we enjoy here at Purdue from our faculty and staff. The money we are raising is being put immediately to work. As many of you know, the largest gift we received in this campaign came from Bill and Mary Ann Bindley. In 2002 they committed an incredible \$52.5 million to Purdue. Of that, \$7.5 million was used to cover half the cost of what we now call the Bindley Bioscience Center. The remaining funds were designated for various initiatives, including, in particular, the Bindley Chair Challenge. The Bindley Chair Challenge allotted \$22.5 million of their deferred commitment to match other gifts and pledges for faculty chairs, in particular to create 15 endowed chairs at \$1.5 each, therefore \$22.5 million, to be matched by 15 more chairs throughout the University. As I have said a number of times, the creation of endowed chairs is absolutely crucial to our efforts to attract and keep the very best people at Purdue.

The Bindley Challenge not only created chairs for our colleges and schools. It was a challenge and thereby encouraged others to join the Bindley's in this effort. When a school or college matched the Bindley Challenge it actually received two chairs. One from the Bindley's and the other from the donor who matched the challenge. An incredible gift to Purdue and it has had an

enormous impact. I am very pleased to tell you today that we have completed the Bindley Chair Challenge. Our College of Agriculture received five Bindley Chairs. Our School of Management received four. Engineering received three. Our Colleges of Education and Technology and the Provost's Office for Discovery Park each received one. All of this was a wonderful opportunity and it proved to be a great success.

I now have a new opportunity to tell you about. It is the Goodwin Chair Challenge which we have just announced. George E. Goodwin, a Purdue alumnus, of Civil Engineering I might add, who died in 2002, provided his estate to Purdue and we have used or set aside now \$15 million of that endowment to create 20 new endowed professorships. It will be part of a challenge match whereby money from the Goodwin estate will be used to match dollar-for-dollar every \$750,000 gift. If a donor or group of donors give \$750,000, the Goodwin estate will add \$750,000 to that to create a \$1.5 million endowment. We can do that for twenty chairs. I should say nineteen because one of them has already been taken. To date, we have raised \$165 million toward our \$200 million goal of funding endowed chairs and professorships. Eighty new professorships have been funded so far as a result of the Campaign for Purdue. In the past year alone, we have appointed 25 new named or distinguished professors bringing us to a total of 116. I would tell you we remain behind our peers in this regard, but we are making progress.

Of course in addition to these named faculty, our Strategic Plan goal is to add 300 new faculty positions here on the West Lafayette campus. This is above and beyond replacements for people who retire or leave for other reasons. As of this past fall, we have authorized 200 of these Strategic Plan faculty positions. Through the Provost's Office we have also provided bridge funding for a number of future authorized positions to take advantage of early hire opportunities. So to date, we have actually hired people for 211 of the 300 faculty positions in the Strategic Plan that includes 156 new assistant professors, 26 associate professors, and 29 full professors. So with more than 200 of the Strategic Plan new faculty already hired, our job now is to hire 89 to get to the total of 300. We have extended the Strategic Plans one year to June 30 of 2007 to accomplish this. Our plans are to add the 89 remaining positions during the next two years to complete our goal of 300. Allow me to put in perspective what impact our annual faculty hiring is having here at Purdue. Since 2001, now about five years, we have hired more than 630 new faculty at Purdue — roughly one-third of the total faculty here at Purdue. As I have noted, more than 200 of the 632 have been brand-new Strategic Plan hires. The remainder are replacing people who have retired or resigned. Of the 632 new faculty hired since 2001, 447 are new assistant professors, 93 are associate professors and 87 are full professors. We have also engaged in cluster hires where the addition of one person can benefit several departments, or conversely where several academic units are searching simultaneously for individuals who will work collaboratively and across the disciplines. And quite apart from the hiring of regular tenured and tenure-track faculty, we have also added a new option for bringing faculty to Purdue. With the support of this Senate, we now have non-tenure-track research faculty professors whose primary responsibilities are to engage in research projects that are often large-scale. This is clearly an exciting time at Purdue.

One of the ways we are communicating outside the University what is happening at Purdue and what Purdue can do for our state is through what I call community visits. Tomorrow we will be in Hamilton County. We will spend about 11 hours meeting with government and business leaders, along with leaders in the health care industry. We will meet with students, tour factories, and conclude the day with a Purdue alumni event. We have done nearly 60 of these kinds of community visits over the last several years. It gives me and those who come with me an opportunity to meet first-hand with the people from throughout the state to tell them what is happening at Purdue and what we can do to be helpful. It also, frankly, gives us a better

understanding of what the state of Indiana needs from and wants from Purdue. The program has been very successful by my measure. We receive a tremendous response to it. As I said this is the fifth year we are conducting these day-long community visits. We have been to Gary, Jasper, South Bend, Lebanon and lots of places in between. For the rest of this year we will be in Hendricks County, Elkhart and New Albany. And this is all in addition to many appearances by me and others from Purdue throughout Indiana, all year long, every year. It has been my experience now over these 5 1/2 years that the people of Indiana are quite impressed with what is taking place here at Purdue. They support our efforts. They appreciate everything we are doing in learning, discovery and engagement. I believe we have convinced them, not only by our words, but by our actions that we sincerely have their best interest at heart. And much of what we do contributes to their best interest. They believe Purdue is quite a remarkable and important asset of our state. To all of you, a thank you for everything you and your colleagues are doing. Thank you for helping us to accomplish our goals. Working with this faculty has been for me one of the more rewarding experiences of my professional life. And I certainly appreciate all that you do. Thank you! I would be delighted to take any questions that you might have for me. Thank you!

**REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE - PROFESSOR TIMOTHY L. SKVARENINA**

Good afternoon, I have a very brief report today, as I expect we will again have significant discussions on the later agenda items.

The Board of Trustees met on February 3<sup>rd</sup>. The Board ratified Dr. Matthew Holt to the Wickersham Chair of Excellence in Ag Research. Chip Rutledge and Vic Lechtenberg presented governance reports concerning sponsored research and engagement, respectively. As usual, the presentations are available at the Board of Trustees website (<http://www.purdue.edu/bot>) and are very interesting.

I updated the Board of Trustees concerning our actions to date with respect to the elimination of redlining and the proposed “freshman forgiveness” policy. I also informed them of the trends of the campus-wide GPA over the past 48 years that I presented to you last month. The Board also received a report from Senator Blankert, the graduate student representative to the Senate. Due to her work with Dean Contreni of the graduate school, health insurance has become more affordable for graduate students with families. This is a significant contribution that impacts the ability of Purdue to attract the best graduate students. Along those lines, we will hear a short report from Professor Levy and the University Resource Policy Committee concerning the impact of fees on our graduate students. Finally, in an action that will affect the makeup of this Senate, the Board approved academic autonomy for the North Central campus. Currently, the North Central campus is represented by four senators, using the population formula that was approved at our November meeting. As an autonomous campus, they will have one representative to the Senate, as do Calumet, IPFW, and IUPUI at present. The Steering Committee and I have asked the Faculty Affairs Committee to develop recommendations for the Senate to amend the By-Laws to implement this change. Several possibilities have been brought up. One would be to reallocate the three Senate seats at the next apportionment of the Senate. Another would be to reduce the number of Senators, and a third possibility would be to consider CSSAC and APSAC representation.

Also at our last meeting, I provided some results from the survey of the faculty concerning pay frequency. Many individuals indicated a desire for having their salary spread over 12 months, and Provost Mason has indicated that will be possible under the OnePurdue system. Incidentally, the finance portion of OnePurdue is scheduled to begin with the fall semester of 2007, so it is not that far away. For those who plan to be here then, you will receive essentially half a pay check at the end of August 2007, followed by somewhat larger checks in September through April, and again a half check in May 2008. Note that by the end of December, you will have received one-half of your pay, just as you do now.

I would be happy to answer any questions.

Respectfully Submitted,

Timothy L. Skvarenina  
Chair, University Senate 2005-06

**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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:mmorgan@purdue.edu)

1. Grade Appeals Process - Doc 05-6 submitted to Senate
2. Committee on Informetrics - Faculty survey
3. Follow-up on faculty development review - mentoring
4. Tenure Promotion Process - automatic tenure clock extension policy
5. Memorial Resolution policy
6. Vacation for academic year faculty
7. Number of senators & University representation
8. Personal Financial Conflict of Interest Policy - Draft review

**STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

April J. Ginther, Chairperson  
[aginther@purdue.edu](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:tao@purdue.edu)  
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., [jcamp@purdue.edu](mailto:jcamp@purdue.edu)  
University Senate Minutes; <http://www.purdue.edu/usenate>

Slide 1

**Graduate Staff Appointment Fees and the Strategic Plan**

Report to the Faculty Senate - 2/20/06

University Resources Policy Committee

Slide 2

**Selected Strategic Plan Aspects That Impact the Graduate Program**

- ❖ Add 300 new faculty
- ❖ Grow the research enterprise to preeminence
- ❖ Recruit and retain talented graduate students with exemplary support for them to achieve success

Slide 3

**Funding and Metrics**

**Fees & Tuition:** Revenues will grow based on annual increases that take into consideration competitiveness with peers (and within the region)

**Metrics:** Competitive graduate assistant stipend level by discipline and number and size of research fellowships

Slide 4

**Graduate Staff Fee Increases**

	Fall 2000	Fall, 2002	Fall, 2004	Fall, 2006
per semester	\$ 332	\$ 478	\$ 522	\$ 711
academic year	\$ 664	\$ 956	\$ 1,044	\$1,422
12-mo. total (+ summer)	\$ 780	\$1,195	\$ 1,305	\$ 1,777.50
12-mo. total Intl. students				\$ 1,927.50*

\* International Student Fee for SEVIS compliance costs.

Slide 5

**(NOT FOR EXTERNAL USE)**  
**Net Avg. RA compensation - Big Ten**  
**Academic Year 2004-05 \***

Institution	RA FTEs	Avg. cash Salary	Tuition & fees paid	Net avg. Comp.
Michigan	877	\$ 15,066	\$ 187	\$ 14,879
Wisconsin	1,249	\$ 14,526	\$ 612	\$ 13,914
<b>Purdue</b>	<b>1,116</b>	<b>\$ 14,829</b>	<b>\$ 1,044</b>	<b>\$ 13,785</b>
Illinois	1,415	\$ 15,033	\$1,260	\$ 13,773
Michigan State	922	\$ 13,467	\$ 0	\$ 13,467
Ohio State	1,017	\$ 13,457	\$ 63	\$ 13,394
Iowa	629	\$ 16,755	\$4,476	\$ 12,279
Minnesota	960	\$ 12,129	\$1,352	\$ 10,777
Indiana	496	\$ 11,753	\$1,019	\$ 10,734

\* Purdue University Institutional Assessments across all disciplines.

Slide 6

**Net Annual RA compensation - Biology**  
**Departments 2004-05 \***

Big Ten Rank: Institution	Living Cost-PU	Annual Stipend	Fees	Adjusted Net Stipend
1. Wisconsin	+12.3%	\$ 22,500	\$ 500	\$ 19,294
2. Michigan	+16.8%	\$ 23,500	\$ 187	\$ 19,396
3. Illinois	- 4.9%	\$ 22,660	\$ 882	\$ 22,782
4. Minnesota	+ 3.4%	\$ 22,000	\$ 354	\$ 20,910
5. Northwestern	+12.9%	\$ 23,750	\$ 0	\$ 20,686
<b>5. Purdue Bio</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>\$ 18,048</b>	<b>\$ 1,305</b>	<b>\$ 16,743</b>
<b>PULSe</b>		<b>\$ 20,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,305</b>	<b>\$ 18,695</b>
7. Indiana	+ 3.4%	\$ 22,000	\$ 613	\$ 20,660
8. Iowa	+ 0.5%	\$ 22,500	\$ ?	\$ 18-22,000
9. Penn State	+ 1.5%	\$ 17,734	\$ 0	\$ 17,468
10. Michigan St.	- 0.7%	\$ 20,700	\$ 42	\$ 20,803
11. Ohio St.	+ 1.0%	\$ 22,140	\$ 248	\$ 21,673

\* Ben Fanson, Dept. of Biol. Sciences, Purdue; Col. from www.bestplaces.net

Slide 7

**Net Academic Year RA compensation -  
Physics Departments 2005-06 \***

Institution	AY Stipend	AY fees paid	Net AY Comp.	Extra Intl. fee
Notre Dame	\$ 16,000	\$ 50	\$ 15,950	
<b>Purdue</b>	<b>\$ 16,400</b>	<b>\$ 1,108</b>	<b>\$ 15,292</b>	<b>-\$100</b>
Toledo	\$ 16,000	\$ 1,024	\$ 14,976	
Ohio State	\$ 15,327	\$ 573	\$ 14,754	
Penn State	\$ 14,445	\$ 0	\$ 14,445	
Northwestern	\$ 15,345	\$ 948	\$ 14,397	
Iowa	\$ 18,000	\$ 4,274	\$ 13,726	
Michigan State	\$ 13,500	\$ 96	\$ 13,404	-\$ 50
Iowa State	\$ 13,500	\$ 621	\$ 12,879	
Kansas State	\$ 12,700	\$ 485	\$ 12,215	

\* Andrew Hirsch, Head, Dept. of Physics.

Slide 8

**Issues**

Is our stipend / fee structure compromising our ability to grow and improve the quality of our graduate programs? If so, in which disciplines?

**Indicators:**

1. Net avg. differential stipends - Big Ten #3-4; in 2006-07 fees > 10% of grad income
2. Biological Sciences - Big Ten #9-11
3. Anecdotal evidence from students: why they didn't enroll (sampling very poor)
4. Declining grad enrollments: multiple inputs into this problem; new initiatives to remedy
5. Graduate student surveys - results TBA

Slide 9

**□ Ultimate issues**

How can we recruit and retain the increased number of talented graduate students that are necessary to achieve the goals of our Strategic Plan?

While we pursue preeminence in all of our missions, can (or how do) we meet our budget requirements without relying heavily on grad fees as a continuing and increasing source of revenue?

**CALENDAR OF STATUS OF LEGISLATION**

<b>SENATE DOCUMENT</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>ORIGIN</b>	<b>SENATE</b>
*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
*05-5	Alternative to Redlining	University Senate Educational Policy Committee	Approved 2/20/06
*05-6	Changes to University Grade Appeals System	Faculty Affairs Committee	Approved 2/20/06
05-7	Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the University Senate	Professor Charles E. Kline	For Information 2/20/06

\*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 2006-2007. The nominees for vice chairperson are:

George M. Bodner	Chemistry
Sally A. Hastings	History
Mark T. Morgan	Food Science
April J. Ginther	English

The resumes are attached.

Approving:  
Joseph W. Camp, Jr.  
Natalie Carroll  
Linda M. Duttlinger  
Bruce R. Hamaker  
Charles E. Kline  
Patrice D. Rankine

Absent:  
Gabriele F. Giuliani  
J. Paul Robinson  
Glenn G. Sparks (on leave)  
S. Laurel Weldon

\*\*\*\*\*

**George M. Bodner**

George Bodner is the Arthur E. Kelly Distinguished Professor of Chemistry, Education, and Engineering. He has made his living by teaching general chemistry to more than 30,000 students since 1972, when he took his first academic appointment at the University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign. Over the years, he has also taught organic chemistry, inorganic chemistry, biochemistry, and, most recently, a physical chemistry course for students in the life sciences. He joined the faculty at Purdue in 1977 and was one of the founding members of the Division of Chemical Education, the first graduate program in chemical education in the U.S.

He has served as chair of both the Educational Policy Committee and the Steering Committee and has repeatedly served as chair of the University Grade Appeals Committee. He has also served as co-chair of the Senate. He has been a visiting professor at Transylvania University in Lexington, KY, at Xi'an Jiaotong University in China, and at Curtin University in Australia. He has graduated more than 50 M.S. and Ph.D. students in the area of chemical education, published more than 100 papers and 45 books, given almost 500 invited lectures at colleges and universities, and has been a consultant on the structure of undergraduate chemistry programs at more than a dozen institutions.

### **Sally A. Hastings**

Sally Hastings is Associate Professor of History and Chair of the Asian Studies Program. She earned her A.B. degree at Tufts University, her A.M. degree at Yale University, and her Ph.D. in Japanese history at the University of Chicago. Since coming to Purdue from Northeastern Illinois University in 1990, she has taught courses on the history of Japan and East Asia. She has served in the University Senate for 5 years and on the Educational Policy Committee for 3; she was secretary of the EPC in 1998-1999 and chair of the EPC in 1999-2000. She has also served many terms on the College of Liberal Arts Senate and is currently Vice-Chair; she chaired the CLA Educational Policy Committee and has been a member of the CLA Faculty Affairs Committee, Grievance Committee, Agenda Committee, and Honors Committee. She has been a postdoctoral fellow and visiting scholar at Harvard University, a visiting scholar at Tokyo Joshi Daigaku, and a visiting faculty member at the University of Iowa, Northwestern University, the University of Michigan, and Tokyo Denki Daigaku. Her publications include *Neighborhood and Nation in Tokyo, 1905-1937* (Pittsburgh, 1995) and several book chapters and articles on modern Japanese women. She is now finishing a book on the first generation of women legislators in Japan, 1946-1974. She is a past president of the Midwest Conference on Asian Affairs and is now serving her second term as a member of the Board of Directors of the Association for Asian Studies. She is Editor of the *U.S.-Japan Women's Journal* and a reviewer of manuscripts for numerous university presses and scholarly journals. She has also given six years of service to the North American Coordinating Council on Japanese Library Resources

### **Mark T. Morgan**

Mark Morgan is an associate professor of food processing and Director of the Center for Integrated Food Manufacturing (CIFM) in the Food Science Department. He joined the Purdue faculty in Agricultural and Biological Engineering in 1992 after earning his Ph.D. from The Ohio State University. In 2003, he accepted a position as CIFM director in Food Science with a courtesy appointment in Ag. & Bio. Engineering. He has served as a member of the senate and the faculty affairs committee for 2 years and is currently chair of the faculty affairs committee. He has previously served on various university service/committees including freshman engineering curriculum, both schools of Agriculture and Engineering grievance, Dean of Agriculture search committee and numerous discipline-specific committees. Mark is a professional engineer registered in the state of Indiana with experience in the areas of food process engineering, sensor design, hygienic design of equipment, and process automation. He has extensive teaching experience, having taught nine different courses in the areas of food process controls, food processing, electric power, and engineering analysis. His current courses include an international Maymester course for students to study food and agricultural processing in Brazil. He has been advisor to undergraduate student organizations in both Ag. & Bio. Engineering and Food Science Departments. He has carried out an active research program with emphasis on sensor development for agricultural and food processing. In addition to numerous research and teaching publications, he has co-written books on Precision Agriculture Technologies and electricity in agriculture and patented a system for mapping soil pH for use in precision agricultural management which has been successfully commercialized. He is an active member of the American Association of Agricultural and Biological Engineers (ASABE), Institute of Food Technologists (IFT), European Hygienic Engineering and Design Group (EHEDG) and Instrument Society of America (ISA).

### **April Ginther**

April Ginther is an associate professor of English and the director of the Oral English Proficiency Program – the program responsible for the certification of oral English proficiency for prospective international teaching assistants. She received an M.A. in Spanish and another in English from Texas A&M. She received her Ph.D. in Linguistics and Measurement from the University of New Mexico. Before coming to Purdue, she worked for three years as an Associate Research Scientist at Educational Testing Service where she conducted research on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). She currently serves as a member of the TOEFL Research Committee, an external oversight committee of four university faculty members from around the world who are responsible for setting the TOEFL research agenda and vetting both internal and external research conducted through the institution. At Purdue, she developed and implemented Purdue's Oral English Proficiency Test, a semi-direct computer-based test of oral English proficiency that is administered to approximately 500 prospective ITAs every year – 300 in the week before classes begin each fall semester. She has served as a member of the faculty senate and as a member of the student affairs committee for three years and is the chair of the student affairs committee this year. She has served on the university's grievance committee as well as numerous departmental committees, including three faculty search committees this year. Her research focuses primarily on language testing and she has numerous publications concerned with different aspects of the development and measurement of proficiency in English as a second language. She held the position of treasurer of the Midwest Association of Language Testers for five years and is actively involved in the professional organizations associated with English as a second language and language testing, the Language Testing Research Colloquium and the American Association of Applied Linguistics. At Purdue, she has taught undergraduate and graduate sections of Introduction to Linguistics, graduate sections of ESL composition, Classroom Communication for ITAs, Theory of Second Language Acquisition, and graduate seminars in Language Testing, Research Design and the Development of Fluency.

TO: The University Senate  
FROM: University Senate Educational Policy Committee  
SUBJECT: Alternative to Redlining  
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Discussion  
REFERENCES: University Regulations 2004-05, Section II, Academic Program,  
Part J

## Introduction

At the 21 November 2005 University Senate meeting, the following amendment was added to Senate Document 05-3.

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.

As noted in Senate Document 05-3, the term “redlining” came from the practice of crossing out the deleted courses with red ink on the form that was sent to the Registrar’s Office when students completed the Change of Degree Objective (CODO) process by which they transferred from one School or College to another. The official term for this process is “index adjustment.”

Two well-articulated and deep-felt positions became obvious during discussions of index adjustment: (1) All grades should be included in the calculation of the GPA until or unless a grade was replaced by a new grade for the same course, and (2) some form of a “freshman forgiveness policy” should exist that enables students to overcome poor grades they might receive while adjusting to the University.

In the spirit of compromise, the Educational Policy Committee proposes an approach to the calculation of a student’s GPA that might satisfy those who believe that a grade should remain on a student’s record. At the same time, it might satisfy those who believe in some form of forgiveness policy. It decouples grade adjustment from the CODO process; it minimizes the number of ways in which the grade adjustment system can be abused by students; and it minimizes differences in the way in which Schools or Colleges can implement the grade adjustment policy.

As it now stands, there are two scholastic indexes — a **semester index** and a **cumulative index**. The compromise we propose is based on the creation of a third scholastic index, which will be known as the **graduation index**. Grade adjustments will be applied only to the graduation index, not the cumulative or semester index.

The cumulative index will be used for all external reporting functions. It is the index to be used, for example, to report athletes grades to the NCAA; to report a student’s grades to external scholarship committees; for financial aid decisions; to report on the students’

progress to the Veterans Administration; and so on. As long as the legacy system is used, which can only report one summative index, the cumulative index would be the one reported on the student's official transcripts.

The graduation index would be used for all internal functions. Rather than trying to recalibrate the myriad places within the University where GPA indices based on our old redlining policy have been used, the graduation index (with its inherent student forgiveness policy) would be used. The graduation index would therefore be used to determine whether a student is placed on probation; whether a student is dropped from the University; whether the student would be allowed into a different program; whether a student would be allowed to move from one School or College to another; whether a student on academic drop status would be readmitted; to determine distinguished list status; and so on.

The EPC proposes that the following restrictions be placed on adjustments to the graduation index.

- X Grade adjustments can be implemented only by an authorized representative of the academic unit in which the student is registered or in which a student will be registering, in consultation with the student.
- X Grade adjustments can be applied to no more than three courses totaling no more than 12 credit hours.
- X Grade adjustments can be applied only to courses completed during the first 12 months of the student's enrollment as a degree-seeking student.
- X There will be no difference between the way this policy applies to full-time, part-time, or transfer students.
- X Courses removed from the calculation of the graduation index must be those that cannot be used toward graduation in the curriculum in which the student is registered or the curriculum in which the student will be registering.
- X The courses must be removed within the first 24 months of the student's enrollment as a degree-seeking student.
- X The process of grade adjustment is not reversible.
- X Courses removed from the calculation of the graduation index cannot be used to fulfill any requirements for graduation.

This proposal enables students to remove from the graduation index courses that are not required for graduation. It also allows the authorized representatives of the academic unit to remove courses that cannot be applied toward graduation.

PROPOSED CHANGE TO UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS 2005-06

Part 2 Academic Regulations and Procedures, Section VII Grades and Grade Reports, Subheading J. Scholastic Indexes, Academic Procedures Manual (Page O-29)

Present	Proposed
<p>J. Scholastic Indexes*</p> <p>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 style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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> <li>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.</li> </ol>	<p>J. Scholastic Indexes*</p> <p>The scholastic standing of all students enrolled in programs leading to a degree shall be determined by <b>three</b> scholastic indexes: the semester index, the cumulative index, <b>and the graduation index.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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> <li>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. <b>The cumulative index will be used by the University for reporting to external agencies.</b></li> <li>3. <b>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 12 months of the student's enrollment as a full-time or part-time degree-seeking student, (2) the courses are not required for the curriculum in which the student is enrolled, and (3) the courses are removed within the first 24 months of the student's enrollment as a full-time or part-time degree-seeking student. The process of grade adjustment is not reversible. Courses that have been removed from the calculation of the graduation index can not be used to fulfill any requirements for graduation.</b></li> </ol>

Approved:

Kristine Anderson  
Behnam Ben Arjomandi  
Ann Astell  
Carol Baird  
George Bodner, Chair  
Dennis Bowling  
Patrick Connolly  
Scott Feld  
Jim Greenan  
L. Tony Hawkins  
Christine Ladisch  
Andrew Luescher  
James D. McGlothlin  
Robert Montgomery  
Mark Moriarty  
Hisao Nakanishi  
Richard Penney  
Mike Talbott  
Robert Waterson

Not Approving:

Layi Adeola  
Robert Kubat

**Amendment from EPC to Document 05-5  
20 February 2006  
As Amended and Approved 20 February 2006**

PROPOSED CHANGE TO UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS 2005-06

Part 2 Academic Regulations and Procedures, Section VII Grades and Grade Reports,  
Subheading J. Scholastic Indexes, Academic Procedures Manual (Page O-29)

Present	Proposed
<p>J. Scholastic Indexes*</p> <p>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> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>J. Scholastic Indexes*</p> <p>The scholastic standing of all students enrolled in programs leading to a degree shall be determined by <b>three</b> scholastic indexes: the semester index, the cumulative index, <b>and the graduation index</b>.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. <b>The cumulative index will be used by the University for reporting to external agencies.</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></p>

**To: The University Senate**  
**From: Faculty Affairs Committee - Mark Morgan, Chair**  
**Subject: Changes to University Grade Appeals System**  
**Reference: University Regulations 2005-06, Part 5, Section III, E. Grade Appeals System**  
**Disposition: University Senate for Discussion**

## **Introduction**

Last spring, Provost Mason appointed a task force to review the existing grade appeals system and to recommend changes to the system. That task force included Associate Dean Stephen Akers, Drs. George Bodner, Anne Knupfer, Wallace Morrison, Charlene Sullivan, Candiss Vibbert, William Zinsmeister, Mr. Jonathan Hoggatt, and Margaret Moan Rowe (chair).

The recommendations from that task force were revised and approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee on October 3, 2005.

### **EXISTING**

#### **E. Grade Appeals System**

**1. Adoption by Faculty.** The faculty of the University at the West Lafayette Campus has adopted the following procedures for grade appeals pursuant to the authority delegated to the faculty. The Board of Trustees hereby approves such procedures for the West Lafayette Campus.

#### **2. General.**

**a.** In the academic community, grades are a measure of student achievement toward fulfillment of course objectives. The responsibility for assessing student achievement and assigning grades rests with the faculty, and, except for unusual circumstances, the course grade given is final.

**b.** The grade appeals system affords recourse to a student who has evidence or believes that evidence exists to show that an inappropriate grade has been assigned as a result of prejudice, caprice, or other improper conditions such as mechanical error, or assignment of a grade inconsistent with those assigned other students. Additionally, a student may challenge the reduction of a grade for alleged scholastic dishonesty.

### **PROPOSED**

#### **E. Grade Appeals System**

**1. Adoption by Faculty.** The faculty of the University at the West Lafayette Campus has adopted the following procedures for grade appeals pursuant to the authority delegated to the faculty. The Board of Trustees hereby approves such procedures for the West Lafayette Campus.

#### **2. General.**

**a.** In the academic community, grades are a measure of student achievement toward fulfillment of course objectives. The responsibility for assessing student achievement and assigning grades rests with the faculty, and, except for unusual circumstances, the course grade given is final.

**b.** The grade appeals system affords recourse to a student who has evidence or believes that evidence exists to show that an inappropriate grade has been assigned as a result of prejudice, caprice, or other improper conditions such as mechanical error, or assignment of a grade inconsistent with those assigned other students. Additionally, a student may challenge the reduction of a grade for alleged scholastic dishonesty.

c. The only University authorities empowered to change grades are the instructor or, in the case of teaching assistants, the faculty member in charge of the course in question and the chairman/chairwoman of the University Grade Appeals Committee acting in behalf of the school and University grade appeals committees.

d. Informal attempts must be made to resolve grade grievances and appeals at the lowest possible level — through the course instructor, through the department head, or through other informal procedures outlined by the school and/or department in which the course was taught.

e. Graduate students who wish to appeal grades received in regular coursework may do so through the grade appeals system. Cases involving the decisions of graduate examination committees, the acceptance of graduate theses, and the application of professional standards relating to the retention of graduate students shall be handled by procedures authorized by the Graduate Council rather than the grade appeals system.

f. When a student initiates a formal grade appeal, he/she should be prepared to state in what way his/her grade assignment was arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise improper. At that time, he/she may seek the assistance of the dean of students, the chairperson of one of the grade appeals committees, or his/her academic advisor.

g. In appealing a grade, the burden of proof is on the student, except in the case of alleged academic dishonesty, where the instructor must support the allegation.

### **3. School Grade Appeals Committees.**

a. Each of the 10 schools of Purdue University at the West Lafayette Campus shall establish a Grade Appeals Committee to hear grade grievances and appeals that are not resolved informally at a lower level. In cases of alleged academic dishonesty, the school committee shall consist of two undergraduate students, two graduate students (except in schools that have no graduate students, in which case the graduates

c. The only University authorities empowered to change grades are the instructor or, in the case of teaching assistants, the faculty member in charge of the course in question and the chairman/chairwoman of the University Grade Appeals Committee acting in behalf of the school and University grade appeals committees.

d. Informal attempts must be made to resolve grade grievances and appeals at the lowest possible level — through the course instructor, through the department head, or through other informal procedures outlined by the **college/school** and/or department in which the course was taught.

e. Graduate students who wish to appeal grades received in regular coursework may do so through the grade appeals system. Cases involving the decisions of graduate examination committees, the acceptance of graduate theses, and the application of professional standards relating to the retention of graduate students shall be handled by procedures authorized by the Graduate Council rather than the grade appeals system.

f. When a student initiates a formal grade appeal, he/she should be prepared to state in what way his/her grade assignment was arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise improper. At that time, he/she may seek the assistance of the dean of students, the chairperson of one of the grade appeals committees, or his/her academic advisor.

g. In appealing a grade, the burden of proof is on the student, except in the case of alleged academic dishonesty, where the instructor must support the allegation.

### **3. College/School Grade Appeals Committees.**

*a. Each of the colleges/schools of Purdue University at the West Lafayette Campus will establish a Grade Appeals Committee to hear grade grievances and appeals that are not resolved informally at a lower level. Each committee will consist of two students (undergraduate or graduate corresponding to the status of the appellant), three members of the instructional faculty, and a non-voting*

will be replaced by a like number of undergraduates), and four members of the instructional faculty; in all other cases, the committee shall consist of two students (undergraduate or graduate corresponding to the status of the appellant) and four members of the instructional faculty. An addition, there will be alternates from each (faculty, graduate, and undergraduate) category. The number of alternates selected by each school may vary depending upon anticipated school needs. Each school shall establish procedures whereby the student members and alternates shall be selected annually by the appropriate segment (undergraduate or graduate) of the student body of that unit. Two of the faculty members of the committee shall be selected annually for a two-year term, by vote of the faculty of the school involved, with alternates being selected at the same time for a like term. From the panel of alternates, the chairperson of the respective school committee shall select at random the particular alternates to serve as temporary or permanent replacements for regular members as may be necessary because of absence, personal involvement in the case, potential conflicts of interest, or other specific disqualifying causes.

**b.** The regular members and alternates shall be selected in the spring (not later than May 1) to commence serving June 1. No member shall serve more than two consecutive terms. Annually, at the last meeting of the academic year, the eight members for the coming year plus all retiring committee members shall elect (by majority vote) one of the four regular faculty members to act as the new chairperson of the committee.

#### **4. University Grade Appeals Committee.**

**a.** A University Grade Appeals Committee, with the authority to hear appeals of school committee decisions, shall be established for the West Lafayette Campus. The University committee shall be responsible to and report to the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Senate. In hearing appeals from cases of alleged academic dishonesty, the University committee shall consist of three undergraduate students, three

***chairperson. The chairperson of the committee will be an assistant or associate dean of the college/school appointed by the dean. The chairperson will be responsible for assuring adherence to established procedures, convening members for an appeal, and maintaining records. The chairperson has the authority to grant warranted time extension in the appeals process described below.***

***b.*** *Voting members of the committee will be selected from a pool of at least eight students and eight instructional faculty. The pool of members of the committee will be selected according to school/college procedures in the spring (not later than May 1) to commence serving on the first day of the following fall semester. No member shall serve more than two consecutive terms in the pool.*

#### **4. University Grade Appeals Committee.**

**a.** A University Grade Appeals Committee, with the authority to hear appeals of school committee decisions, shall be established for the West Lafayette Campus. The University committee shall be responsible to and report to the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Senate. ***In all appeal cases,*** the committee shall consist of ***two students*** (undergraduate or graduate to correspond to the status of the appealing student)

graduate students, and six members of the instructional faculty, in all other appeal cases, the committee shall consist of three students (undergraduate or graduate to correspond to the status of the appealing student) and six members of the instructional faculty. They shall be selected in the following manner: six undergraduate students nominated by the student body president and confirmed by the Student Senate; three graduate students appointed by the Committee on Student Affairs of the University Senate; and nine faculty members selected by the University Senate. The student members shall be appointed annually. Three of the faculty members of the committee shall be elected annually for a three-year term.

**b.** The members shall be selected in the spring (not later than May 1) to start serving June 1. No member shall serve more than two consecutive terms. If any appointing authority fails to make the initial appointments to the University Grade Appeals Committee within the specified time, or to fill any vacancy on the panel of members within five days after being notified to do so by the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee, or if at any time the University Grade Appeals Committee cannot function because of refusal of any member to serve, the chairperson of the Faculty Affairs Committee may make appointments, fill vacancies, or take such other actions as he/she deems necessary to constitute a University Grade Appeals Committee.

**c.** Annually, at the last University Grade Appeals Committee meeting of the academic year, the 18 members for the coming year plus all retiring committee members shall elect (by majority vote) one of the six regular faculty members to act as the new chairperson of the committee.

**d.** The University Grade Appeals Committee shall adopt its own hearing proceedings, and establish uniform procedures to be followed by the school committees. The chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee shall be responsible for insuring that all school grade appeals committees are properly constituted and functional.

and **four** members of the instructional faculty. They shall be selected in the following manner: **four** undergraduate students nominated by the student body president and confirmed by the Student Senate; **four** graduate students appointed by the Committee on Student Affairs of the University Senate; and **eight** faculty members selected by the University Senate. The student members shall be appointed annually. **Two** of the faculty members of the committee shall be elected annually for a three-year term. -

**b.** The members shall be selected in the spring (not later than May 1) to start serving **on the first day of the following fall semester**. No member shall serve more than two consecutive terms. If any appointing authority fails to make the initial appointments to the University Grade Appeals Committee within the specified time, or to fill any vacancy on the panel of members within five days after being notified to do so by the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee, or if at any time the University Grade Appeals Committee cannot function because of refusal of any member to serve, the chairperson of the Faculty Affairs Committee may make appointments, fill vacancies, or take such other actions as he/she deems necessary to constitute a University Grade Appeals Committee.

**c.** Annually, at the last University Grade Appeals Committee meeting of the academic year, **the members** for the coming year plus all retiring committee members shall elect (by majority vote) one of the **eight** regular faculty members to act as the new **non-voting** chairperson of the committee.

**d.** The University Grade Appeals Committee shall adopt its own hearing proceedings, and establish uniform procedures to be followed by the **college/school** committees. The chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee shall be responsible for insuring that all school grade appeals committees are properly constituted and functional.

## 5. Initiating a Grade Appeal.

**a.** A student who wishes to appeal a grade must file a notice of intention to appeal with the chairperson of the Grade Appeals Committee of the school in which the course was taken. This must be done within 30 days after the start of the regular semester following the one in which the questioned grade was given. The student will then have a maximum of 30 days (from the date of the notice) to attempt to resolve the situation with the instructor, department head, etc. If a mutually acceptable decision is not reached, the student must return (within the 30-day limit) to the respective school committee chairperson with a detailed written statement of allegations, facts, and circumstances. When it appears necessary to avoid undue hardship or to avoid injustice, the school committee chairperson may extend the time limitation.

**b.** After receipt of the student's detailed statement, the chairperson shall promptly give notice of the hearing to the involved faculty member with the time, date, and place of the hearing (which shall be held not less than five and, whenever practicable, not more than 10 days after the receipt of such notice). Written notice shall be accompanied by a copy of the student's detailed statement, as well as the procedures and sequence of events to be followed in conducting the hearing.

The involved faculty member may request the school grade appeals committee to review the student's allegations and rule if the allegations concern issues within the jurisdiction of the committee. If any member of the committee finds cause for a grade appeal, a hearing shall be held; otherwise, the student's appeal shall be denied. Within six class days of receipt of the committee decision the student may file a written notice of intent to request further appeal with the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee.

## 5. Initiating a Grade Appeal.

**a.** *Prior to initiating a grade appeal, the student is strongly encouraged to resolve the situation with the instructor, department head, or head's designee. The department head is strongly encouraged to facilitate an informal resolution process between the parties.*

### **b. Appeal Process.**

*(1) A student who wishes to initiate a grade appeal must file a written statement of allegations, facts, and circumstances concerning the grade assigned with the chairperson of the Grade Appeals Committee of the college/school in which the course was taken. This must be done within 30 calendar days after the start of the regular semester following the one in which the questioned grade was given.*

*(2) After receipt of the student's written statement, the chairperson will promptly furnish a copy of the statement to the involved instructor who has seven days to make a written response. The chairperson will submit the statement of appeal and any responses to each of the members of the college/school grade appeals committee. Committee members will review the written documents within seven calendar days from the date they are received. If one voting member of the committee rules that the allegations warrant a hearing or are best addressed through a hearing, a hearing will be held; otherwise, the appeal will be denied. With reasonable cause, the chairperson may override the decision not to hear the case.*

*(3) If the appeal is to be heard, the chairperson will promptly give notice of the time, date, and place of the hearing to the parties involved. The hearing will be scheduled not more than 14 calendar days after notice to the student and instructor.*

c. The faculty member shall promptly make all pertinent grading records available to the school committee chairperson. In advance of the hearing, the chairperson may at his/her discretion make available to the student those records (or portions thereof) that he/she judges to be relevant in light of the student's allegations.

**6. Conduct of School Grade Appeals Committee Hearing, General.**

a. The hearing shall be closed, unless both parties agree in writing that it be open. This chairperson's determination of the hearing location and the number of individuals that can be conveniently accommodated shall be final. The student and the instructor are both entitled to be represented at the hearing by advisors of their choice. Because the hearings are administrative and not judicial in nature, the advisors may not be lawyers. Both parties (or their representatives) have the right to present evidence and witnesses in their behalf and to confront and question opposing witnesses.

b. Under normal circumstances, if the duly notified student complainant does not appear for the hearing the complaint shall be dismissed, the case closed, and these actions not subject to further hearing or appeal. If, however, a duly notified faculty member does not appear, the hearing will continue on the presumption that there is no desire to challenge evidence or witnesses presented by the student.

(4) The *instructor* will promptly make all pertinent grading records available to the *college/school* committee's chairperson. In advance of the hearing, the chairperson may at his/her discretion make available to the student those records (or portions thereof) that he/she judges to be relevant in light of the student's allegations.

**6. Conduct of College/School Grade Appeals Committee Hearing, General.**

a. The hearing shall be closed, unless both parties agree in writing that it be open. The chairperson's determination of the hearing location and the number of individuals that can be conveniently accommodated shall be final. The student and the instructor are both entitled to be *accompanied* at the hearing by advisors of their choice. Because the hearings are administrative and not judicial in nature, the advisors may not be lawyers. Both parties have the right to present evidence and witnesses in their behalf and to confront and question opposing witnesses.

b. Under normal circumstances, if the duly notified student complainant does not appear for the hearing the complaint shall be dismissed, the case closed, and these actions not subject to further hearing or appeal. If, however, a duly notified faculty member does not appear, the hearing will continue on the presumption that there is no desire to challenge evidence or witnesses presented by the student.

c. An official tape recording shall be made of each hearing and filed by the chairperson of the respective school committee for at least one year. The recording will be confidential and used only if further appeal is granted by the University Grade Appeals Committee or under legal compulsion.

d. At the conclusion of the hearing, the committee may (by a majority vote of the committee membership) recommend changing the original grade. A written report of the committee's decision shall be sent to both parties and the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee no later than 15 days after the conclusion of the hearing. Either party may, within six class days of receipt of the decision, file a written notice of intent to request further appeal with the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee. If no such notice is received by the chairperson within the six-day period, the decision shall not be subject to further hearing appeal. If, at that time, the instructor who originally gave the grade is not willing to initiate a recommended change, the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee shall file the directed change with the registrar who shall record the new grade.

#### **7. Appeal of a School Committee Decision.**

a. Under certain specific circumstances (Sec III-E-7-b) either the student or the instructor may file a request for an appeal of the school grade appeals committee decision. If the appeal request is granted, the case will be heard by the University Grade Appeals Committee. The process may be initiated by filing a personally signed notice of appeal with the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee within the six-day limit (Section III-E-6-d). The notice

c. An official *audio* recording shall be made of each hearing and filed by the chairperson of the respective *college/school* committee for at least one year. The recording will be confidential and used only if further appeal is granted by the University Grade Appeals Committee or under legal compulsion.

d. At the conclusion of the hearing, the committee may (by a majority vote of the committee membership) recommend changing the original grade. A written report of the committee's decision shall be sent to both parties and the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee no later than *three* days after the conclusion of the hearing. Either party may, within six class days of receipt of the decision, file a written notice of intent to request further appeal with the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee. If no such notice is received by the chairperson within the six-day period, the decision shall not be subject to further hearing appeal. If, at that time, the instructor who originally gave the grade is not willing to initiate a recommended change, the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee shall file the directed change with the registrar who shall record the new grade.

*e. The chairperson of each college/school committee will maintain a written record of all grade appeals heard in the college/school and provide an annual overview of the grade appeals process to the Provost*

#### **7. Appeal of a College/School Committee Decision.**

a. Under certain specific circumstances (Sec III-E-7-b) either the student or the instructor may file a request for an appeal of the *college/school* grade appeals committee decision. If the appeal request is granted, the case will be heard by the University Grade Appeals Committee. The process may be initiated by filing a personally signed notice of appeal with the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee within the six-day limit (Section III-E-6-d). The notice

shall be accompanied by a written statement of the alleged procedural irregularities or new evidence, or a substantial enumeration of why the appellant believes the school committee decision is erroneous or unfair. Upon request, the respective school committee chairperson immediately will transmit the tape recording of the school hearing and any other items of evidence presented at the school hearing to the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee. The decision of the University Grade Appeals Committee to grant or deny appeals from school committees shall be final.

**b.** If the University Grade Appeals Committee finds, on the basis of the appellant's written statement and other available evidence, that substantial procedural irregularities or inequities existed in the school hearing or that substantial new evidence has been uncovered, the University Grade Appeals Committee shall hear the case de novo. Additionally, the committee may, at its discretion, hear appeals from the school level, when the appellant's statement substantiates to its satisfaction that the school decision may have been erroneous or unfair. If the University Grade Appeals Committee grants an appeal, the chairperson shall promptly give notice to both parties of the time, date, and place of hearing (which shall be held not less than five and, whenever practicable, not more than 10 days after the receipt of such notice), as well as providing them with a copy of the procedures and sequence of events to be followed in conducting the hearing.

#### **8. Conduct of University Grade Appeal Committee Hearings, General.**

**a.** The appeal hearing shall be closed, unless both parties agree in writing for it to be open. The chairperson's determination of the hearing location and the number of individuals that can be conveniently accommodated shall be final. The appellant and opposing parties are both entitled to be represented at the hearing by advisors of their choice. Because the hearings are administrative and not judicial in nature, the

shall be accompanied by a written statement of the alleged procedural irregularities or new evidence, or a substantial enumeration of why the appellant believes the *college/school* committee decision is erroneous or unfair. Upon request, the respective *college/school* committee chairperson immediately will transmit the *audio* recording of the *college/school* hearing and any other items of evidence presented at the college/school hearing to the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee. The decision of the University Grade Appeals Committee to grant or deny appeals from school committees shall be final.

**b.** If the University Grade Appeals Committee finds, on the basis of the appellant's written statement and other available evidence, that substantial procedural irregularities or inequities existed in the *college/school* hearing or that substantial new evidence has been uncovered, the University Grade Appeals Committee shall hear the case de novo. Additionally, the committee may, at its discretion, hear appeals from the *college/school* level, when the appellant's statement substantiates to its satisfaction that the *college/school* decision may have been erroneous or unfair. If the University Grade Appeals Committee grants an appeal, the chairperson shall promptly give notice to both parties of the time, date, and place of hearing (which shall be held not less than five and, whenever practicable, not more than 10 days after the receipt of such notice), as well as providing them with a copy of the procedures and sequence of events to be followed in conducting the hearing.

#### **8. Conduct of University Grade Appeal Committee Hearing, General.**

**a.** The appeal hearing shall be closed, unless both parties agree in writing for it to be open. The chairperson's determination of the hearing location and the number of individuals that can be conveniently accommodated shall be final. The appellant and opposing parties are both entitled to be *accompanied* at the hearing by advisors of their choice. Because the hearings are administrative and not judicial in nature, the

advisors may not be lawyers. If an appeal is heard on the basis of procedural irregularity or new evidence, either parties (or their representatives) have the right to present evidence and witnesses in their behalf and to confront and question opposing witnesses. If, however, the University Grade Appeals Committee elects to hear an appeal on the grounds that the school grade appeals committee's decision appears to be erroneous or unfair, it shall not accept additional evidence but shall consider only matters introduced at the school hearing. The taped record of the school hearing shall be made available for audition by both parties and the members of the University committee. Additionally, the committee may, at its discretion, have a transcript of the school hearing prepared. If a transcript is prepared, it will be safeguarded and used in the same fashion as taped records of hearings.

**b.** If a duly notified appellant does not appear for the hearing, the committee may close the case and it will be subject to no further hearing or appeal. If the opposing party (having been duly notified) does not appear, the hearing will continue on the presumption that there is no desire to challenge evidence or witnesses that may be presented.

**c.** An official tape recording shall be made of each hearing and kept by the chairperson of the University committee for at least one year. The tape will be confidential and used only under legal compulsion in civil court proceedings.

**d.** After the University Grade Appeals Committee hears an appeal, it may (by a majority vote of the committee membership) recommend changing the original grade. A written report of the University Grade Appeals Committee's decision shall be sent to both parties no later than 15 days after the conclusion of the hearing. The University Grade Appeals Committee's decision is final, and shall not be subject to further hearing or appeal. If the instructor who originally gave the grade is not willing to initiate any recommended grade change, the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee shall file the change with the registrar who shall record the new grade.

advisors may not be lawyers. If an appeal is heard on the basis of procedural irregularity or new evidence, both parties have the right to present evidence and witnesses in their behalf and to confront and question opposing witnesses. If, however, the University Grade Appeals Committee elects to hear an appeal on the grounds that the *college/school* grade appeals committee's decision appears to be erroneous or unfair, it shall not accept additional evidence but shall consider only matters introduced at the *college/school* hearing. The *audio* record of the *college/school* hearing shall be made available for audition by both parties and the members of the University committee. Additionally, the committee may, at its discretion, have a transcript of the *college/school* hearing prepared. If a transcript is prepared, it will be safeguarded and used in the same fashion as *audio* records of hearings.

**b.** If duly notified appellant does not appear for the hearing, the committee may close the case and it will be subject to no further hearing or appeal. If the opposing party (having been duly notified) does not appear, the hearing will continue on the presumption that there is no desire to challenge evidence or witnesses that may be presented.

**c.** An official *audio* recording shall be made of each hearing and kept by the chairperson of the University committee for at least one year. The *recording* will be confidential and used only under legal compulsion in civil court proceeding

**d.** After the University Grade Appeals Committee hears an appeal, it may (by a majority vote of the committee membership) recommend changing the original grade. A written report of the University Grade Appeals Committee's decision shall be sent to both parties no later than 15 days after the conclusion of the hearing. If the instructor who originally gave the grade is not willing to initiate any recommended grade change, the chairperson of the University Grade Appeals Committee shall file the change with the registrar who shall record the new grade. The University Grade Appeals Committee's decision is final, and shall not be subject to further hearing or appeal.

**9. Other Academic/Grade Appeal Jurisdictions.**

**a.** Informal boards or committees may be established within academic departments to resolve grade grievances and appeals.

**b.** Students involved in cases of alleged academic dishonesty may be subject to disciplinary penalties under Section III-B-2-a of the Regulations Governing Student Conduct, Disciplinary Proceedings, and Appeals.

**Approving:**

- A Beck
- J. Duzinkiewicz
- B. Harper
- N. Harter
- T. Kuczek
- V. Killion
- S. Mason
- D. McMillin
- M. Morgan
- C. Nakatsu
- A. Rollock
- C. Sullivan
- D. Williams

**9. Other Academic/Grade Appeal Jurisdictions.**

**a.** Informal boards or committees may be established within academic departments to resolve grade grievances and appeal.

**b.** Students involved in cases of alleged academic dishonesty may be subject to disciplinary penalties under Section III-B-2-a of the Regulations Governing Student Conduct, Disciplinary Proceedings, and Appeals.

**Absent:**

- J. Contreni
- C.S.G. Lee
- Y. Yih